

Education, Human Security, and the Terrorism Problematique: Reflections on UNESCO, ISESCO, and Iran

by Wayne Nelles

Although there is no consensus on best responses to political or religious violence, some governments, media, and security analysts have argued (amid controversy) that Islamic education is a primary contributing factor, or “root cause,” of much terrorism today and that reforms might prevent or mitigate violence. Yet an important human security report has raised concern about current approaches to fighting terrorism, in part because the educational sector was “chronically underfunded.”¹ Equally problematic is a violent, military-led, declared “war” with no clear end, ostensibly against “terrorism” but largely targeting Islamic peoples or nations. Such a war further compromises realistic, nonviolent, and human security–based alternatives, such as education for conflict resolution, peace education, multicultural education, education for tolerance, and similar approaches. This paper² focuses on related United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) debates and pragmatic challenges. It further suggests non-Western agencies—such as the Islamic Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (ISESCO)—need better understanding in light of Westphalian international relations theory, misperceptions of Islam, and new diplomatic imperatives, now particularly connected to Iran.

UNESCO’S HUMAN SECURITY MANDATE, 9/11, AND TERRORISM POLICY DEBATES

UNESCO’s 1946 Constitution asserts that, since wars begin “in minds” or due to “ignorance of each other’s ways and lives,” it is through education that “defences of peace” must be built. UNESCO’s nonmilitary security mandate further reflects many current core human security objectives. The UNDP’s 1994 *Human Development Report* popularized the human security idea, highlighting “soft” or “non-traditional” security threats to individuals over “hard” security or military defense for nationstates. Theoretical frameworks and field applications since have ranged from a

Wayne Nelles is Senior Associate at the Sustainable Development Research Institute at the University of British Columbia and is a 2002 DFAIT Human Security Fellow, University of Victoria, Centre for Global Studies, Canada.

broad sustainable human development-oriented concept (“freedom from want”) to a narrower, personal safety or human rights idea (“freedom from fear”), coupled with a “human rights-based” or international “rule of law” approach.³ Education studies have been mostly linked to post-conflict reconstruction or peacebuilding,⁴ but some recent research has examined education, terrorism, and human-security linkages more specifically.⁵

While terrorism as an idea or tactic clearly existed in the 1940s, it was not a pressing concern for UN founders. UNESCO largely ignored terrorism issues until the attacks of September 11, 2001, on the United States. The 9/11 crisis spawned new popular debate and academic analysis on interrelated education, conflict, and terrorism challenges.⁶ Some field research suggests that different faith groups (not just Muslims) and various forms of religious learning may indeed fuel deadly extremism.⁷ The US pledge to reenter UNESCO in 2002, after an eighteen-year absence, was partly in response to such concerns, representing an attempt to achieve global security through a “hearts and minds” approach, but President Bush problematically announced America’s return to UNESCO with an advance declaration of war against Iraq.⁸ Arguably this commitment was more about “public diplomacy” to justify a dubious counterterrorism and national security strategy that violently undermined many nonmilitary human security initiatives than about a genuine commitment to UNESCO or multilateralism.⁹ Despite a modest boost to its regular budget with expected American membership dues, direct funding for UNESCO remains miniscule compared to the work expected of it. By contrast, the United States substantially increased bilateral educational aid to Pakistan (mainly targeting extremism believed to be fostered in *madrassa* schools), for example, and other Muslim countries in strategic locations.¹⁰

On the other hand, one important post-Cold War education theme in global policy discussions, taking another approach to concerns about peace and conflict on a more personal level, and discussed in multilateral forums, has focused on “Learning to Live Together.” Its aim is to facilitate respect, peace, and tolerance in a diverse, pluralistic world. Ironically, UNESCO’s forty-sixth International Conference on Education ICE in (2001), which reviewed related national education efforts and achievements in conflict resolution and peaceful cooperation, took place just days before 9/11. The ICE was partly a response to the 1995 Delors Commission Report.¹¹ At the time, the US still had not rejoined UNESCO, but in light of the obvious, one set of ICE 2001 proceedings raised an important question. UNESCO Director-General, Koichiro Matsuura, asked,

Does what happened on 11 September mean that we have failed, that our ideal is but a Utopia, that all effort is unavailing? Certainly not. It is one more reason to step up our action in order to eradicate the deep-rooted causes of terrorism, which include poverty, ignorance, prejudice and discrimination.¹²

In October 2001, the Biennial General Conference of UNESCO, also meeting just weeks after 9/11, affirmed that “a coherent and coordinated response” to

terrorism was needed, but rejected “the association of terrorism with any particular religion, religious belief, or nationality.” Towards this end, UNESCO Resolution 2001/39 stressed “values of tolerance, universality, mutual understanding, respect for cultural diversity and the promotion of a culture of peace.” This resolution also, based on the organization’s mandate, proclaimed that “UNESCO has a duty to contribute to the eradication of terrorism, drawing on its character as an intellectual and ethical organization” and invited “the Director-General to take appropriate action.”¹³ But Pierre Sane, assistant director-general, social sciences (UNESCO’s most senior official overseeing human security policies and programming) also worried, “If terrorism is a global threat, it is best tackled through international cooperation, within the framework of international law and international justice”¹⁴ while upholding human rights. UNESCO plays a role in helping governments educate citizens about fundamental human rights and freedoms,¹⁵ but some countries, under the guise of combating terrorism, have openly violated and dramatically compromised human security objectives (especially the “rule of law” and “freedom from fear” dimensions).¹⁶

Some countries, under the guise of combating terrorism, have openly violated and dramatically compromised human security objectives.

After 9/11, the UN system as a whole took an interagency approach to perceived terrorist threats. A new Policy Working Group on the United Nations and Terrorism stressed that two types of strategies were needed: operational prevention and structural prevention. The first refers to immediate measures amid imminent or actual crisis, and the second concerns “longer-term measures to remove the causes of conflict.”¹⁷ Recommendation 10 of its 2002 report suggested “giving greater prominence” to UNESCO and other UN agencies “in respect of educational initiatives, such as curricula reform, that aim to increase understanding, encourage tolerance and respect for human dignity, while reducing mutual mistrust between communities in conflict.”¹⁸ It called on all UN organs dealing with education to “mount a coherent worldwide programme to assist countries in which the educational systems need support or that are under the control of groups advocating terror.”¹⁹ Recommendation 21 focused on decreasing the incidence of defense scientists and technical experts supporting terrorist activities.²⁰

In response, Mr. Matsuura convened a February 2003 interagency meeting entitled “Promoting Peace and Security through Education and Science: Elements for a UN Strategy against Terrorism.” He highlighted UNESCO’s primary contributions, including promotion of the right to education, the right to free participation in cultural life, and the right to free expression.²¹ More broadly, he drew from a UNESCO Bureau of Strategic Planning background document prepared for the meeting which reviewed five key UNESCO “action areas”: (1) Revision and Development of Textbooks and Teaching Materials and Related Teacher Training;

(2) Ethics of Science and Technology; (3) Culture of Peace, Human Rights Education and Education for Non-Violence and Peaceful Resolution of Conflict; (4) Media Education and Freedom of Expression; and (5) Dialogue among Cultures and Civilizations and Protection of Cultural Diversity.²² The latter, Matsuura stressed, was a key strategic priority for UNESCO.

UNESCO's background document highlighted various projects, conferences, declarations, programs, and international and decade frameworks implying that eradicating poverty, promoting literacy, nurturing respect for other cultures, protecting human rights, and promoting education for peace programs, would all help prevent terrorism. One example was the "Youth Declaration on Terrorism and War" from a Youth Forum at UNESCO's thirty-first General Conference. Another was a UNESCO-sponsored Conference on Terrorism and the Media in May 2002 in the Philippines,²³ which discussed state oppression against reporting, and the need for the free flow of and access to information. The document further stressed that UNESCO was "mindful of the importance of human security" as a "contribution to the prevention of terrorism," combining freedom from fear and want objectives. It pointed to relevant networks including: a) UNESCO Chairs; b) the Associated Schools Project; c) the UNESCO Education Server Programme for Civic and Human Rights Education in South East Europe; d) the International Council for Science; e) the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge; f) the International Bioethics Committee/Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights; g) Management of Social Transformations (MOST); and h) the Commission on Human Security.

Eradicating poverty, promoting literacy, nurturing respect for other cultures, protecting human rights, and promoting education for peace programs, would all help prevent terrorism.

Later, at its 2003 Paris General Conference, member states agreed to promote "regional frameworks" on human security in UNESCO's "fields of competence." That work falls mainly under Major Programme III—Social and Human Sciences. UNESCO's 2004–2005 Programme and Budget pledged to expand related "research on new forms of violence" through UNESCO's SecuriPax Network. More specifically, "as counterpoint to concerns about terrorism," it committed UNESCO to "foster thinking about the historical, socioeconomic, and cultural factors."²⁴ However, most UNESCO work on terrorism issues so far has been indirect, including the promotion of a "culture of peace," "nonviolence education," "peace education," and other approaches through domestic reforms, international development cooperation, and post-war reconstruction. At its 2003 General Conference, member states also passed a new resolution stressing "the need to respond to new challenges" which emphasized that "a commitment to dialogue among civilizations and cultures represents also a commitment against terrorism."²⁵

UNESCO's global policy agenda returned more specifically to terrorism during the fall 2004 executive board meetings, when the Russian Federation's Beslan school massacre triggered new debate. In Beslan, schools became not just potential causes of terrorism, but vulnerable targets. Broader contexts for 2004 debates were UNESCO's earlier General Conference post-9/11 commitments, but initial calls to action were based on a proposal by Russia, Belarus, China, and Italy, tabled October 5, 2004. The proposal called upon "the Director-General to develop specific counter-terrorism activities" for UNESCO's 2006–2007 program and budget. The draft went through several iterations based on a smaller working group and floor discussion. The final version was approved on October 12, 2004, but the resolution was almost scuttled because some governments initially suggested that it was a "political" issue that UNESCO should avoid. Other speakers indicated that their governments would not support any new budgetary increases. As discussions progressed, however, clarification on UNESCO's core purpose and previous resolutions emerged. In the approved version, the "counter-terrorism" reference was finally removed, leaving less militant, more familiar, UNESCO-like language. It suggested that a "lack of knowledge of others and intolerance towards the rich diversity of the world's cultures"²⁶ fueled extremism.

UNESCO clearly has a mandate to address terrorism, but since virtually all of UNESCO's work could be viewed (indirectly at least) as terrorism mitigation or prevention, its actual contribution is difficult to measure in results or effectiveness.

At UNESCO's executive meeting, member states' divergent views resulted in toned-down language because some UNESCO staff and member governments remain uncomfortable about a "counterterrorism" model often more associated with covert violence or military operations. UNESCO clearly has a mandate to address terrorism, but since virtually all of UNESCO's work could be viewed (indirectly at least) as terrorism mitigation or prevention, its actual contribution is difficult to measure in results or effectiveness. The sector leading specific work is UNESCO's Major Program in Social and Human Sciences, committed to further research on violence and terrorism.²⁷ In a broader context, UNESCO over the past few years has conducted or is planning a number of subregional consultations in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Eastern Europe to develop relevant regional human security frameworks, and it will hold a larger interregional conference in Paris, publishing a global human security report by 2007. That final synthesis of earlier contributions, including analysis of post-9/11 challenges, could include some modest reflection on terrorism issues.²⁸

UNESCO ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL ACTIVITIES AND ISSUES

Despite various rhetorical commitments by UNESCO and its member states in the sometimes ethereal Paris UNESCO policy debates, few new financial resources have directly supported specific analytical or project work on terrorism. Nonetheless, lingering effects of 9/11 and more recent tragedies have compelled UNESCO and its partners to act more concertedly. Most new work has come from “extra-budgetary” resources upon which some UN agencies today increasingly rely. The Asia-Pacific region has been a particular focus for UNESCO.

Inspired by the Delors “Learning to Live Together” Report, the Australian National Commission for UNESCO, with partners and cosponsors, hosted a conference in Adelaide on education for “preventing extremism and terrorism,” with 9/11 and the 2002 Bali nightclub bombings as obvious backdrops. It brought 255 delegates, including senior UNESCO representatives, National UNESCO Commissions, government officials, academics, teachers and teacher educators, conflict analysts, and peace education specialists from some fifty countries in and around Asia.²⁹ Koichiro Matsuura’s message linked the conference to a human security agenda, saying “We live in difficult times when peace and human security are facing new challenges.” Mr. Matsuura expected the Adelaide meeting to be “extremely helpful to UNESCO and its many partners as they address the threats posed by terrorism, fanaticism, and intolerance.”

Plenary speakers such as Sheldon Shaeffer, director of UNESCO’s regional office in Bangkok, connected this event to previous UN conferences, reports, and declarations including the Delors Report and the UN Decade of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World, 2001–2010. One broader context for increased intolerance, violence, and terrorism, Mr. Shaeffer suggested, was “social exclusion” arising from the widening gap between rich and poor due to globalization. This called for increased and improved intercultural and interfaith education for peace, including changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors; reorganization of curricular contents toward moral, ethical, and cultural education; teaching new content; retraining teachers; and creating safe school environments. He also suggested that new work was needed to link emerging UNESCO frameworks and the Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) Decade (2005–2014) with long-standing and varied “culture of peace” objectives and activities.³⁰

Fears of globalization, migration, diversifying societies, and demonic visions (of the “other”) threaten peace. This implies educating for shared values and understandings to stave off a “clash of civilizations” precipitated by terrorism.

Mary Joy Pigozzi, Director of UNESCO’s Division for the Promotion of Quality Education at Paris headquarters also underscored that “the urgency of our

work was not determined by 9/11,” but the attack highlighted issues that UNESCO has wrestled with since its creation. The challenge posed by terrorism, she said, is that terrorist acts and their justifications, as well as reactions of others, come from peoples who do not really know each other well. Fears of globalization, migration, diversifying societies, and demonic visions (of the “other”) threaten peace. This implies educating for shared values and understandings to stave off a “clash of civilizations” precipitated by terrorism. Concerning UNESCO’s core challenges, advancing quality education, she argued, was among the most important for promoting intercultural and interfaith understanding, to counteract intolerance and violence, and to foster a culture of peace.³¹

Although UNESCO has facilitated other work connected to interfaith and intercultural dialogue issues, the Adelaide conference has so far been the only major UNESCO initiative explicitly linking terrorism and education.

A working premise in Adelaide was the need to identify and develop shared values among different cultures, religions, and nations to find common goals and perspectives for helping to counteract negative stereotypes through education. Many speakers vaguely referred to post-9/11 world “turbulence,” but except in passing, terrorism as an issue was rarely discussed. Most remarks focused on very particular local conflicts or violence problems. The final Draft Communiqué did not even mention the word terrorism, noting “extremism” only once. Another challenge not well addressed in Adelaide was the contestable assumption that shared values do or can reduce or eliminate extremism or terrorism. Research on values education actually points to different, sometimes conflicting, results. The question of whose values should be shared and how (imposed or voluntary) was raised in Adelaide but not well debated, with clash-of-civilizations issues barely broached. Although UNESCO has facilitated other work connected to interfaith and intercultural dialogue issues,³² the Adelaide conference has so far been the only major UNESCO initiative explicitly linking terrorism and education.³³

Other UNESCO-affiliated research work has also begun through the Seoul-based Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU) founded in 2000. The APCEIU’s first annual conference of peace activists and educators, discussing case studies and models, took place in November 2001. As the American-led war in Afghanistan had just begun, APCEIU Director Samuel Lee worried about military force as a means to achieving prosperity and security.³⁴ He echoed comments at the 2001 UNESCO General Conference from French President Jacques Chirac, who worried about a wider clash of civilizations with more radical and violent cultural and religious-based conflict to come.³⁵

ISESCO, TERRORISM, “CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS,” AND IRAN

ISESCO was established in 1980 as specialized agency of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) in 1969, responding to perceived threats against Islam, with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a principal backdrop. Now with forty-eight member countries, ISESCO’s mandate has expanded to “consolidat[ing] understanding among Muslim peoples and contribut[ing] to the achievement of world peace and security,” importantly underscoring the Islamic community’s perceptions of their own security needs. ISESCO aims to “protect...Islamic thought against cultural invasion and distortion factors” and “to safeguard the Islamic identity of Muslims in non-Islamic countries.”³⁶ Many Western governments and diplomats, as well as non-Islamic Asian and other secular states, have never come to terms with this profound Muslim concern.

Why, many ask, should only certain countries be allowed to remain or openly become nuclear powers? Human security alternatives are ignored in the din.

Recent observations on shifts in American presidential and Pentagon thinking about the so-called global War on Terror, suggest their mission description is being replaced by the phrase “a global struggle against violent extremism,” and a “war of ideas,” with perceived threats more starkly labeled “Islamist extremism.”³⁷ This shift in language illustrates the greater need for multilateral organizations and Western governments not to simply attack, but understand Islam’s diverse culture and its unique global institutions. For decades, UNESCO, among many international agencies has been most sensitive to such challenges. But so far UNESCO, the OIC, and ISESCO all remain marginalized because Cold War military security institutions and models still dominate international relations. Despite the Soviet collapse, Western and Islamic world divisions were never really bridged. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains unresolved. American-Iranian diplomatic relations after 1979 festered from an open sore into a gaping and now life-threatening wound. New tensions surround Western worries over perceived Iranian nuclear ambitions, developing countries’ defiance of continued Western hegemony over the global security agenda, and obvious double standards. Why, many ask, should only certain countries be allowed to remain or openly become nuclear powers? Human security alternatives are ignored in the din.

International concern over Iran has grown amid possible nuclear threats, not only because of its strategic influence in American-occupied Iraq, but also because of its oil. Critics of Iran point out that its current president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, encouraged widespread reading of Huntington’s theories as a reserve officer in the Islamic Revolutionary Guard. They suggest Iran is now encouraging a clash of civilizations while exporting radical Islam to underpin an Iranian-led Caliphate in the Middle East and beyond.³⁸ Yet, ironically, it was Iran (a leading

member state of ISESCO) despite American diplomatic isolation, which spearheaded a new international dialogue process in response to Huntington and company, ostensibly to defuse tensions or prevent more open conflict. Whatever Iran's real, and undoubtedly varied, motives among its diverse groups and leaders, it supported the International Year for the Culture of Peace in 2000, and 2001 as United Nations Year of Dialogue of Civilizations.³⁹ Both ISESCO and UNESCO have carried out related work. ISESCO, with Iran at the helm, pioneered meetings among Muslim countries, as well as between Muslim and European nations. The United States, in contrast, long declaring Iran a "terrorist state," avoided normal diplomatic relations and dialogue. After 9/11, the US administration went so far as to make even stronger (but arguably unfounded) claims, saying that Iran was part of a global "axis of evil" threatening world peace.⁴⁰

Such rhetoric, however, has inflamed rather than reduced international tensions. It has oversimplified complex realities, inviting military escalation and confrontation instead of encouraging alternatives that could include authentic dialogue to reduce further potential for new terrorist violence or war. In preparation for 2001, the UN secretary-general's personal representative for the Year of Dialogue of Civilizations, Giandomenico Picco, stressed that productive dialogue could indeed be a reasonable and pragmatic goal. He said the dialogue of civilizations idea should "constitute the basis for switching from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention," but this "requires a shared commitment by Governments to set in motion processes of dialogue and mediation to address the underlying causes of potential conflicts before they erupt into wars."⁴¹ A series of international dialogue events followed, despite 9/11, but the US was not involved, and the international (especially American) media largely ignored or pilloried such initiatives. The international community as a whole has not well analyzed, engaged with, or understood Islamic multilateral institutions, and it avoids systematic global approaches to conflict prevention (despite it being a core human security objective).⁴²

The international community as a whole has not well analyzed, engaged with, or understood Islamic multilateral institutions, and it avoids systematic global approaches to conflict prevention.

In sum, international diplomacy and aid regimes to date have suffered from tepid, weak, and culturally narrow human security approaches hampered by limited resources and national interests. But an especially difficult challenge remains from those viewing the "West as best" with a clash of civilizations as necessary or inevitable. A key flaw with Huntington's work was the notion of the Western mind's "inability to conceive that the West may have developed structural weaknesses in its core value systems and institutions."⁴³ Some Muslim diplomats have justly called for new approaches and international system change.⁴⁴ The UN system in particular is a Westphalian legacy growing primarily out of Christian-European roots,

establishing international rules initially only shared and codified among Western nations. Some international relations scholars correctly say the rules “did not apply to Islam or the rest of the world.”⁴⁵ The post–World War II system was partly a transformation of old imperial systems into a new order of powerful nations imposing their laws and values on weaker states. The OIC and ISESCO were understandable responses, but the international community has still not adequately appreciated diverse religious, cultural, national, multilateral, or human security perspectives.

CONCLUSIONS: WHAT NEXT?

In light of these diverse and complex challenges, what can we conclude and what could be some next steps? Before 2001, ISESCO and UNESCO dialogue notions were never well understood, appreciated, or operationalized among academics, particular governments, or within the wider international community, either in theory or diplomatic practice. Dialogic- and human security–oriented world views have been further compromised after 9/11 and still suffer from those who view a military-led war as a primary (or even preferred) response to terrorism, alleged or real. UNESCO and ISESCO have already pointed to alternatives, but the international community has not taken them seriously. This is partly a conflict among “realists” and “idealists,” despite many shared concerns about the role of ideology, ideas, and education in world politics, social control, and violence reproduction. Still we might ask, if a significant or greater clash of Western and Islamic cultures after 9/11 remains (further complicated by increasing American and generally Western tensions over Iran), how can a “dialogue of civilizations” better serve violence mitigation, international confidence building, and global conflict prevention?

If a significant or greater clash of Western and Islamic cultures after 9/11 remains, how can a “dialogue of civilizations” better serve violence mitigation, international confidence building, and global conflict prevention?

UNESCO’s approach to this challenge has already been reinforced in various meetings and declarations. UNESCO’s executive board in November 2003, noting a New Delhi Ministerial Conference recalling UNESCO Resolution 2001/39 on preventing and eradicating terrorism, called for “intensifying the dialogue of civilizations and cultures and identifying new perspectives and approaches relating thereto.”⁴⁶ UNESCO’s director general has stressed that its work to protect cultural diversity and promote dialogue among civilizations was a key strategic priority⁴⁷ linked to a global human security agenda. Yet compared to traditional military or defense spending, few resources have been dedicated to this badly needed work. Hard security, violence, war, and terrorism ultimately still dominate mainstream

news, global policy agendas, and government budget allocations while human security approaches are viewed as “soft” or unrealistic.⁴⁸

Given such challenges, Western-Islamic cultural and diplomatic relations and their implications for human security deserve more systematic study. Accurately perceiving and better responding to Islamic culture and education as a human security issue is critical. Others have begun useful work underscoring that Western-dominant political and knowledge systems have not sufficiently appreciated that certain forms of Islamic education or religious learning communities may reflect culturally relevant and legitimate local and personal (human) security provisions.⁴⁹ ISESCO especially might be better understood for its expertise and unique views about Muslims’ community security, particularly in light of international debates or accusations that have linked some forms of Islamic education with extremism or terrorism. For example, in 1984 UNESCO and ISESCO signed a cooperation agreement later establishing a Joint Commission,⁵⁰ so work of this nature could be expanded upon.

Working more strategically, directly, but also less confrontationally, with Iran in particular, building on past dialogue-of-civilizations work, and better supporting UNESCO’s regional cluster office in Tehran could also be helpful.⁵¹ Potentially supportive governments or alliances such as the Human Security Network (HSN) might assist. UNESCO, ISESCO, HSN, and their member states must find new ways to strengthen inter-civilizational dialogue and research with special attention to Islamic-Western relations, while still realistically addressing interrelated education, terrorism, and human security challenges.

Notes

¹ Commission on Human Security (CHS), *Human Security Now* (New York: Commission on Human Security, 2003), 48, 69, 117-118.

² Some field research for this paper was carried out (September 2004–March 2005) thanks to financial support from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) Canada, Asia-Pacific Branch, Research and Conference Fund, while I served as a DFAIT-supported consultant to UNESCO’s Asia-Pacific regional office in Bangkok. My comments and analysis here, however, are those of an independent academic. They do not reflect either official UNESCO or Canadian government views.

³ For an overview of these three dimensions see: Fen Osler Hampson with J. Daudelin, J.B. Hay, T. Martin, and H. Reid, *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder* (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2002), 16.

⁴ Space does not permit a comprehensive review here, but on recent theory and field practice note: The World Bank, *Reshaping the Future: Education and Postconflict Reconstruction* (Washington: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2005); and Sohbi Tawil and Alexandra Harley, eds., *Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion* (Geneva: UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 2004). For a specific case study linking education and human security see: Wayne Nelles, “Education, Underdevelopment, Unnecessary War and Human Security in Kosovo/Kosova,” *International Journal of Educational Development* 25, no. 1 (January 2005): 69-84.

⁵ For some theoretical issues and debates with case studies see: Wayne Nelles, ed., *Comparative Education, Terrorism and Human Security: From Critical Pedagogy to Peace-building?* (New York: Palgrave-MacMillan Press, 2003).

⁶ Beyond my own work (Nelles 2003), and numerous media stories, for a sampling of early reports see: P.W. Singer, “Pakistan’s Madrassahs: Ensuring a System of Education not Jihad,” Analysis Paper #14, *Brookings Institution* (November 2001). Available at <http://www.brook.edu/dybdocroot/views/papers/singer/20020103.pdf> (Accessed December 19, 2005); and International Crisis Group, *Pakistan: Madrasas, Extremism And The Military*. ICG Asia Report # 36 (Islamabad/Brussels: International Crisis Group, July 2002). Available at <http://www.intl-crisis-group.org> (Accessed December 19, 2005). On Pakistan, the ICG later issued two

subsequent reports assessing the mostly ineffective progress of the government and international community on education reforms.

⁷ For one useful field and interview-based introduction to various religious groups or sects (not just Muslim, but Christian, Jewish, and Hindu) as well as individuals' motives and beliefs for justifying deadly violence, see: Jessica Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003).

⁸ George W. Bush, "President's Remarks at the United Nations General Assembly," White House, Office of the Press Secretary (September 12, 2002).

⁹ For a critique see: Wayne Nelles, "American Public Diplomacy as Pseudo-education: A Problematic National Security and Counter-terrorism Instrument," *International Politics: A Journal of Transnational Issues and Global Problems* 41, no. 1. (March 2004): 65-93.

¹⁰ A detailed comparative study of multilateral and bilateral education assistance for violence prevention or peacebuilding is beyond the scope of this paper. But the "follow the money" adage should point to the obvious, calling for more systematic analysis. For example, while we should be careful of "apples and oranges" comparisons, UNESCO's biennial global budget for 2004–2005 (some USD \$610 million over two years) pales next to more clearly strategic American bilateral education commitments, such as at least \$100 million in new USAID education support to just Pakistan alone over four years. This is not to mention millions more supporting a host of other bilateral education and military training initiatives linked to "counterterrorism." For a breakdown of specific UNESCO activities see: *United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization, 2004–2005 Approved Programme and Budget*, 32 C5, (Paris: UNESCO, 2004), passim. On American support for Pakistan, note: Owais Tohid, "Pakistan, US Take on the Madrassahs," *The Christian Science Monitor* (August 24, 2004).

¹¹ Jacques Delors (Chairman) *Learning the Treasure Within: Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century* (Paris: UNESCO, 1996).

¹² UNESCO/IBE. *Learning to Live Together: Have we Failed? A summary of the ideas and contributions arising from the Forty-Sixth Session of UNESCO's International Conference on Education: Geneva, 5-8 September 2001* (Geneva: UNESCO, International Bureau of Education, 2003), 5.

¹³ General Resolutions, Resolution 39, "Call for International Cooperation to Prevent and Eradicate Acts of Terrorism," Records of the General Conference, 31st Session, Paris, 2001 Proceedings, Vol. Resolutions, (Paris, UNESCO, 2003), 79.

¹⁴ Pierre Sane, "Steps to Protection: The Dublin Platform for Human Rights Defenders Conference" (Speech given in Dublin, Human Rights Defenders, January 17-19 2002). Available at <http://www.frontlinedefenders.org/platform/1307> (Accessed 19 December 2005).

¹⁵ Discussed in Katarina Tomasevski, *Manual on Rights-Based Education: Global Human Rights Requirements Made Simple* (Bangkok: UNESCO, Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education, 2004).

¹⁶ This has been a point of considerable controversy since 9/11. Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and other reputable NGOs have accused the US and many of its allies of violating human rights and even condoning or counseling torture while claiming exemption from international laws to fight terrorism. Of particular significance note the issue under consideration by the UN Human Rights Committee. See Thalif Deen, "UN Human Rights Body to Scrutinise U.S. Abuses," *Inter Press Service News Agency* (September 20, 2005). Available at <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=30355> (Accessed 19 December 2005).

¹⁷ United Nations. *Report of the Policy Working Group on the United Nations and Terrorism. Annex to A/57/273, S/2002/875*. Available at <http://www.un.org/terrorism/a57273.htm> (Accessed 19 December 2005).

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Koichiro Matsuura, "Promoting Peace and Security through Education and Science: Elements for a UN Strategy against Terrorism – UNESCO's Contribution" DG/2003/032 (Address given at conference with same title, February 26, 2003).

²² UNESCO Bureau of Strategic Planning, *Promoting Peace and Security through Education and Science: Elements for a UN Strategy against Terrorism – UNESCO's Contribution* (February 2003). Available at http://www.unesco.org/bsp/eng/peace_security.pdf (Accessed 19 December 2005).

²³ Connected to that conference, see: S.T. Kwame Boafo and Sylvie Coudray, eds., *Media, Violence and Terrorism* (Paris: UNESCO, 2003).

²⁴ UNESCO, *United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization, 2004-2005 Approved Programme and Budget*, 32 C5, (Paris: UNESCO, 2004), 168-9.

²⁵ UNESCO, *Records of the General Conference, 32nd Session*, Paris, September 29–October 17, 2003, Vol. 1 Resolutions, (Paris: UNESCO, 2004): 87-88.

²⁶ I observed the debate while the final consensus decision was titled: "The Promotion of Dialogue Among Peoples." It is recorded in: *United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization, Executive Board, Decisions Adopted by the Executive Board at its 170th Session*, (Paris: UNESCO, November 12, 2004), Available at

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001373/137349E.pdf>, 26.

²⁷ *United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization 2004-2005 Approved Programme and Budget*, 32 C5, (Paris: UNESCO, 2004), 168-169.

²⁸ Details are unclear at this stage. However, for some initial discussion, see Wayne Nelles, "Education, Terrorism and Multilateralism in Central Asia: Problems and Prospects for New Human Security Research Cooperation" (a paper presented to UNESCO-OSCE Academy Conference on "Human Security and Peace in Central Asia," (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, September 2005). A proceedings publication by UNESCO is forthcoming, 2006. Also note plans in *United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Draft Programme and Budget, 2006-7, 33/C5*, (Paris: UNESCO 2005), 135.

²⁹ *United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, "Education for Shared Values for Intercultural and Interfaith Understanding: Education Towards Preventing Extremism and Terrorism-Curriculum Design: Innovative and Effective Strategies"* (Adelaide, Australia: November 28 to December 3, 2004). Ironically, perhaps still reflecting how little real priority the United States gives to UNESCO's multilateral approach, not one American delegate attended in any official capacity. Only one professor from the United States participated privately. For the final declaration ("Call to Action, Adelaide, December 2004") see: http://www.dfat.gov.au/intorgs/unesco/education_for_shared_values.html.

³⁰ Sheldon Shaeffer, "The Role of Education for Sustainable Development, The Four Pillars, Child-Friendly Schools, Et. Al, in *Intercultural/Interfaith Education*" (a paper presented at the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Adelaide Conference, Adelaide, Australia, November 29, 2004).

³¹ Mary Joy Pigozzi, "Opening Address," and "The implications of global challenges for Education for Shared Values for Intercultural and Interfaith Understanding" (paper presented at the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Adelaide Conference, Adelaide, Australia, November 29, 2004). It should also be noted that within UNESCO's Division for the Promotion of Quality Education, is an entire "Section for Education for Peace and Human Rights" supported by eleven staff members in Paris.

³² UNESCO has engaged teachers, scholars and religious representatives in discussions for some years through its Intercultural Dialogue Division with a small Inter-Religious Dialogue Programme since the early 1990s. Reviewing recent trends, note UNESCO, *UNESCO Survey on Education and Teaching of Intercultural and Inter-religious Dialogue 1999-2001* Available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127158e.pdf>. Also, see *The Oslo Global Meeting of Experts* (September 2-5, 2004) and its accompanying Declaration.

³³ One other event was planned for April 12-14, 2005 in Melbourne, Australia called "Religion in Peace and Conflict: responding to Militancy and Fundamentalism"—with support from UNESCO focused sub-regionally on "Intercultural and Inter-religious Dialogue for the South-East and Asia Pacific Region."

³⁴ Samuel Lee, "Welcome and Opening Address," In *United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Report: International Symposium: Peace Movement and Education in Asia-Pacific Conflict Zones, November 20-22, 2001*, (UNESCO Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding), x.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, xi.

³⁶ Found in the "Objectives" section of the *ISESCO Charter*, Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Available at <http://www.isesco.org.ma/presentation/index.htm>

³⁷ George Packer, "The Talk of the Town," *The New Yorker*, (August 8 and 15, 2005): 33-34.

³⁸ Such theories are not new. But among recent (popularized) iterations see: Amir Taheri, "Iran: A Clash of Civilizations," *Newsweek* (September 5, 2005): 22-23.

³⁹ President Khatami, speech at the United Nations General Assembly, September 21, 1998. Available at http://www.salamiran.org/events/UN_GeneralAssembly/speech_khatami_un.htm

⁴⁰ George W. Bush. "The President's State of the Union Address" (Washington, DC: January 29, 2002).

⁴¹ A/54/546, United Nations General Assembly, *United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations: Report of the Secretary-General* (November 12, 1999), Annex: *Provisional report of the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations*.

⁴² Conflict prevention has been one among Canada's five priorities, for example. See: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, *Freedom From Fear: Canada's Foreign Policy for Human Security* (Ottawa: DFAIT, July 2000). For current government approaches and programs built on this foundation see <http://www.humansecurity.gc.ca/menu-en.asp>.

⁴³ Kishore Mahbubani, "The Dangers of Decadence: What the Rest Can Teach the West," *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (September/October 1993): 14.

⁴⁴ See, for example, comments from a former Bangladeshi Ambassador: Muhammad Zamir, "UN, OIC and the Muslim world," Asia News Network (September 10, 2004), Available at http://www.asianewsnet.net/level3_template2.php?l3sec=11&news_id=30181.

⁴⁵ In the context of largely mainstream introductions to IR theory there are fairly concise and relatively "objective" (pre-9/11 with no "war on terrorism" or "clash of civilizations" overtones) explanations in

historical and contemporary contexts, comparing and contrasting Westphalian-Muslim systems. The quote is from Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham, "Islam" and "Westphalia, Peace of 1648," *Penguin Dictionary of International Relations* (London: Penguin Books, 1998), 282-283 and 572-573.

⁴⁶ 167 Executive Decisions, "Action pertaining to the dialogue of civilizations and cultures," In *United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Dialogue of Civilizations—The International Ministerial Conference on the Dialogue of Civilizations: Quest for New Perspectives in New Delhi*, July 9-10, 2003 (Paris, UNESCO, 2004) 201-202.

⁴⁷ Director General, number 032 (February 26, 2003).

⁴⁸ Measurement is a difficult but more systematic research with comparisons of military or defense spending with investments in human security alternatives, and the broader implications for mitigating terrorism or enhancing global peace and security, would be useful beyond the scope of this paper.

⁴⁹ The "Umma" (or global Islamic community) idea reflects larger Muslim concerns, but to illustrate a more local, Indonesian context see: Andi Faisal Bakti "Communication and DAKWAH: Religious Learning Groups and Their Role in the Protection of Islamic Human Security and Rights for Indonesian Civil Society," in *Comparative Education, Terrorism and Human Security: From Critical Pedagogy to Peace-building?* ed. Wayne Nelles (New York: Palgrave-MacMillan Press, 2003), 109-126.

⁵⁰ "List of Agreements concluded by the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (1984-2005)" Available at <http://www.isesco.org.ma/English/coop/index.html> (Accessed December 20, 2005).

⁵¹ With recent changes in Iran's government it is unclear (without further research) how it now views "dialogue" in diplomatic terms, or how the West might better engage. Until recently, however, the International Centre for Dialogue Among Civilizations, based in Tehran, (with background information and archival documents available at <http://www.dialoguecentre.org>) functioned and appointed Iranian officials who carried out related programs. UNESCO's "Cluster Office" based in Tehran is also responsible for overseeing activities in four countries: Afghanistan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and Turkmenistan in what UNESCO refers to as "the Central and South-West Asia Cluster." So with clear political commitment among all governments, as well as more dedicated resources, both offices could better complement related human security work.