



## General Conference

Twenty-seventh Session  
Information document

## Генеральная конференция

Двадцать седьмая сессия  
Информационный документ

# inf

Paris 1993

## Conférence générale

Vingt-septième session  
Document d'information

## Conferencia General

27.ª reunión  
Documentos de información

大会

第二十七届会议  
资料性文件

المؤتمر العام

الدورة السابعة والعشرون  
وثيقة اعلامية

27 C/INF.25

9 November 1993

English/French/Spanish

Address delivered by  
Mr Federico Mayor

on the occasion of his re-election as  
Director-General  
of the United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Paris, 8 November 1993

17

(The Director-General began his address in French)

Mr President of the General Conference,  
Madam Chairperson of the Executive Board,  
Heads of Delegation,  
Excellencies,  
Dear Colleagues and Friends,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is almost six years to the day since I stood on this same rostrum that René Maheu once compared to a cliff from which one descends the ocean of the world. For almost 50 years, this ocean has been lashed by terrible storms and many billows have swept over this rostrum. Now, when the ocean is becoming calmer, I should like to pay particular tribute to all my predecessors who, through their commitment and their tenacity, managed to maintain intact the ideal of international intellectual co-operation. At the dawn of a new era, a third millennium which is still *terra incognita* and thus full of the promises of a new renaissance, this ideal is at last able to offer mankind the alternative of a culture of peace and solidarity.

So much has changed in six years! The world itself, of course. However, the most spectacular change has undoubtedly been the end of the threat of a nuclear holocaust; the end of the years of leaden hopelessness, oppression and silence; the end - perhaps - of superpowers and potentates and of arbitrary rule, and the dawn of an age when hundreds of millions of people will cease to be impotent observers and become responsible participants.

Ever more rapid change, ever greater complexity. At the same time, I too was changing. I am now six years older - six years, during which I have tried, passionately, to communicate the message you entrusted to me: that there is no solution other than education, that the future is in the hands of educators - above all, schoolteachers - and that while economic and political agreements are necessary, they are not enough, since everything depends on the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

They have been six years during which I have travelled greatly, listened a lot and learnt much. I have met over 110 Heads of State. I have shared their hopes, seen their perplexity and sensed their determination. Above all, I have been able to see at close quarters to what extent rulers, assailed by the everyday difficulties of their people, are still often the unwilling prisoners of the short term. At the end of these six years my eyes are worn out with contemplation of the misfortune of the world, and yet I remain fully convinced that it is still possible to change course, to find new ways forward so as to release, at long last, the immense potential of human creativity.

During these six years UNESCO, too, has changed very considerably. As we all know, it had to begin a process of renewal. 'Without haste but without delay, I shall set in motion the modernization process that we all want.' Those were the words I spoke to you in 1987 when I took office. The upheavals that have occurred in the world since then have facilitated this process of modernization while at the same time making it even more essential. First of all, we

had to piece together again an institution that had been riven asunder. This was the focus of consultation, patient but tenacious, which led to the healing of the ideological wounds, a healing that was confirmed by the General Conference in October 1989. Reconciled with its constitutional principles - human rights, freedom of expression and freedom of information - UNESCO was able to reclaim for the benefit of all, without distinction, firstly its heritage of peace at the Yamoussoukro Congress and then the heritage of democracy at the Prague Forum.

After consultation, co-operation was the watchword of the 1991 General Conference. With the Jomtien World Conference on Education for All, the major organizations of the United Nations system had just embarked on an unprecedented form of partnership which was to find more elaborate expression still, in 1992, at the Rio de Janeiro United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, and was continued the following year, in Vienna, at the World Conference on Human Rights.

The keynote of 1993 - that is today, the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference - will have been a determination to concentrate on our ethical mission through a return to the very essence of our Constitution - 'constructing the defences of peace in the minds of men'.

Yes, UNESCO has changed. It is more present, more diverse and more in evidence than in 1987. Being more present means being closer to those whom it is endeavouring to serve, foremost among whom are the most deprived or the weakest - the children of Bosnia or Somalia, Chernobyl or Maputo; today, Cambodia and El Salvador, tomorrow South Africa, Palestine and - it is to be hoped - Haiti. UNESCO is also more conspicuously present at the decision-making tables, both of our United Nations partners and of governments, whether the issue is the launching of an educational reform, working out a new status for the press or contributing to the protection of the environment.

Close contact and speed are a guarantee of efficacy. Much remains to be done, of course, to adapt the Organization to the pace of the age and we must not close our eyes to the difficulties of the task. It will not be easy to serve an ever-growing number of Member States with the same budget.

The UNESCO of 1993 is also more diverse, as regards both the forms its action takes and the partners it mobilizes - the network of UNESCO chairs, the UNITWIN inter-university co-operation programme, the Common Market of Knowledge or the Bolívar programme to develop interaction between universities and industry, world reports on the state of education, science and communication - all these being examples of the wide spectrum of activities initiated to encourage the transfer and sharing of knowledge. New partnerships with the private sector, foundations and municipalities have made it possible to convey UNESCO's message to sectors which it had previously not been able to reach.

By so doing, UNESCO has given itself a stronger and more visible image. Its voice carries further and is heard more clearly; it has, as it were, regained its authority. The conferral of the Press Freedom Award, besides being a personal honour that touched me deeply, was also highly symbolic, representing the healing of a wound from the Organization's past and recognition and acceptance by media professionals themselves of its resolute fight for freedom of expression. And what better proof could UNESCO provide of its high profile than the distribution on the major international news networks of programmes produced by it? Then I think of all the public figures who have agreed to participate in UNESCO's major forums for intellectual analysis or who have lent it their names and their talent, becoming its 'goodwill

ambassadors'. They all deserve our deepest appreciation. I think too of the Félix Houphouët-Boigny Peace Prize, which rapidly won the attention of the public through the quality of the members of its jury and the prestige of its prizewinners.

UNESCO has also, as you know, made an effort to communicate in a clearer fashion. Today it speaks more directly. Many of its publications have a more accessible style and presentation. But, beyond the level of communication, UNESCO's impact is situated, primarily, on the moral plane. The Organization, including its governing bodies and its Secretariat, endeavours to speak plainly, to speak the truth. It is that above all else that enables it to put its message across. And UNESCO's entire image gains in authenticity and authority.

Lastly, UNESCO's management and functioning have been modernized. A new merit-based personnel policy has been introduced, together with delegation of authority, which covers the whole of the Secretariat. The improvement of financial management, the trimming of procedures, greater decentralization of activities and posts and the strengthening of administrative autonomy: these have been the major themes of a reform that has engaged much of our energy over the last six years. We have certainly made a great deal of progress, but we still have a long way to go.

**(The Director-General continued in English)**

Mr President,  
Madam Chairperson of the Executive Board,

The world has changed. The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked the end of Cold War confrontation between the two major power blocs, which is undoubtedly the most important political transformation over the last six years.

What has this meant for world peace? The geopolitical interpretation, perhaps the commonest, maintains that bipolarity based on the existence of two nuclear powers of equal strength was the guarantee of peace over the last 40 years. Now this balance of terror has disappeared, all kinds of wars are once again possible.

I do not share this view of 'negative peace'. In the first place, it is inaccurate since, while applicable in some degree to Europe, it does not take account of the hundreds of wars that have devastated other parts of the planet since 1945. Secondly and most importantly, it overlooks the perverse effects of the unquestioned paradox 'war is unthinkable but disarmament is impossible', which made superpower confrontation the inescapable fate of several generations and justified the arms race as the only rational solution.

The end of the Cold War has nullified the logic of this reasoning. The widespread propagation of warlike violence, which is a characteristic of the second half of the twentieth century, today appears to us as a self-evident fact and forces us to recognize that the nature of war and its protagonists have changed. War today assumes the form of civil war and its belligerents are not States but the distinctive communities - ethnic and social - who seek political fulfilment to compensate for their personal, cultural and social frustrations.

This exaggerated desire for political compensation explains why the achievement of freedom in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe has mainly taken the form of a radical affirmation of the integrity of their collective identities and has been reflected in intransigent and violent claims for the restoration of ideal frontiers. The Geophysical Institute of the

Moscow Academy of Sciences reported in 1991 that of the 23 frontiers that separated the different republics only three were fully accepted, which put at 75 the number of potential trouble-spots, 17 of which were already the scene of open conflict.

In the face of these intrastate wars, ethnic and cultural in origin, fluctuating and intermittent, highly varied and changing in form, involving an unpredictable and indeterminate number of participants, traditional conflict scenarios have little to tell us. These situations require a deep historical and sociological analysis, they call for a new cultural approach - tenacious and imaginative - that sees prevention as the only possible solution. Or at least as the only possible way to reconciliation. What I am saying is that they demand - more than ever - a culture of peace, and thereby assign UNESCO a key role in this context.

**(The Director-General continued in Spanish)**

Mr President,  
Madam Chairperson,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

What are difficult are the conceptual changes, the changes in course that future generations will reproach us for not having made if we do not have the clear-sightedness and spiritual strength needed to embark on them. This is because not only war but also the conditions affecting our collective security, and indeed the very concept of security, have changed. For that reason I think the Security Council, as it approaches the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation, could not only change its composition but also come up with a fresh definition of the idea of security itself, which is now so different from what it was in 1945. In my opinion, all the global threats to security - the environment, living conditions, population problems, cultural and ethnic incompatibilities, obstacles to the full enjoyment of human rights in a democratic context, and so on - should, once they are apt to affect security worldwide, be regarded as falling within the competence of the Security Council, duly advised according to the nature of the issue.

If what we really want is to put an end to this other kind of threat to our security, part of the vast sums spent on military may well have to be invested in reducing poverty, especially in rural communities, and in preventing extreme poverty in the so-called Fourth World and the resulting violence and mass emigration. Money will have to be invested in wiping out the collective shame represented by street children, child workers, and children made to do intolerable jobs. We are countenancing things that cannot be countenanced. We are still girding ourselves against enemies who no longer exist, and we stand defenceless before those now threatening us. At the present time operations involving force overwhelmingly dwarf in numerical and financial terms the paltry resources spent on preventive systems for building peace and on alarm signals that can cut off conflict at its very root. This is the responsibility of all those in positions of power - and above all of the most powerful among them.

We are well equipped to contend with the most conventional dangers of war culture; we have armies and the relevant appropriations for defence and armaments in our national budgets. Yet we have been incapable of setting aside the 0.7 per cent needed to help the developing countries summon up their vast endogenous capacities. We needed to display the ability to look far ahead, but we have not managed to do so since 1974, when the United Nations adopted the resolution on the New International Economic Order. The upshot is poverty, excessive population growth, mass emigration, intolerance and violence. We are now paying a preposterous price for our short-sightedness. Are we now any more capable of looking ahead, so that in 20 years' time we can say we have learnt our lesson? The first threat

facing us today is that posed by the ever-deepening chasm that separates the countries of the North from the countries of the South, a threat partly masked by the current economic crisis. Yet from the vantage point of UNESCO there can be no doubt that the world is one. Either we all forge ahead together or else we shall be unable to avoid chaos and disaster. A global outlook is now the prime condition of our survival.

There will not be an 'Agenda for Peace' unless the disproportion between the excessive claims of peace-keeping and the neglect of peace-building is reduced, since only by constructing the defences of peace can the enjoyment of human rights be guaranteed. There is no doubt that the key to an agenda for peace is an agenda for human rights.

What I have often said is that the really great change consist in moving from the logic of might to the might of logic. For the United Nations to display might is not the real might of the United Nations. Its might resides in the application of its entire Charter. Peace must not only be preserved, it must be constructed. And the organization that holds the lead role in the construction of peace is UNESCO. The time has come. We must give ourselves the means that will enable us to set in motion, worldwide, the actions that lead to the prevention of war and the construction of peace.

How can we speak of the end of history when there are millions of people subsisting in a state of utter destitution? Passiveness is one of the worst consequences of a sated society. It is well known that the superfluous leads to decadence. We must get out of our rut and devise entirely new ways of living together. We are equipped to deal with the past. Now we must hasten not only to adapt to the events of the present day but also to anticipate those of the future.

The most developed countries will have to realize that they will be able to solve their own problems only within this global and unitary perspective, by contributing without delay to the development of the countries of the South. If - as I said before - we want to avoid eruptions of violence caused by poverty and neglect; if we want to slow down population growth rates; if we want to avoid large-scale emigration; if we want to sow the seeds of peaceful coexistence in places where today we are reaping the fruits of distrust and intolerance, then the most developed countries will have to decide to invest in collective security before it is too late. Within the space of five years development aid should amount to 3 per cent of GDP, and it should attain some 3.5 per cent by the end of the century; if this could be achieved the prospects for the beginning of the next millennium would be less gloomy. It is not an impossible effort. Will this mean that we will have to change our energy consumption habits, our accustomed well-being and our work habits? It does indeed - we *will* have to change them.

We will have to change them even though it might be unpopular. There are times when doing something unpopular is not only dictated by reason but is also a matter of ethics. There is an urgent and imperative need for us to think, without self-censorship or fear, about how we can overcome the great contradictions that are the key to our contemporary world, the pathways of the twenty-first century. For example, how can we reconcile the dichotomy between ethical requirements and technical rationality?

It is this dichotomy that we find in the different approaches of those who advocate either *development* or *human rights*. While some talk in terms of human rights and democracy, others speak of development. We often forget what is most important of all - *man himself* - and the need common to all - *justice*. If the globalization that communication and technology

make possible can lead to the best as well as the worst, why not choose the best from the very beginning?

What is clear today is that without the agreement of peoples and without their participation, neither States nor institutions can guide human progress by means of official conventions or agreements of an economic or political kind. It was thought that economics and politics ensured happiness and progress and had eliminated the need for conscience. It is not so.

We have a formidable fund of forces to draw on in order to raise awareness and to take action - teachers, intellectuals, writers, journalists and the media in the four corners of the earth. In this connection, UNESCO should consider helping to provide information periodically on the state of the world: every day we hear weather forecasts and are told about stock market movements - but we are not told about things that should really be of concern to us all and those that will have a long-term effect on the climate and the economy. Likewise, explaining to the general public the significance of the great parameters of the environment, education, population, human rights and exclusion would help to involve us more fully in global issues.

Another example of contradiction relates to the frequent crises in the technically most advanced societies and the role which work should have in those societies. What criteria should guide our thinking and what guidelines should apply when proposals are formulated? As an increasing number of goods and services can be produced with a constantly shrinking amount of human labour, how can we share out the available work-time and the corresponding rewards in the fairest possible way? And, perhaps most difficult of all, how can we use the resulting spare time for activities which are satisfying to the individual and are also useful to society, activities which stimulate creativity, generate knowledge and encourage solidarity?

Therefore, change we must. We must learn to pay the price of peace just as we had to pay the price of war. We shall have to set fresh priorities. We shall have to convince all statesmen of the need to draw up a nation-wide pact for education, at all levels, including university education, and then go on to do the same for social development.

We have to strengthen democratic systems, because the big issues of the present day can only be tackled and resolved in a democratic context. The State has to concentrate on its role as guarantor and civil society has to take its destiny into its own hands. As in the case of economic growth, the keystone of the consolidation of democracy is training. The only possible form of development is that in which every individual is participant and beneficiary alike. On the world scale, access to knowledge and its transfer are the only substratum on which we can build democracy, that common dimension where all differences can exist peacefully, side by side, in synergy, while not forgetting the basic foundation of the whole edifice: the municipality, which is the primary cell of civic life.

We have to guarantee democratic systems in which all individuals, minorities and peoples can give free and unrestricted expression to the characteristics of their cultures and, at the same time, get to know, respect and - why not? - admire and incorporate characteristics of other cultures. We are, without realizing it, engaging in an exercise of genealogical identification which we have so often rejected. The defence of the cultures and distinctive characteristics of those belonging to minorities is an issue of the utmost importance and, no matter how sensitive it may be, UNESCO has to tackle it, since it is a significant source of misunderstanding, isolation, marginalization and violence.

Culture is not spread by retreating or by carving up territories. It is not by erecting frontiers that the rights of everybody and every culture can be respected. We are all, at one and the same time, unique and universal, but the future of humanity lies in intermingling, in the fruitful union of the most varied civilizations. We have to protect and foster all forms of diversity. We have to get history to lay down its arms. We teach our children the history of power but not of knowledge, the history of war but not of culture. The path of history is strewn with warlike acts, with the clash of arms as their only accompaniment.

Mr President,

I think it can be said that, having succeeded in basing our relations on mutual trust, UNESCO has reached its cruising speed. The period with the priority focus on reform has come to an end. I shall now put into effect the recommendations of the advisory group I set up and shall continue to consult the Member States - in particular through groups of experts - on matters of management, administration, structure, etc.

But it would not be reasonable to concentrate too much on technical and institutional aspects, since this would mean running the risk of losing sight of the one thing that ultimately matters, namely where we are going, the objectives to be attained. Of course, there is still much room for improvement in the efficiency of the Secretariat; of course, there is room for improvement in the functioning of the National Commissions so that the impact of the resolutions adopted by the General Conference is felt in all spheres in the countries concerned; of course, we must be responsive to any suggestions in this regard.

But in order to succeed in refounding the United Nations system as it approaches its fiftieth anniversary, in 'reinventing' it, in the words of the President of the United States of America, what will be needed will be a firm common resolve to take the radical steps required, it being clearly understood that the performance of an organization that has undergone structural changes only would be like that of an actor wearing different make-up but incapable, on the stage, of playing anything but his old, outdated part.

And so what is to be made of UNESCO, what must the Director-General do to ensure that the Organization can rise to the challenges and convey its message both upstream and downstream, to the highest decision-making authorities but, at the same time, to all citizens? What standards, what approaches must he adopt?

There are two fundamental ones that should be mentioned - the global approach and the long-term view. I should like to refer in this connection to something that has become a haunting obsession with me - time as a moral issue. Knowing that, for the first time in history, the damage we can do if current consumption trends do not change may be irreversible, that our future is in our hands today and that this consideration must govern all decision-making processes.

The same goes for complexity. Faced with complex reality, we cannot be satisfied with perceptions that simplify it, because, if we really want to change reality, we must be able to see it in an overall perspective, with all its complexities, in order to be able to transform it. Complexity is one of the major tributaries that leads us to the mainstream of interdisciplinarity, in which alone we can trust. Disciplines and of course sectors are watertight compartments incapable of resolving problems which, by their very nature, go well beyond their conceptual and institutional bounds. I shall take the necessary steps to ensure that interdisciplinarity is guaranteed and, in doing so, I shall bring down the barriers between spheres of influence and



established hierarchies so that the work will be done not only in a co-ordinated but in a synergetic manner.

What must be done urgently is submit to Member States transdisciplinary projects with a thematic rather than sectoral approach, grouping together various fields of knowledge capable of providing concrete solutions to development problems, whose complexity calls for a holistic approach. Examples of such projects might be basic education, higher education, human rights, democracy and peace, and the environment.

Intellectual co-operation will need to be enlisted to the utmost. UNESCO must continue to rely on forums of reflection, the councils of the various international programmes and all sources of ideas and innovation in order to carry out its mission as effectively as possible. The key to the future lies in the spirit and not in technology. In a world which is, happily, moving in the direction of universal democracy, purely technical institutions will soon decay. The only ones to survive will be those capable of pointing out new paths, devising fresh approaches and shaping new patterns of daily behaviour.

At the same time, UNESCO must concentrate on three major priority groups: women, the least developed countries, and Africa. I should now like to make just a few additional observations on the subject of Africa: Africa as a solution and not a problem; Africa as a continent which possesses extraordinary cultural and natural wealth and which needs to have confidence in its potential and to map out its own future; Africa as an example of tolerance; Africa which has engendered so many new cultures in its Diaspora. That is the example to which we shall be paying tribute in 1995, the United Nations Year for Tolerance, as proposed by UNESCO, bringing all our contributions to the Gorée Memorial as an acknowledgement of the fact that we seek a future free of all discrimination based on the colour of one's skin or on one's beliefs or sex. At the 'Consultations for Africa', which are scheduled for the coming year, we shall be asking each African country to let us know, within the limits of the Organization's capacity, what are its most urgent needs and the medium- and long-term plans in connection with which it would like to obtain UNESCO's co-operation.

The obvious and moving examples of violence and terror should not lead us to forget the vast web of generosity and love on which history rests and daily life proceeds; or the examples and forms of understanding and harmony which Latin America and Asia offer us.

'I am proud to belong to a religion which has taught the world both tolerance and universal acceptance', said Swami Vivekananda at the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1893. There could be no happier coincidence than the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations at the same time as the International Year for Tolerance, which was proposed by UNESCO. Disagreement is natural; and there must be relevant action to strengthen the ethical pillars on which the future is to be built. But violence - never! On the proposal of the Executive Board, UNESCO will be honouring next year two great contemporary figures who bequeathed to all future generations the example of their convictions, their dreams, their attitudes and their dissenting voices, albeit in a vast context of non-violence, consideration for others and international solidarity - Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King. Both light our way, today. Both taught us the supreme lesson of the constant and non-violent defence of our ideals.

We must decentralize in order to see the whole picture, to deal with complexity and set to work on an interdisciplinary basis. The type of decentralization which is needed is expressed in terms of functional autonomy, granted in such a way as to provide all the conditions for flexible and rapid action, at the right time, while simultaneously ensuring that all activities are

conducted within the framework of the goals and objectives decided on by the General Conference, without decentralization leading to a weakening of interaction. I therefore propose to expand our facilities in the field so that, like most of the Specialized Agencies, programmes and funds of the United Nations system, we can have a greater presence at national level. The Regional Offices provide suitable contexts for subregional and regional studies, analyses and approaches but their influence at national level, starting in the countries nearest to them, is usually limited.

In decentralization, as with the evaluation of the activities, the implementation and the monitoring of the Participation Programme, and in informing and mobilizing all the communities relating to our fields of competence, the National Commissions for co-operation with UNESCO have a leading role to play. I call upon all Member States to strengthen their National Commissions, to take them into consideration when dealing with topics of relevance to UNESCO and to promote exchanges with other National Commissions both within the region and from other regions. If we are to achieve our objectives it is absolutely vital that the National Commissions should be equal to the new challenges before us. There can be no efficient action in the field without efficient National Commissions.

In this formidable task we need new alliances. At the national level it is absolutely essential to have the help of parliamentarians, the media, private associations, non-governmental organizations and, above all, political will on the part of every Member State. Furthermore, with regard to intellectual co-operation, what counts, in the final analysis, is talent. For example, the fact that a small Caribbean country such as Saint Lucia was recently awarded two Nobel Prizes shows that there are no small States in UNESCO, since each and every one, whatever its size, can make a valuable contribution to the community of minds. It is not a question of exporting - even less of imposing - models, but of fostering the spread of values and knowledge that will enable each person, each country and each State to determine their own future. This is a great task in which UNESCO must make its effort not by providing a list of ready-made formulas and products, but by contributing, at the highest possible level, to the formulation of educational, scientific and cultural strategies.

As far as the governing bodies of UNESCO are concerned, it would also be advisable to review completely the methods of work and decision-making procedures. The 100 or more ministers of education who have spoken at this General Conference contributed very interesting ideas and proposals, but were unable to exchange ideas and examine together the future of the Organization. Furthermore, a good many of them will not be present when decisions are taken.

Would it not be possible, for example, to conceive of the General Conference beginning with technical meetings and then setting aside a few days at the end for statements by ministers, whose participation is essential in devising the main lines of emphasis of the programme and in allocating budgetary resources? Clearly, this is the exclusive right of the governing bodies, but I am willing - if they so wish - to make suggestions to improve operational procedures that now do not meet current requirements.

Mr. President,  
Madam Chairperson of the Executive Board,  
Your Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

The time has come to thank you and to say how much I appreciate the honour that has been bestowed on me, an honour that goes beyond my person, because it is above all a tribute paid to UNESCO as a whole.

I should like to express my gratitude to the members of the Executive Board, who unanimously endorsed my nomination, and to all the delegations of the Member States who were present at this General Conference the day before yesterday and expressed an opinion on it.

I should like to convey my appreciation to the countries, institutions, colleagues and staff members, past and present, who have put forward proposals and ideas that have resulted in activities that are now particularly relevant to the Organization.

I should also like to say publicly how indebted I am to all those who have honoured the Organization by agreeing to take part in the different commissions, committees, boards, juries and working and advisory groups, to all who have given me their advice and, in particular, all who have been good enough to voice their disagreement and criticism, which is the surest sign of friendship.

I cannot fail to tender my best wishes to all the authorities and leading figures of the intellectual world and the media and to the people of the very many countries that have welcomed me on official visits. I have, as I have already said, learnt many lessons at every level during those visits, which gave me an opportunity of learning at first hand about the cultural realities and identities of many of the world's countries. In this connection, I should like to highlight, for obvious reasons, one of my recent visits - to Indonesia. I shall never forget the hospitality that Indonesia, starting with President Soeharto himself, showed me, and the fellow-feeling and affection lavished on me. This is yet another reason why today I want to convey my special esteem to all of them, and in particular to my colleague and friend, Makaminan Makagiansar, who used to be Assistant Director-General for Culture and Communication in this Organization and who was a candidate for the office of Director-General of UNESCO.

Over these past six years - and this is very important to me - I have continued to enjoy the affection of my closest friends, although we do not see each other all that often and have little time to talk. What is more, I have made new friends through the length and breadth of the world. This is our greatest source of enrichment. I shall not mention anybody in particular, with the sole exception of Marie-Annick Martin Sané, the prime mover, in spite of her serious illness, behind the team that promoted my nomination six years ago. How much I owed to her obstinate and unswerving determination that I would be the Director-General of UNESCO! How dearly I remember her today!

I cannot conclude these expressions of gratitude without mentioning those people, who are as important as they are invisible, working with UNESCO all over the world and sharing our ideals. To you, dear unknown friends of mine, a big 'thank you' for your support. My thanks likewise go to all the colleagues who, both at Headquarters and in the field units, cope with the less conspicuous tasks, to all those whom I do not know by name, whom I perhaps only know by their voices or their writings, those who look after our security, those who deal

with servicing, cleaning and all kinds of ancillary duties. I shall not include my secretaries in this tribute, because that would call for a whole chapter to itself. But I still want to tell them again how deeply and warmly grateful I am to them.

Mr President,

At a moment as moving as this, I cannot but remember my family and above all my mother, whom I lost not very long ago. The person who gave me life has died. The example she set me, her boundless generosity, her immense capacity for coping with the problems of others, have left an indelible impression upon me. My mother always used to say that we should not accept things that were unacceptable. She now lives in my memory. I still have my father, who is already advanced in years and who is still pressing on in the same dogged spirit that has always been his throughout his stay on this earth, with perseverance as the guiding thread of his everyday personal endeavours. Only a few months ago, when I went to see him, he asked me about UNESCO. 'How's UNESCO doing?', he said. I replied that things were getting better. 'Are they getting better, or are you becoming more easy-going?'

Just as it was six years ago, I have the good fortune to be surrounded by my family, which increased three years ago with the birth of my third granddaughter - Andrea, Maite and now Irene. Irene means 'peace' in Greek. To all of them, most of all to all them, I want to say how much I appreciate the moderation of their criticisms, which is in inverse proportion to the stimulus they give to my work, work that accounts for my absences but not for distance separating me from them. I should very much like to tell them that I shall be travelling less, that I shall be at home more often, that I shall have more time to think and to write. But I do not say it. I shall say it when I manage to do so, if I do manage it.

From everything I have just said you will have gathered that I intend to devote myself personally, in the coming years, to the culture of peace, the peace of peoples and the peace of individuals, peace that is the prime condition for discharging our duties as men and women to the full, our mission as human beings. What better watchword, what better task, could there be? Montaigne already had the answer, when he said 'Rien n'est si beau que de bien faire l'homme'.

I shall take on this commitment with all the passionate intensity it calls for. The fact is that reacting reasonably is not enough. Reason can counsel us to give, but only passion and compassion can prompt us to give of ourselves and share, and this is the only urgent task in the times in which we are living, in which we have to decide whether we are going to build a new world together, whether we are going to invent a fairer future, whether we are to devise the future that the vast possibilities of knowledge enable us to conjure up. Moving minds is something that comes out of one's innermost convictions, out of the passionate feeling of giving one's all. Only the loss of all sense of proportion and, in these times of transition from a culture of war to a culture of peace, in which so very many impediments have to be overcome, only the determination to give of one's all will make possible the far-reaching social changes that are bound to come to pass. The sea cannot be closed off; limits cannot be imposed on freedom, or conditions and impediments dictated to love. Because - and I should like to repeat it here and now - 'The measure of loving is loving beyond measure'.

Thank you very much for your attention.