Intergovernmental Council of the

Management of Social Transformations

Programme (MOST)

Third Session

Paris, 16-20 June 1997

Final Report

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

**Third Session of the Intergovernmental Council of the
'Management of Social Transformations' (MOST) Programme**

**UNESCO, Paris
16-20 June 1997**

FINAL REPORT

Table of contents

I.   Opening of the session

The third session of the Intergovernmental Council of the MOST Programme, which was held at UNESCO, Paris, from 16 to 20 June 1997, was opened by Mr François Hainard, representative of Switzerland, and outgoing Vice-President of the Intergovernmental Council.

II. Address by the Director-General of UNESCO - (résumé)

(The full version of this address is available from the MOST Clearing House on the Internet http:www.unesco.org/most).

The creation of the MOST programme in 1994 confirmed the General Conference's desire to promote cooperation between member states and their social science communities as an essential element in addressing the current challenges facing all the world's societies.

Globalisation is creating new social, political and economic realities which demand new methods of analysis and new approaches to tackle emerging problems. There is now a real danger that these changes will lead to even greater inequality in the distribution of the world's resources, increasing the risk of the marginalisation of vulnerable groups, violence and extremism. An important responsibility therefore lies with policy makers and those who inform and advise them, to devise and implement policies which reduce such inequalities, and which anticipate and act to alleviate potential problems before they reach crisis level.

In addition the new global reality has emphasised the trans-national nature of many contemporary issues like environmental damage and drug trafficking. Such problems go beyond national boundaries and require constant efforts to protect and reinforce international cooperation and democracy.

Given the increasing complexity of modern social issues, finding solutions demands not only a trans-national but also a trans-disciplinary approach, offering an increased scope for activity to the social sciences which already permeate all of UNESCOs programmes in some way. Only social analysis attuned to the realities of globality and complexity can establish a useful framework for action, as the study of social problems in Africa amply demonstrates. In this context the Most programme has an important role to play in observing and analysing rapidly the evolving reality as a basis for finding sustainable solutions.

Social scientists indeed play a key role in providing policy-makers with concepts, methods and tools for understanding social changes and adapting institutions to meet the demands of social innovation. There is thus a need to develop new research agendas, particularly in association with the natural

and biological sciences - an approach which will be emphasised during the UNESCO World Science Conference in 1999.

The MOST programme was established specifically to respond to the need for interdisciplinary contributions to social policy forums.Since its inception the programme's activities have developed to include capacity-building initiatives providing training to both social scientists and policy makers. Although it is an international cooperation programme, the main support for MOST activities is provided by the social research and descision-making communities within member states. Therefore, despite the proposed increase in its funding in the UNESCO regular budget, the MOST programme will be able to pursue and develop its activities only if the member states continue to provide adequate financial resources. Member States are therefore strongly encouraged to actively support MOST by providing extra budgetry funds for its initiatives to address current social challenges

III. Election of the Bureau

Under the presidency of Mr Hainard, elections were held to renew the Bureau of the Council. The President, the six Vice-Presidents and the Rapporteur were elected by consensus.

President: Mr Kenneth Wiltshire (Australia)

Vice-Presidents: Mr Edi Joseph Akomian (Côte d'Ivoire)
                        Mr Zainul Ariff (Malaysia)
                        Mr Donald Robotham (Jamaica)
                        Mr Salah Jemily (Morocco)
                        Mrs Lieteke van Vucht Tijssen (Netherlands)
                        Mr Marek Ziolkowski (Poland)

Rapporteur: Mrs Virginia Miralao (Philippines).

IV. Adoption of the Agenda

Under the presidency of Mr Wiltshire, the agenda was adopted by consensus.

V. Creation of a drafting group

A drafting group was formed as follows:

        Mr. M. Illner. (Czech Republic)
        Mrs A.M. Laulan (France)
        Mr I. Monsi (Benin)
        Mr N. Nanjundappa (India)
        Mr M. Nasraoui (Tunisia)
        Mrs Penelope Rodriguez (Colombia)

VI. Keynote address: « Globalisation and Migration: some pressing contradictions » by Stephen Castles (résumé)

(The text of this address is available on the MOST Clearing House on Internet and an expanded version of this address will appear in the International Social Science Journal, Vol. 156, June 1998).

The address highlights nine contradictions which are typical of our time and which provide useful categories for analysing the process of globalisation and the problems it creates. It focuses particularly on examples relating to international migration which is an essential feature of global change in which each of these contradictions is played out.

1 The contradiction between inclusion and exclusion
Globalisation has allowed the inclusion of groups and individuals with the requisite skills in international markets and a global social order, however those lacking such skills have been excluded and sometimes even denied basic rights. International migration is closely linked to these processes : In countries of emigration traditional social and economic structures are disrupted by migration which may result from a sense of exclusion forcing people to leave. Whereas in receiving countries ethnic communities may experience exclusion as immigration becomes a key issue in debates on social relations and national identity.

2 The contradiction between market and state
The process of globalisation is the product of anonymous market forces taking no responsibility for inequality which is seen as vital to economic efficiency. Since the fall of communism no alternatives have appeared to question the international dominance of the market rationale and governments have been forced to abandon measures to protect living conditions to comply with it. Thus both emigration and receiving countries accept the economically productive while the unskilled or socially costly are excluded everywhere. States cannot stop migration if the global market demands it, although realistic policies may help shape it in the public interest.

3 The contradiction between growing wealth and impoverishment
In almost all the industrialised countries which have adopted free markets and a non-interventionist state there is an increasing gap between rich and poor. A similar inequality exists on a world scale between industrial countries and countries which have not yet achieved sustained economic development. Thus the real divisions in the world today exist between those included in mainstream economic and social relations and those excluded from them. This exclusion is felt more strongly by particular groups, like the ethnic minority communities which are the result of years of migration first to Western and now to newly industrialising countries.

4 The contradiction between society and the individual

The tension between society and the individual has taken on new characteristics in the current context. New information technologies create global networks of wealth and power according to economic rationality, but fail to create a meaningful sense of identity for people. For this reason many contemporary conflicts to protect local economies in fact result from a desire to protect a people's identity and sense of dignity. The rise of racist anti-immigration movements in receiving countries is often based on protecting an identity myth of a homogenous nation. On the other hand amongst frequently marginalized ethnic minorities the premium placed on group identity may lead to separatism and fundamentalism, or to mobilisation for recognition and equality of rights.

5 The contradiction between the global and the local
What seems rational at a global level may have disasterous consequences locally and market mechanisms alone cannot give local communities a voice in decisions affecting them. Thus while international migration is usually analysed at national level its effects are felt most strongly at local levels, weakening production and family structures in emigration countries, and causing conflict between national and local administration concerning immigrants in countries which receive them.

6 The contradiction between the economy and the environment
Continual growth means ever greater stress on natural resources and ecological systems. In certain areas migration flows are the direct result of environmental degradation to living spaces or the pressure of competition for resources. However immigration, including tourism, can also place strains on the natural environment. Thus there is a real need for global cooperation in understanding and managing population mobility.

7 The contradiction between modernity and post-modernity
The globalisation of markets can be seen as a kind of realisation of the Enlightenment concept of Modernity as a universalistic narrative of progress based on common values - in this case western notions of rationality. However this global, modern integrated economy lacks the political and social project of Modernity which demanded a strong state to intervene to ensure a good life for all. The political sphere is thus post-modern in its fragmented nature. But rational and efficient markets cannot ensure social balance and equality. Thus the economic benefits of the free circulation of labour, predicted by Neo-classical economists, cannot exist without political frameworks which assure migrants rights and social needs.

8 The contradiction between the citizen as a national and the global citizen
In a democratic nation-state a citizen belongs both civically to a political community and culturally to a national community, and the process of nation building often involved the assimilation of ethnic identities by a national one. However today's « age of migration » has made national cultural homogenisation impossible. People now have multiple citizenships and trans-cultural competencies. There is thus a need for a new model of citizenship no longer linking belonging to territoriality, but recognising ethnic diversity. The process of globalisation itself also creates a need for a new global citizenship by reducing the authority of individual states to control

outside influences. For this reason supranational institutions must be strengthened to curb the excesses of global markets and provide world society with a global policy.

9 The contradiction between globalisation from above and globalisation from below
Until now globalisation has mainly meant changes imposed on local communities from above. However the activities of local and civic groups in developing a new notion of citizenship and working towards sustainable development gives hope for the emergence of a more equal world. If UNESCO MOST can facilitate the work of such groups, linking them with wider organisations, it will have carried out a worthwhile task.

After Dr Castles' presentation there were comments and questions by a representative from the UNCHR, the delegates from Malaysia, Thailand, Bulgaria, Austria, Benin, Tunisia, Hungary, India and Jamaica and the Secretary-General of the International Social Science Council. In his reply, Dr. Castles made the following points;

1.   Globalization is not only economic;
2.   International migration is a long-term phenomenon;
3.   We have to work out ways of promoting return-migration;
4.   We need to further conceptualize the idea of "sustainable development";
5.   Global and local are only two ends of a continuum that also includes the regional level;
6.   The Internet, because of its decentralized nature, offers potential new opportunities for individuals to have an input in the social transformations of our time;
7.   Researchers, when studying international migration and multiculturalism, should pay attention to differentials in political-power relations, to cost and benefit considerations, and to the contradiction between the realities imagined by immigrants and the reality they eventually face;
8.   The analysis of international migration should indeed explore the different and changing motivations of the immigrants; and
9.   The effect of international migration and of remittances from immigrants on the Welfare State and on the countries of origin, respectively, is complex.

Dr Castles concluded by a reminder that international migration is a crucial aspect of globalization and that we need to do more research on it in order to improve the decision-making process.

VII. Joint session of the Scientific Steering Committee and the Intergovernmental Council of MOST, presentation of the Report of the SSC by the SSC President

The Chairperson of the SSC, Prof. Whittaker, emphasized the following points, following the Vth Session of the Committee, (12-16 June 1997), (SHS.97/CONF.203/16).

Major achievements of the last three years

Research: 104 applications were received and 17 projects approved within the four themes of MOST. The breakdown by theme is as follows : Theme 1, 5 projects; Theme 2, 4 projects; Theme 3, 7 projects; Theme 4 (Capacity-building), 1 project.

These research projects are to be distinguished from the "pro-active" projects, which are "action-oriented" and will be presented in the Secretariat Report.

The Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) based its evaluation of social science proposals on the following characteristics: internationality, comparativeness, interdisciplinarity and policy relevance. The SSC also debated issues bearing on research management, visibility and advocacy of the MOST Programme, intellectual and epistemological issues of sustainability, poverty, paradigm shifts, and the application of research results to social policy.

Highlights of the Vth session of the SSC

-Progress reports on each of the 17 on-going projects were made by the MOST Secretariat, and were evaluated by the SSC.
-The series of regional and sub-regional meetings is in its final phase.
-There was considerable enthusiasm for the "pro-active" projects of the Programme.
-The International Scientific Advisory Board of the World Science Conference, as it stands today, is without any social science representation or specialist.
-Dissemination of publications and the MOST Web Site on Internet.
-PhD Award to promote careers of young scholars.
-Three new projects were considered: one got the MOST label but without seed money, one was recommended for another Programme, and one was given some recommendations and will be re-evaluated later.
-A presentation was given on the paper: "sustainability as a social science concept".
-With regard to mid-term evaluation, a discussion took place to consider its objectives and terms of reference.

Budget

The President of the SSC presented the budgetary situation of the Programme, highlighting the need for increased extra-budgetary resources for MOST projects and activities.

On behalf of the Committee, the President expressed her gratitude to the Member States that had contributed through Funds-in-Trust and other means to MOST projects and activities. The Committee suggested that the IGC members work to increase, within their own institutions and Ministries, allocations for international comparative research on MOST issues and themes. The Indian Council for Social Science Research (ICSSR) was cited as successfully doing this.

Conclusions, Directions and Legacies

The original ideas of the MOST programme were praised but some rethinking was recommended on budgetary issues and on themes such as the tension between research and practice and the tension between practical and theoretical knowledge.

Some other SSC members participated in the discussion. Professor Alagh, (India) proposed that the Scientific and Technology Department (CSIR) and the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) jointly host the next SSC meeting in India. In this, the Indian delegate supported him. Professor Lamba stressed the need for empirical research. He talked about a miss-match between resources and the purposes of international comparative research.

Discussion

Following a query by the President of the IGC, the Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences said that the World Science Conference will bring together social and natural sciences and that UNESCO will be providing details on the conference in the coming weeks.

After a discussion in which delegates expressed their ideas and concerns, the President of the IGC pointed out the following with respect to the World Science Council and the funding issue:

The World Science Conference:

Social sciences must be strongly represented and involved in this Conference. Themes such as Ethics, Youth, Women, Poverty, Education, Social Exclusion, Peace, Citizenship, Pluralism and Democracy, and Internet and the Culture of the Screen should be considered as part of the Conference's agenda. Discussion of these themes would make a vital contribution to this Conference.

Funding:

IGC has to be more active in this area. In this sense, a resolution was proposed in order to face this challenge and to press for further funding.

In addition to the discussions on the World Science Conference and budgetary issues, a MOST PhD Award and efforts in Capacity Building were considered high priorities by many Member States.

The President welcomed the propositions made by India and the Netherlands to host MOST-related meetings, and the suggestion by the World Federation of Mental Health to increase the involvement of NGOs in MOST Programme activities.

He stressed the need for the Council to be more active in lobbying, supporting the Programme in the next session of the General Conference of UNESCO, and fund-raising activities.

VIII. Address by the Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences and the Secretariat Report on the MOST Programme by the Executive Secretary

After welcoming remarks, the Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences presented an overview of UNESCO's Draft Programme and Budget for 1998-1999 (29 C/5) and the place of the MOST programme in it

1.   The series of MOST regional meetings have contributed to the thematic developments of the Programme. Many of the MOST projects have emerged from these meetings* .

2.   The 1998-1999 biennium will celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, an important event for the Social and Human Sciences Sector.

3.   The main relevance of the Draft 29 C/5 with respect to the MOST Programme is that it emphasizes the role of electronic information and communication and the importance of turning scientific data into public knowledge and social policy.

---

* For example, "Social Sustainable Cities", which emerged from the Western European meeting on cities (Vienna, 1994); "New Migrations and Growing Diversity in Asia-Pacific", from the Asia-Pacific meeting (Bangkok, 1994); "Democratic Governance in a Multi-Cultural Society, from the Central Asian meeting (Bishkek, 1994); "Ethno-Net Africa", from the African meeting (Nairobi, 1995); "Mercosur and Spaces for Interaction and Integration", from the Latin American and Caribbean meeting (Buenos Aires, 1995); "Coping with Transformation Risks in Central and Eastern Europe", from the Central and Eastern Europe meeeting (Budapest, 1995); and "Globalization, Structural Adjustment and Transformation in Rural Societies in Arab Mediterranean Countries", from the Arab States meeting (Tunis, 1996).

Following the address of the Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences, the Executive Secretary of the MOST Programme outlined the activities undertaken in the past biennium (SHS-97/CONF.203/3):

1. Joint interdisciplinary activities were developed with the following programmes within UNESCO: the CSI (Coastal Zones and Small Islands Project); IHP (International Hydrological Programme); and MAB (Man and the Biosphere); the Culture Sector as the follow-up of the Perez de Cuellar Report; the Cultural Heritage Division and the World Cultural Heritage Centre; and the Education Sector.

2. The MOST Clearing House: The following information functions and tools have been developed and implemented so far: an **electronic library** of MOST publications; a **keyword search** facility; a **central agenda**; a **news service**; **discussion forums**; and a **reference service**.

3. The Best Practices Data Bank: Progress has been made to develop a data bank on proven solutions to common problems in the management of social transformations, known as *Best Practices*. The concept of Best Practices in differing social-cultural contexts is itself analyzed in this activity.

4. Capacity building: UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN networks in MOST areas and a UNITWIN Network on "Global Education Network Initiatives" have been launched. A proposal for a MOST Ph.D. Prize will be developed. An international project is being prepared for the training of city professionals.

5. National Liaison Committees (NLCs): A number of these committees have been established as focal points for the MOST programme and constitute a fundamental part of the MOST Programme.

6. Research/decision-making linkages: The MOST Programme will develop a series of specific activities in this area in 1998-1999. A workshop on social sciences and decision-making, was held in December 1995 at Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

7. Funding: Should the budget under Draft 29 C/5 be approved at the Twenty-ninth session of the General Conference, $2,000,000 is foreseen for MOST. On-going projects and activities have received extra-budgetary support from Member States, reaching a level of some $1.7 million (not including contributions in kind) over a 3-year period. This is valuable support to the MOST programme that is foreseen to continue.

8. A mid-term evaluation of the MOST Feasibility Programme will be conducted early in 1998.

9. As to MOST publications, the *MOST Newsletter* is now in its eighth issue and The Policy Papers and Discussion Documents series continue. Arising out of MOST activities, an issue of the *International Social Science Journal* was devoted to cities in 1996, and other such issues in 1998 will be on multiculturalism and on governance.

10. The <u>World Science Conference</u>, to be held in 1999, will address the issue of how progress in all sciences can better be put at the service of social development. Given such a goal, the social sciences should participate in the WSC as equal partners with the natural sciences.

11. The *World Social Science Report*, to be published in 1999, will be the first of its kind (following the *World Science Report*, the *World Education Report* and the *World Communications Report*).

Discussion

Several delegates and observers from different countries and institutions participated in the discussions.

Among the major points and suggestions arising from the discussions are:

1. There is a need for MOST to forge further co-operation and partnerships with other bodies and networks, at national, regional and international levels including NGOs, multilateral organizations and United Nations agencies and other international networks of social scientists; and to link likewise with area studies in pursuing MOST goals and activities. The ISSC, IIAS and the WFMH offered to co-operate and link their activities with the MOST Programme.

2. National Liaison Committees play and important role and links between them and the SSC should be established. Also a strategy should be set up to foster relationships between the IGC and non-IGC members of UNESCO Member States;

3. National budget allocations for research should be increased, particularly in the area of MOST programme themes;

4. The Social and Human Sciences Sector within UNESCO should remain autonomous and the equal recognition of the social sciences in international scientific meetings/conferences should be ensured;

5. "Best Practices" emerging from MOST projects and programme activities should be disseminated;

6. The visibility of MOST and the dissemination of MOST publications and materials through NLCs, other existing networks, schools and universities and NGOs must be improved;

7. Conceptual differences between the terms "transdisciplinarity", "multidisciplinarity", and "interdisciplinarity" frequently appearing in MOST publications must be clarified, and

8. The credibility of MOST projects through a rigorous selection process and guidelines applied by the SSC should be maintained; it was noted, however, that these guidelines might be too demanding for some countries.

The Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences said that the suggestions made by the different delegates and observers will be taken into account in the implementation of the programme and budget for 1998-1999. The Executive Secretary of MOST recalled that many issues will be brought up in the discussions foreseen in the Agenda.

IX.   Presentation of on-going projects

Two projects accepted by the SSC and two pro-active projects were presented.

1.   Social and economic transformations connected with drug trafficking

This project is concerned with the study of drug trafficking and other trans-national problems relating to the environment, identity crises and economic flows. Drug production, trafficking and abuse have become a source of revenue, filling national budget deficits or enriching individuals. Social transformations connected with the drug economy reveal the expansion of the illegal and informal sectors and their interconnection with official sectors. This problematic requires further research and study.

The objectives of the project, along with its conception and methodology and expected scientific and institutional outputs, were presented. Similar programme activities are planned for the coming year in India, China, Nigeria, Mexico and Brazil.

Two interventions followed the presentation. It was suggested that it would be useful to build on the experience of the Observatoire Géopolitique de Drogues, with regard to the drug situation in sub-Saharan Africa. Also with regard to the disciplinary composition of the network, the need to include psychologists in the project team was emphasized.

2.   Sustainability as a Social Science concept   -

This pro-active project financed by German funds-in-trust, is concerned with promoting social science research on sustainability. The basic processes related to sustainability are economic and social as well as governance and political participation. In this context, social scientists are key actors in achieving sustainability by reorienting social science disciplines and by encouraging cross-disciplinary co-operation in sustainability research.

Several representatives expressed their keen interest in the project and its future activities. One representative added that a conference will be held in Chile on similar themes and that co-operation with this project would be fruitful.

In response to questions and comments raised by other delegates on whether the sustainability model developed by the project is to be used as the framework for MOST projects, the Secretariat clarified that this sustainability model constitutes only one possible framework for MOST research development, among others, and mentioned that after the initial effort of conceptualization, a research-oriented project on sustainability would be submitted to the SSC. In this context, several representatives stated that the MOST research networks themselves and the MOST Scientific Steering Committee are the appropriate contexts for discussing alternative paradigms and research methodologies. (See MOST Policy Paper N°6 *"Sustainability: A Cross-Disciplinary Concept for Social Transformation"*).

3. Cities: Management of Social Transformation and the Environment

This pro-active, action-oriented, and interdisciplinary project aims at encouraging initiatives to improve the quality of life of city dwellers and to promote citizenship. Three pilot sites were developed in Yeumbeul (Senegal), Port-au-Prince (Haiti) and Sao Roque (Brazil). Two further experimental projects are being developed in the cities of Essaouira (Morocco) and Tunis. The project comprises three parts: to encourage local initiative, integrate the training of local planners, social workers and community leaders, and to ensure the diffusion of relevant information among stakeholders. The Yeumbeul project was presented. The approach used in this project is based on participation of inhabitants and on a partnership between inhabitants, grassroots organizations, NGOs and concerned municipalities. The objective is to choose a number of pilot sites and to develop in these a relevant participatory methodology for the management and improvement of the environment by the inhabitants themselves. This methodology would then be replicated in other areas.

In reply to comments from the floor, it was clarified that the budget for the Yeumbeul project is made up of US$80,000 from UNESCO's Regular Programme and US$120,000 from extra-budgetary funds. One representative asked about the social science knowledge to be gained from such a micro-project. In reply to this question, it was noted that this transdisciplinary project was research-action oriented, to provide a link between practitioners, researchers and decision-makers.

4. Asia-Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN)

The project focuses on the social and political aspects of international migration in East Asia, South East Asia, Australasia and the Islands of the Western Pacific. The APMRN currently includes research institutions in ten countries as well as the Pacific Islands and Hong Kong. The presentation looked into issues being studied by the network, among them the massive labour movements in the region in response to economic development and globalization processes, and major refugee flows engendered by political instability and internal conflicts. By the mid-1990s, approximately 3 million Asians were employed outside their own countries within the Asian region, and another 3 million were employed in other continents.

Also presented were the objectives of the project, the country-composition of APMRN and details regarding the network's research work-plan. In reply to questions, it was noted that APMRN's co-operation with other regional groups is taking place within the MOST Programme and that national teams are already working with other international networks.

X.   Funding strategy

The funding strategy of MOST was introduced by the Secretariat, based on the "Working document on MOST-related extra-budgetary fund-raising" (SHS 97/CONF.203/INF.2).

Although the document focuses mainly on fund-raising targeted to development assistance agencies, it was clear from the current experiences that the best approach to secure long-term funding for MOST projects is to rely on national interest and support. The funds for international research are extremely limited and will never be sufficient to sustain MOST research. Ideally, national authorities should introduce in their national research councils a priority budget for the participation of their country's research teams in the MOST projects.

The challenge is to convince Member States to invest in social science research in the framework of MOST.

Amongst other things, this will require an active and motivated contact partner in each Member State, that can defend and sell the MOST programme's strengths within the national infrastructure. The National Liaison Committees for MOST should play this important role.

Sweden has recently established an NLC, composed of members from Government ministries, the National Commission, and funding agencies. This is an example that may inspire other countries.

Support was expressed for the view introduced by the representative of Chile that the MOST Programme should function to give a MOST-UNESCO label to national projects that have been approved and funded nationally. Funding and the MOST-UNESCO label would then be used to seek other international partners for these projects, or generate similar ones in other countries. MOST seed money would be used to establish international contacts for projects already with significant funding.

Several representatives pointed out that in developing countries financial support for social science research from national authorities was not available. Much of the research in the social sciences in these countries is already financed through international and bilateral sources.

The catalytic effect of the MOST label was mentioned by several Members of the Council as an important asset of the Programme.

With regard to the role of the SSC, it was emphasised that this steering body should concentrate on the scientific and intellectual aspects of the programme, rather than on the budgetary situation.

The strength of UNESCO-MOST lies in its co-ordinating capacities that allow it to foster networks of experts and to promote the exchange of information. Several representatives recommended the inclusion of national research projects that come with their own funding in MOST. Another representative pointed to the involvement and contribution of many researchers in MOST projects, in spite of current under-financing. A proposal was made to organise a conference for all MOST researchers to allow them to share their results, conclusions and recommendations.

Still another representative suggested that in many countries, social science research in the framework of MOST could be made part of the national social development plan. This would provide stable funding possibilities.

In the concluding remarks by the IGC President and the Secretariat, it was emphasized that the major goal of MOST is to promote and legitimize the use of social science research. In that sense MOST has a much broader objective than the completion of its 17 adopted projects. National Liaison Committees will have to play an important role that can be supported through the Participation Programme of UNESCO.

XI. SECRETARIAT REPORT ON THE REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL MEETINGS OF MOST (SHS-97/Conf.203/INF.3)

MOST has organized this series of meetings in accordance with the recommendations of the first and second IGC meetings that considered them as crucial to the development of MOST as a worldwide programme.

The specific objectives of the meetings were:
a) To present MOST in each region and mobilise research communities and policy-makers concerned with its themes;
b) To formulate and integrate in the programme the policy and research issues and priorities of each region in all three MOST themes;
c) To be the starting point of one or two major MOST projects or other initiatives, co-ordinated by specialists from the region.

Since the start of the programme some eleven regional and sub-regional meetings have been organized in close collaboration with the National Commissions of UNESCO in the respective host countries, and with the support of the Field Offices of the regions concerned. All meetings benefited strongly from the support of the Member States.

The report presented in a compact manner the research and policy priorities that emerged in the regional meetings, and examples of the follow-up from each meeting were given. The capacity-building aspect of the MOST programme received considerable attention in several regions, that stressed the need for improved training and research facilities and for stronger

regional co-operation, and the desire to take part in worldwide information structures such as Internet.

The results of the meetings and the high number of projects that were subsequently developed show that MOST is a timely and welcome initiative, which researchers find useful. The same is true for the many agencies and organizations, and especially NGOs that participated in the meetings and that are currently involved in follow-up projects and activities.

Projects and networks, inter-linking researchers and policy-makers in some 84 countries, have started to co-operate and exchange information on the priority issues of MOST. This is in itself an important achievement of the programme. It has also created the foundation for MOST to become a significant undertaking in the social sciences world-wide. The full development of the projects in the coming years will be the major challenge of MOST.

In the discussion following the presentation of the report, comments were made by six representatives. Several representatives welcomed the positive outcome of the regional meetings of the MOST programme and the Secretariat was asked to explore the possibilities of further developing activities at the regional level. At the same time it was suggested that the role of UNESCO should be to reinforce inter-regional co-operation, for instance by establishing co-operation between different regional projects. The ETHNONET in Africa and the Ethnicity Monitoring project in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia were cited in this respect.

To strengthen international co-operation and exchange of information, MOST should develop its Clearing House network on the Internet, so that all researchers and organizations involved in MOST projects have access to electronic mail and the World Wide Web. This will allow MOST' s many partners to fully develop their regional and international co-operation.

XII. MID-TERM EVALUATION

The draft terms of reference for the Programme's mid term evaluation (SHS-97/Conf.203/INF.4) generated observations and suggestions by many Council Members. Overall, Members stressed that the evaluation was mid-term, and not final, and that this had strong implications for the methodology and criteria for the evaluation framework. There was general agreement that the draft current terms of reference seemed more appropriate for a final rather than mid-term assessment of MOST. On this note, a number of helpful suggestions were made to improve the terms of reference and to guide the development of the evaluation method. Particular mention was made of the following points:

- The need to include within the evaluation itself, the possibility of questioning whether the original objectives of the programme remain appropriate, or whether they need to be adapted to further enable the programme to achieve its overall purpose;

- The possibility that the evaluation take into account gaps in coverage within MOST activities, either geographic or issue-based, such as, for example, the need for placing more emphasis on project development focusing on questions related to citizenship, democracy and pluralism;
- The importance of selecting evaluators who have experience with other international research programmes that share the innovative aims and objectives of the MOST programme;
- The National Liaison Committees and UNESCO National Commissions may be tapped to provide national information on the MOST programme. Consideration can be given to designing a survey questionnaire as an instrument in the evaluation methodology;
- That the evaluation should cover not only MOST research projects but also other activities such as the pro-active projects, the Clearing House and the publication series;
- It would be inappropriate to attempt to assess any policy impact at this mid-term stage. This should be included in the final evaluation of the Programme, in 2002. This same recommendation was made concerning the socio-economic impact and sustainability of the Programme;
- Consideration should be given to forming an evaluation team comprised of representatives from inside and outside the programme;
- Researchers themselves should be requested to contribute to the evaluation process by providing self-study and critical analysis of their own research work within the Programme; and
- The scientific quality of a project in terms of its contribution to theoretical and methodological development should be important criteria for evaluation.

XIII. SOCIAL RESEARCH AND SOCIAL POLICY PLANNING (SHS-97/Conf.203/INF.5)

The overall purpose of the MOST Programme is to strengthen the link between the production of social science knowledge and the policy-making process. The creation of the MOST programme was a response to the need of the international community to focus more attention on how, and under what conditions, social science research results are considered in Government planning processes.

Following introduction of the relevant document prepared by the Secretariat on this issue, the ensuing discussion centred on the activities proposed for 1998-1999. These activities are designed to raise the profile of the Programme in this area, and in their interventions, Member States acknowledged this as being very important.

The IIAS has long experience in political research and offered to involve the MOST Programme in its planned 1998 meeting at UNESCO on policy-research linkages.

The Netherlands offered to host the proposed International Symposium on the interplay between research and policy, planned for 1999. The purpose of the Symposium will be twofold: to contribute toward raising the profile of the social sciences and to emphasise the need for social science research to contribute toward resolving policy driven questions; and to generate discussion and thinking on how this could best be done: i.e. through training programmes for policy-makers on aspects of social science research; to design a graduate training programme on how to formulate a research framework around a policy driven question. In their offer, the Netherlands proposed to establish a coalition of national partners for the planning of this Symposium, with the MOST Secretariat, which would include the National Research Council (NWO), the Social Cultural Planning Office (SCP), Multi-Cultural and Pluralistic Societies Programme (MPS) and the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR). Other Member States may suggest to the MOST Secretariat national or regional institutions to join this initiative. It was suggested that the theme of R*esearch and Policy on the Effectiveness of the State* might be considered as a title for the conference.

Additionally, the Netherlands offered that the MOST Programme be their partner in the planning of their forthcoming conference on "Education and Social Exclusion" which is to result in a proposal for the MOST Programme.

Support was expressed for the development within the MOST Clearing House of a data base for specific case studies on best practices where social research results have been considered in policy planning and where there exist interesting mechanisms for fostering interaction between policy makers and researchers.

A number of Member States gave critical insights into how their national research institutions or programmes interact with government planning. The Malaysian IRPA Programme (Intensive Research on Priority Areas) is one interesting case study in this regard, amongst others.

Other interesting comments were raised in the discussion, in particular the different time scales facing researchers and policy-makers, long-term for the former and short-term for the latter; the importance of assessing the degree to which UN Agencies and Bretton Wood institutions depend upon social science research in their programme formulation; the need to retain scientific autonomy of research, while forming links with policy communities; and finally, the very important role assigned to the MOST Programme in a time where science is increasingly being subjugated to the rules of a global market society, with the harmful effects this may have on the availability and autonomy of knowledge.

XIV. Recommendations: Preliminary discussions

The President presented the draft recommendations emerging from the Session's meetings and invited comments and reflections.

These draft recommendations are on:

1) The World Science Conference;
2) MOST Funding Strategy;
3) The Role and Functions of the IGC; and
4) Developing MOST-related National Activities.

Some changes in the phrasing of particular draft recommendations were made and agreed upon, while others were deferred for further deliberation and approval at the Council's final meeting.

XV. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS OF THE IGC SESSION BY THE PRESIDENT

The President concluded the meeting by highlighting the following issues as key components of the week's discussion:

- MOST activities in the coming biennium should contribute to furthering conceptual understanding of models of social research use for policy- or decision-making;

- additionally, efforts must be made by the Secretariat, IGC members and National Commissions or National Liaison Committees to raise the profile of the Programme in respective Member States and to convey the benefit of the Programme to Member States;

- the Secretariat is requested to develop a viable funding strategy to raise the Programme's capacity to attract extra-budgetary funds for its activities;

- the Secretariat is to devise ways and means of stimulating active participation of National Commissions and National Liaison Committees in MOST activities, with the understanding that national support is essential for achieving the purposes of the Programme;

- the imperative for IGC members to be actively involved in, and supportive of the Programme's work between IGC meetings.

In this spirit, efforts will be made to organize tele-conferences for members of the Bureau. To maintain momentum, it is considered useful for Member States to include their MOST IGC representative in the delegation to the 29th session of the General Conference during which the President will be holding an informal meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL OF MOST
Paris, Third Session, 16 to 20 June 1997

Recommendation on the World Science Conference

The Intergovernmental Council of the Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme,

Noting with satisfaction the proposal of the Director-General of UNESCO in the Draft Programme and Budget for 1998-1999, to convene in 1999 a World Science Conference.

Welcoming the view of the Director-General that the Conference should concern all the sciences, both social and natural,

Underlining with satisfaction that the Executive Board of UNESCO in its decision 151.EX/Decision 5.1, insisted on "the complementary roles of the natural and the social and human sciences" and recommended "that a wide range of expertise drawn, ...be associated with the preparation of this conference, including in the framework of the International Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB)",

Appreciating that the conference will address the main achievements of all sciences and their challenges ahead,

Recognizing the importance of social and human scientific knowledge in social, economic and cultural development and in political decision-making,

Emphasizes that the process of development including the application of science and technology requires the methods, skills and tools of social science disciplines,

Requests the Director-General of UNESCO that:

- membership of the International Scientific Advisory Board and the Organizing Committee for the preparation of the Conference also include internationally recognized specialists in the field of social sciences, and that the same criteria be applied for selecting participants for the conference,

- the composition of both the Advisory Board and the Conference participants adequately reflect the growing role of women scientists in the world,

- at each stage of the preparation of the Conference and its agenda by the secretariat of UNESCO, the Sector of Exact and Natural Sciences and the Sector of Social and Human Sciences act as full partners,

- the agenda and the plan of action of the World Science Conference be pluridisciplinary and propose orientation programmes on priority social, economic and environmental issues.

Recommendation on the MOST Funding Strategy

The Intergovernmental Council of the MOST Programme,

Considering the interest raised by the MOST Programme in the Member States,

Noting the activities developed by MOST and the scope they acquired over the three years that elapsed since the IGC held its first session in March 1994,

Expressing its appreciation to the Executive Board and the Director-General, for the significant increase in the MOST budget in the Draft Programme and Budget for 1998-1999 (29 C/5) that was decided, showing clearly that this Programme is given high priority in UNESCO,

Noting the concerns of the Scientific Steering Committee that appropriate funding is needed in order to maintain the quality and momentum of MOST activities,

Recalling that UNESCO's regular budget assigned to MOST can only respond partially to the overall needs of the programme,

Reconsidering the MOST fund-raising strategy which is now being implemented,

Agrees that the MOST activities require considerable amounts of extra-budgetary funding, national and international, originating from public and private sources,

Considers that the support at the national level through funding or contributions in kind, is the basis of such a funding strategy and needed for securing international public and private funding and, therefore

Invites the Member States of UNESCO to make a special effort to contribute financially to MOST activities, either directly to participating networks or through Funds-in-Trust agreements and/or using a UNESCO special account, where possible, by means of bilateral agreements in particular with developing countries, as well as pursuing their efforts to identify international extra-budgetary funding sources.

Recommends that Member States of UNESCO encourage their national research councils, research ministries and/or other national research bodies to establish arrangements with the UNESCO/MOST Programme through National Liaison Committees when they exist and/or National Commissions for UNESCO, so that the purpose, objectives and funding of MOST activities are included in the programmes of such institutions.

Recommendation on the role and functions of the Intergovernmental Council of MOST

The Intergovernmental Council of MOST,

Considering its guiding role in the steering of the MOST Programme,

Mindful of its responsibilities towards the successful development of this programme,

Stresses the need to liase actively with the other Member States of UNESCO,

Recommends to each of its members to be pro-active, in liasing with their respective policy and research communities, National Commissions for UNESCO, NGOs, private businesses and other societal actors, in order to secure funding for MOST activities and marketing the programme,

Recommends that Members States of UNESCO take action to make the MOST Programme more visible in their respective countries, particularly amongst scientific communities and funding sources,

Requests its Bureau to set up organic relationships with the MOST National Liaison Committees,

Further requests the Bureau and the other Members of the Council to exchange information through available means.

Recommendation on developing MOST-related national activities

The Intergovernmental Council of the MOST Programme,

Considering that the MOST Programme has raised wide interest in the Member States,

Stressing that the development of MOST-related national initiatives provides a solid foundation for the programme, and significantly increases its impact by multiplying its activities,

Expressing its appreciation to the Executive Board and the Director-General, for the significant increase in the MOST Budget in the Draft

Programme and Budget for 1998-1999 (29 C/5) showing clearly that this Programme is given high priority in UNESCO,

Noting, however, that as foreseen in the Programme's feasibility study (140 EX/11 of 20.8.92), the scope of MOST activities requires funds well above the regular budget of the Organization assigned to this programme,

Reminds Member States of UNESCO that the Participation Programme requests for 1998-1999 provide an opportunity for supporting MOST-related national activities,

Also *recommends* that those Member States, which have not yet established MOST National Liaison Committees, take action to do so.

Closing address at the 3rd Session of the Intergovernmental Council of the Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme,

by Mr. P.H.B. Pennekamp, Director General for Social Welfare of the Netherlands Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, Paris, Friday 20 June 1997.

Mr. President,
Madame Assistant Director-General,
Distinguished members of the Intergovernmental Council,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is indeed a great honour and a pleasure for me to be present at this Council's meeting today. I hope you have had fruitful discussions during the past days and you are presumably looking forward to finalizing the Third Session of the Council this very morning.

But before you will be coming to that, permit me to capture thirty or so minutes of your time in order to speak to you about a topic that I simply will call "the dialogue between social scientists and policy makers". Or, in a more specific way: "the mutual relationship between research actions and decisions concerning the minorities policy.

You might have heard the story that ever since World War Two in the United States of America, social scientists had been attempting to convince federal government that large-scale research should be conducted in the field of minority group relations. They were turned down at that time, because the subject allegedly was "too controversial".

Even after the widespread unrest and riots in the summer of 1967 - almost thirty years ago now - the prominent American social scientist Hubert Blalock Junior ironically observed that the US government appointed a blue-ribbon commission of investigation, but without any single social scientist as its member. Somewhat out of frustration Blalock thereafter wrote his book "An introduction to social research", in which he expressed the intention "to close the communication gap between the social scientist and the layman.."

Times have changed since then. Social policy research and applied research on minority issues and in general, flourished in the seventies and eighties and produced a wealth of projects, reports, data and information.

In accepting the invitation to appear before you this morning, I took into consideration, that the experiences of a small, democratic, pluriform and wealthy country like the Netherlands might be of some interest to those involved in the MOST-programme to shed some light on this policy research relation.

Being a policy maker myself and responsible for multicultural social welfare on a national level, I very much welcome concerted international research actions like in those the MOST- Programme. As I find it very important to further develop international comparative and interdisciplinary research in the field of multiculturalism, multi-ethnicity and social integration - it is by the same token important to promote intellectual co-operation and the exchange of concepts and ideas.

You might take my presence here as a contribution to that co-operation and exchange.

What I intend to cover this morning is the following:

At first I will briefly expose some specific elements of the relationship between social research and social policy in general. I will introduce the notions of "the policy cycle" and "stages of research" and explore how they might fit together on different levels and what difficulties in communication between the two usually exist.

This might be an old story for some of you, but I hope it is worthwhile first to define the playing field and conditions before entering into discussions or critique.

In portraying this relationship/dialogue I will conceive it as an "intercultural learning process" and a "dialogue".

In the second part of my speech I will inform you in some detail about how, in the Netherlands, social research has played a role in shaping government policies on ethnic minorities and multicultural policies as were pursued over the last two decades. I will try to formulate some general conclusions.

Based on these conclusions I will finally express some general views on how we should adapt to emerging challenges of research and policies in an international context.

No question about it, ladies and gentlemen: when talking about the relationship between research and policy making we are dealing with a complicated matter, which is not easy to portray in a short time. So I have to focus on some aspects. Furthermore don't expect that I am pretending to introduce brand new insights and visions, or to deliver the final answers on long existing problems. I simply would like to bring up some topics, to pinpoint some nasty problems and to raise awareness on the relationship between research en policy in general. All because in my opinion this subject should be of continuous concern and consideration to all who are involved.

Furthermore - from the beginning we should realize that the relation between research and policy has been an issue ever since multi-national organizations came into existence. This year for instance, exactly 40 years ago, in 1957, a seminar was held entitled: The relation between research, planning and social welfare policy. It was organized in The Hague by the UN,

in co-operation with the predecessor of my current Ministry. UNESCO was represented too. This seminar adopted four conclusions, which - as you might guess - could easily have been stated today. One of them reads: "greater attention should be directed to the contribution that can be made to research by administrators, social workers and researchers from different disciplines..."

This was forty years ago - But very recently, ladies and gentlemen, only two weeks ago I had the privilege of chairing a meeting in Amsterdam on the topic of "the social quality of Europe". This meeting was attended by on the one hand social scientists and on the other hand by policy makers from the fifteen European Member states. Our intention was to start a dialogue between both groups in order to focus on the real relevant social issues of European citizens. I can tell you that at this conference it proved to be difficult to establish a common frame of reference between the two. Policy - especially in a EU-context - has to deal with so many constraints and to take care of "circumstantial evidence". At that conference it became clear to me that you can not just juxtapose scientists and policymakers and expect them to communicate in the effective way. This needs thorough preparation, the specification of external conditions and above all some clear focus on the policy and research problem.

First let us try to sort a few things out about the notions of policy and after that about research as such.

It depends whether you see policy-making as a rational goal-oriented problem-solving process or as a process of negotiating and combining various interests. In my experience and view policies often become manifest through complicated and diffuse processes; this is reflected in the notion of policy as "muddling through", coined by Lindblom many years ago.

Policy-problems appear to be most of the time multi-variate, interdependent, with doubtful or spurious causal relationships.

However that may be, we should keep in mind that policy interventions always refer to possible transformations in society. It presumes that society is a human - or better - a social construction, based on collective perceptions and values. This is why we can change society if we - collectively - change our opinions and concepts, be it within certain conditions and limits. This also is or should be the rationale of every process of social planning and administration and of policy making in general.

At this moment I am not so much interested in the various types of policy making. One can look upon it as a process of decision-making, of information-processing or as a learning process.

What is important is to see it as an evolving, a cyclical process in which we need to distinguish some formal elements or phases:

That is (Policy cycle):

1. problem definition,
2. formulation of policy
3. implementation
4. administrative routine

And after phase four by means of "evaluation" we could come back to phase one.

What is important to keep in mind however, is that in the communication and relationship between research and policy one should always be aware of the particular phase of the policy cycle one is.

Looking at these phases, one could say that research is most frequently used in phase one, to discern and describe the exact problem. To a lesser extent in phase two, to formulate policy alternatives for example. In phase three one could think of evaluation research. But in phase four research is not frequently used.

Let's now turn to research.

I assume you all might hold your own definition of "research". Taking it here into account I guess the most relevant distinction for us now is that between applied and basic research; the former is aiming at the production of practical knowledge the latter is trying to proof fundamental theories and concepts. I will consider as "research" any reproducible and controlled procedure that generates relevant data and information. (It is tempting to touch in this Council upon the issue of the possible "cultural biases" that can be attributed to Western social research methods or the question if the scientific attitude itself is a culture-related disposition? But I will resist that inclination...and continue).

When I will use the term "policy research", I assume that this procedure is aimed at solving certain problem that have been articulated in the policy process I just mentioned before.
What should bother us here also is the division in steps, in formal stages of research. I will consider the following stages:

The initial stage where you find the elements:

1. observation; problem definition; conceptualization; hypotheses
2. developing measurement instruments; choosing a research design and format.
3. Collection: which contains sampling and data collection
4. Analysis with: data analysis and data interpretation
5. and finally Implementation, where you could think of reporting and implementing of results. The aspect of feedback and evaluation is also relevant here.

As I said before, when bringing together research and policy we need to keep in mind the congruence between these formal stages and the formal policy phases.

Looking at these research stages, my general observation is, that in the stage of problem definition and conceptualization the specific policy question play an important role. Stages two and three on the average show little direct involvement of policy - although sample size is a very sensitive cost factor.

When we come to "data-interpretation" and the implementation, a stronger relationship with policy considerations becomes evident.

You can see, that already the use of both these formal "phases" or "stages" of policy and research shows more nuance, more differentiation in the picture of the relationship between policy and research. We can speak of several "interfaces" in which policy and research actually meet each other.

But of course not only formal elements matter. Much depends on the subject matter, the substantial issues and problems that research - and policy - have to address. In that matter it is in my opinion the duty of all research to clarify what are the researchable issues and to seek an understanding with policy interest as to mutual and realistic expectations.

Ideally spoken the researcher should provide - in time and in an appropriate way - the knowledge and information that decision-makers need. This knowledge as a product of the research stages - has to be gathered, critically assessed, summarized and transformed into something that is susceptible to being used by decision makers. That is the standard model.

But looking at the literature and from our own experience, it seems more common usage to speak about this model as a problematic one. There are many tensions in the relationship between policy and research: mutual prejudice, difference in expectations and misunderstandings.

Differences between Research and Policy

✓ goal-orientation and function
✓ time horizons
✓ look at (continuity and) progress
 	
       working methods
       value orientations
       language, culture
 	
✓ accountability

The various explanations of this problematic relationship may be familiar too; let me mention about six reasons:

First: the difference in goal-orientation and function. It follows from the different functions that policy makers and researcher perform in society. Policy makers are interested in - you might guess - policy making and implementation that is achieving certain goals. The same is true of a difference in time horizons: policy makers are frequently more interested in short time successes within one or two years; social scientist are dealing with long range developments.

Related to this is the distinct way both sides look at continuity and progress; to old and new situations. In preparing their actions policy-makers and administrators seek guidance from the past. The policy makers' interest is in obtaining evidence to support and reinforce existing policy while researchers are keen to provide fresh data and evidence to shape new policy. (That is what made Keynes to articulate his opinion that: "Governments hate information!")

Other obvious differences are that in working culture: methods, value orientations, language. I am not going to deep into this, but policy makers more often rely on routines whereas researchers need their creativity. Researchers look for general recipes while policy makers need specific solutions. An noticeable difference is also that while the researcher strives at more quality and high methodological standards, the policy maker favours practical effectiveness.

Lastly, ladies and gentlemen I mention as an important point the distinction that lies behind the various roles and can be stated as a difference in accountability. Politicians are accountable to let's say their electorate and the community and ultimately... to themselves. Scientists and researchers are accountable to their contract, their peers and ultimately ...to the Truth (with capital T)

Apart from the differences I just mentioned, it helps to understand that the relationship between science and policy appears at three different levels, commonly labelled as macro, meso and micro. The macro-level in the science sphere is highly abstract and theoretical and can be said to guide general research themes at the meso level and studies on the micro level. Looking at the policy sphere, we can make a corresponding distinction between the general level of political ideology, which guides more specific policies at the meso level and administration at the micro level.

I have got the feeling that if we compare policy and research on the macro-level - "high theory and ideology" we would not encounter much of a problem. Both are vague enough to go together. Neither - I think - at the concrete micro-level of data gathering, is there a major problem between administrators and the researchers carrying out their studies.

The most problematic aspects of the relationship between research and policy tends to be concentrated at the <u>middle range level</u>. On this meso level we use concepts and models to come to grips with reality in order to understand and to change it. This is also the level of programming of research projects.

* Just to recap: After focusing on specific "interfaces" in which policy and research relate, I presented several differences and difficulties in this relationship, then we zoomed in on a distinctive level, the meso-level on which these differences become most visible and troublesome.

If we look at the discrepancies between research and policy discussed so far, especially at the meso-level, we might wonder whether the train will ever meet? Are policy and research not two different cultures that communicate only by coincidence?
In order to start a dialogue between research and policy a certain number of conditions must be fulfilled. It is the task of research management and policy management to establish the appropriate conditions.

One of my suggestions - as a policy maker - would be in this respect that researchers should be trained in order to understand better and take into account the realities of the policy environment. But researchers might call for more understanding of the research process by the policy maker.

Anyway, if I may make a suggestion, I would say that this dialogue could at best be represented as a model of a <u>mutual learning situation</u>. The research stages here are subsumed under the policy process.

Departing from this model an empirical evaluation study was carried out a couple of years ago in the Netherlands about the effectiveness of 45 research projects on policy making in several government sectors.

Because it is one of the rare studies that I know of in this field, I won't withhold you the final conclusion that the investigator came up with. It was - and I quote: "the problem of linking research with policy is very diversified!". Well, this is a stunning conclusion, isn't it?

Besides that: - a few considerations from that study that deal with the relationship between policy and research might be of interest to you.

Effectiveness of policy research (?)

✓ policy maker's openness to
   external information

✓ changes and transformations
   of policy problems

✓ type of knowledge correlates
   with type of policy

✓ congruence between policy question
   and research answer

- In the initial - definition stages:

1. a strong position of the policy maker, his capacity and motivation to absorb external information is the best predictor for the use of research.
2. The type of problem itself is not of much importance; what is needed is a permanent awareness of the transformation of problems within the policy system and during the research - and policy - process.
3. Analysis of the type of policy helps to predict the type of knowledge that can be handled.
4. The best way to clarify a research question is to give the characteristics of the desired answer.

Another example from a report on programme evaluation stated that administrative policy makers frequently prefer quantitative research and research data over qualitative. This preference was - according to the authors of the report - based on a limited and selective knowledge of research methods and instruments.

So far we have just looked at the formal aspects of the dialogue between social research and policy. What if we apply them to a real policy subject, for instance that of developing minorities policy in a multi-cultural society, let us say in the case of the Netherlands?

And, furthermore. Are these general principles still valid on an international level, also in the case of policies and research on multicultural issues.

Are their particular factors and conditions that we must keep in mind when projecting the policy/research dialogue on the subject of minorities policy and social integration issues?

Well, I shall not pretend - as I said before - to give the answers, but we might deal with some more substantial issues now.

Let me as an illustration - and simply because I don't know too much about other countries - start with my own national situation, that is to say the domain of social and minorities policy in the Netherlands.

Although the Netherlands is not mentioned as one of the examples in Christine Inglis' valuable MOST-paper number 4 on Multiculturalism, it shows a comparable approach in establishing a policy towards a multicultural society, like for instance Sweden.

For a long time after the War, until the eighties, government policy - if any - was based on the assumption that immigrants would only stay temporarily. The specific policy then was that immigrants received subsidies for their own associations and institutions, as well as for cultural events, but hardly any public attention was given to social integration or to the elements of an emerging multi-cultural society.

In fact, the general opinion at that time was that integration would simply happen by itself. This opinion was not at all too unrealistic, being related to that typical feature in Dutch society called "pillarization". This can be considered as a sort of "segmented pluralism" with strong social distinctions, but through which social and political conflicts were regulated in society. (You might be familiar with Mr. Lijphart's publication on this issue dating back from 1968, entitled "The Politics of Accommodation")

By the beginning of the eighties, however, change in production technology, disappointing economic performance, the increasing burden of welfare state expenditures - and the gradually dawning realization that ethnic minorities were becoming a permanent element of Dutch society led - to a shift in national policy. A shift that had already been made by local authorities!

This was 1983. At that time policies began targeting legally resident members of minority groups. This targeting was based on research findings! The Chinese minority for instance was not labelled as a "vulnerable" target group and therefore was not entitled to certain benefits.

Minorities policy in the eighties concentrated on alleviating deficiencies in education, housing, employment, well being and health. The more or less implicit notion behind it was that of a multicultural society, a notion that John Rex describes as "a situation whereby there is a shared political culture of the public domain - promoting equal opportunities and preventing racial

discrimination - and the private domain, where culture and language are part of separate communities" (1994).

In that fashion minorities policy has since helped to improve the legal position, political participation and housing of minorities - in education and employment however have the results been unsatisfying. Research results made apparent that unemployment among certain minority groups was disproportionately high and that performance at school was particularly poor, in the sense of both the level of the qualifications obtained and the unusually high drop-out rate.

Also, opposition to minorities grew among the native Dutch population, resulting in occasional violent outbursts and rising support for extreme right-wing political parties. (It is true to say that these problems did not take on the proportions we have seen in a few of our neighbouring countries but, in themselves, these developments were disturbing enough).

Slowly but surely, the government began to realize that it could no longer remain aloof under such circumstances.

Thus the position of government - that is of the coalition of political parties - on minority policy has over the years shifted from broader policy goals, concerning the advancement of social reform in a pluralist, multi-cultural direction, to a more intensified and more obligatory policy of integration of the members of minorities into primarily the school system and the labour market. The attention has shifted from rights and citizenship-as-a-status to duties and "citizenship as a practice".

In its actual policy the Netherlands government emphasizes as the main goals for social integration - of legal or documented immigrants and residents - that everyone speaks the same language, that people have work or, at the very least, a decent income, that they have the opportunity to learn, access to public facilities and that they share certain standards and values with regard to how to behave towards one another.

This presents the government with a dilemma. On the one hand it is the task of the government to encourage social integration but on the other hand, the constitutional freedoms I have already mentioned must be observed. The latter consideration means that there are limits to what a government can impose upon its people, while the former means that the government still has the obligation to try. Furthermore there is the issue of separation between public and private domains. The key is to find a balance between these two positions.This balance has to date been sought in a number of policy programmes.

One of them - that might be relevant for an international audience - is a more or less obligatory a Scheme for the Integration of Newcomers, consisting of courses in Dutch and social and vocational orientation, career planning and social guidance. The scheme is to be implemented by local authorities.

I stop here talking about our policy situation, but not without mentioning that I still think the Netherlands' situation - or elements from it - is worthwhile for a comparative study in this field. Why not as part of the MOST-programme?

Let me briefly allude some aspects of the research component concerning Dutch minorities policy.

From the very beginning in the fifties, the situation of migrant in the Netherlands has been object of sociological and anthropological research.
Social policy and research are since then going hand in hand and reveals itself in many forms: advice, consultation, gaining empirical evidence, doing evaluation and case studies, surveying public opinion and so forth.

Compared to international standards the Netherlands government has spent a substantial amount of money on social policy research over the last twenty years. (- Compared to what is spent on R&D activities in for instance the industrial sectors it is a modest amount however!) - But, in spite of this amount, not too much is known about the real effects.

Analogue to the growth of policy making in this field, social research in the Netherlands relating to minorities expanded in the seventies to reach its peak in the eighties.

Although government has financed most of the research projects during these years, its attitude towards the problem has changed quite fundamental.

Before 1980 this attitude can be described as "benevolent and passive". No research programme existed; initiatives taken by individual researchers were positively received and subsequently subsidized, if only they did not interfere with - barely existing - policies.

I know though of one significant exception. The government decided in the fifties to reject a research proposal about the situation of the Moluccan minority - because of political sensitiveness I guess... Twenty years - one generation - later in the mid-seventies: public opinion and policy making were shocked by violent train hijackings by Moluccan youths! And this influenced government policy more than any research. This reminds us at the position of research vis-à-vis policy as was pointed out by Blalock - which I mentioned at the beginning of my speech.

After 1980 the Netherlands government formulated and implemented a explicit minorities policy and provided funds. This resulted in an increase in research projects financed by the government. A record total of 220 research projects was under way in 1984-85 with a budget with more than two million US-dollars. And in addition to government funding their came the start of programming of policy oriented research projects. This meant direct control of governmental agencies over content and scope of research projects. This picture might look familiar to those of you from developed countries:

During the early nineties research on minorities became further institutionalized. Special institutes for minority research were designated and a programming committee and advice councils were set up. Following the shift in policy orientation towards minorities, research also shifted emphasis towards general social problems of deprivation and social exclusion and directed research to mainstream policies.

Since 1993 the government is reporting about the situation of minorities on a more or less regular basis to Parliament. This is done by the Social and Cultural Planning Bureau - which is related to my ministry - from their database and a regular survey.

If I may quickly refer back to the relationship between research and the policy cycle. to link this to the state of minorities research:

As a general conclusion we notice that findings from research in the eighties were integrated in the four phases of the policy cycle. We experienced that research was quite influential in the first and second phases in which the problem is defined and a policy or strategy is formulated. At least this was the case with minority policies in the Netherlands. It became also clear, that the influence of research became marginal in the third phase of implementation and administrative routine.

Anyhow, over the years several hundreds of reports and contributions in social science research have been produced. Many case studies illustrating a particular instance of minority policy or multicultural society.

The question is in how far - apart from problem solving advice to policy - this expansion of research has led to an accumulation of knowledge and formation of theory. A theory that can be used as a point of reference for both the researcher and the policy maker.

Frankly speaking, ladies and gentlemen, I think this is exactly what is lacking today in our country and maybe abroad. There is an urgent need for more explicit theoretical frameworks. But also for policy theories that link between policy practice on the one hand and the operationalization of observation and measurement instruments.

In order to redirect policy research in the Netherlands on minority issues we need to have new inspiration and to develop a broader view. Maybe this inspiration can be found in the international debate and global developments that are manifest since the beginning of this last decade.

And for this let address the question of the possible relevance for a programme like MOST to rethink some of our national concerns.

It may sound trivial ladies and gentlemen, but Dutch society is also influenced by modern global dynamics. The Netherlands - and Europe as well - is no fortress on an island. In recent years astounding changes have taken place in the political, economic and social world situation. These

changes might have been much discussed in academic publications and the popular media, I have yet seen only a few attempts to make a comprehensive analysis of their social effects; let alone that policy makers are anticipating on these effects.

And I have in view the issues of migration, movement of populations; with the establishing of new national identities, multiple identities, citizenship, and the transformation into market economies and civil society.

If we may believe Megatrend-guru John Naisbitt a new era is ushered in with the "return of tribalism". Tribalism is the belief in fidelity to one's own kind by ethnicity, language, culture, religion or even - profession. This makes that the common connections between people is their "distinctiveness".

Contrary to what you might believe, these social and social development issues are not always adequately dealt with in international politics and policies. Even in the developed countries of the European Union international co-operation concerning social and human issues is a difficult and controversial matter. (I hope the Amsterdam Treaty will not turn out to be a Dutch Treat).

Although peace, development as promoted by UNESCO has over the years always been based on the social and cultural needs of human beings, in general international and developing policies this social element was re-invented after say 1990. A first explicit signal of a more integrated approach, of course, were the Human Development Reports issued by UNDP. The priority importance of social development was further stressed by a series of major United Nations Conferences like the Copenhagen Summit for Social Development and the Beijing Conference on Women both in 1995 and Habitat-II in Istanbul in 1996.

Why I am so explicitly saying this? Well, first of all because all the work that came out of all these conferences is of course "paper", but it also the work of policy makers; we have committed ourselves!

In the second place: When involved in national politics and policy one is not always aware of ongoing international developments. But to my conviction the paramount outcome of these major global UN conferences is that they have shown us that developed and developing countries have a common social mission and should co-operate and learn from each other.
It is now time to convert this ambition into realistic targets and measurable effect. That is why we need a better dialogue between research and policy, a dialogue that incorporates elements that are still valid and useful after the year 2000.

And I will finish my contribution this morning, ladies and gentlemen, by briefly mentioning four aspects that we should take into account in this future dialogue.

Based on what I have said earlier: that is my experience in the Netherlands and in view of the global development I think it is necessary that we should further develop:

A. a more "responsive interface" between policy and research, based on
B. more explicit "grounded theories" as a mutual product of both policy and research
C. employing "versatile, flexible methods" linked to the various phases of the policy cycle
D. and while having better access to available data; also developing - standardized - "indicators

A.   I will not say anything more about the conditions under which the policy maker and researcher should communicate. As I have mentioned there should become engaged in a <u>responsive dialogue</u> characterized by: the right focus,
the right level, the right time and the right stages and phases. It is the responsibility of research and policy management to establish the favourable conditions under which such a dialogue can take place.

B.   As I already mentioned, in order to further the dialogue between research and policy we need a <u>theoretical framework</u>, which has its roots in the actual and real situation.
The ground for developing social integration policies on a national and international scale, lies in the assumption that the social fabric of the western world, and especially that of Europe, is becoming ever more diverse. This <u>diversity</u> must serve as the guiding principle for our approach; recognition of diversity is a primary precondition in this respect. Policy has an important part to play in this to develop a normative framework and confront this with features of multi-cultural research. I am very pleased to see that in the ongoing MOST-programme this is exactly one of the important issues.

C.   Apart from developing a theoretical prospect, I would favour to make more creative use made of existing and research methods, in such a way that a better linking with the policy cycle is established. A further exploration of assessment and evaluation methods might be useful. In a strategy for social impact assessment we are dealing with a method that focuses on the identification, assessment and <u>management of risk</u>. In that it differs from mere policy evaluation, which examines the extent to which a policy meets its prior stated objectives.

Over the last couple of years more knowledge was generated by the use of methods like social monitoring and reporting, but in my opinion we should make more use of scenario studies and forecasting in order to better develop the "early watch" function of policy research.

D.   I also think it is becoming increasingly important for both policy makers and researchers to discuss about and agree on broadly inter-nationally accepted and workable concepts of and criteria for measurement. Of course, the discussion on the value and use of <u>social indicators</u> dates

back for many years; but we should start rethinking. A more proper role of measurement data, statistics and indicators will be indispensable in setting targets, in monitoring, in using comparative evaluation or even in forecasting social policy measures. Social indicators may be used to set policy targets, to monitor the consequences of policy programmes.

I envisage a new role for UNESCO and the MOST-programme in setting up public debates, convenes meetings and organises seminars between several actors who are dealing with conceptual and measurement issues concerning social development. Especially, of course, between policy-makers and experts.
The initiatives of UNESCO in this field are a good start, especially the co-operation between UNESCO and UNRISD on developing indicators of well being as a follow-up of the report Creative Diversity.

I sincerely hope, ladies and gentlemen, that my discourse has shed some light on the complicated but important relationship between policymaking and research - and that it has not created even more confusion in your minds. But if so - and I would regret it very much - then it is my wish that you in any case have the feeling you are confused on a considerable "higher level" than you were before!

ANNEX 3

**Third Session of the Intergovernmental Council (IGC)
for the "Management of Social Transformations" Programme
MOST
UNESCO, Paris, Room XII
16 to 20 June 1997**

**AGENDA
AND TIME TABLE**

Monday 16 June

9:00   Meeting of the Bureau

9:30   Opening by the Director-General

10:00   Election of the Bureau
              Adoption of the Agenda
              Establishment of Drafting Group for minutes and
              recommendations, and report to the General Conference

10:30   Coffee Break

11:00   Keynote address by Stephen Castles "International Migration
              and Multiculturalism".
              Discussion

12:30   Lunch

15:00   Joint session of the Scientific Steering Committee and the
              Inter-governmental Council of MOST, presentation of the
              Report of the SSC, discussion on the thematic development
              (SHS-97/CONF.203/16)

16:15   Coffee Break

16:45-18:00   Continuation of the discussion

18:30   Reception

Tuesday 17 June

9:00   Meeting of the Bureau

10:00   Presentation of the Draft 29 C/5, by ADG/SHS
              (SHS/97/CONF.203/3 Annexe I)

10:30   Report of the Secretariat of MOST (SHS-97/CONF.203/3)

11:00   Coffee Break

11:30   Discussion

13:00   Lunch

15:00   Presentation of selected projects

16:00   Coffee Break

16:30-18:00 Continuation of presentations - discussion

Wednesday 18 June

9:00   Meeting of the Bureau

10:00   Funding strategy (SHS-97/CONF.203/INF.2)
             Discussion

11:00   Coffee Break

11:30   Synthesis of regional meetings (SHS-97/CONF.203/INF.3)
             Discussion
13:00   Lunch

15:00   Mid-term evaluation of programme
             (SHS-97/CONF.203/INF.4)
             Discussion
15:45   Coffee Break

16:00-17:00 Linkages-Research/Decisions (SHS-97/CONF.203/INF.5)
             Discussion

17:00-18:00 Recommendations of the Council

Thursday 19 June

No meetings

Friday 20 June

9:00   Meeting of the Bureau

10:00-11:15 - Closing speech by Mr. P.P. Pennekamp, Director General for
              Social Welfare of the Netherlands Ministry of Health, Welfare
              and Sport

11:15-11:30 - Coffee Break

11:30	- Adoption of final report
	- Adoption of report to the General Conference
	- Adoption of the recommendations of the Council

| 13:00 | Closure of the meeting |

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES
POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS
PARA LA EDUCACION, LA CIENCIA Y LA CULTURA

Third Session of the Intergovernmental Council (IGC)
For the "Management of Social Transformations" Programme
MOST

Troisième session du Conseil intergouvernemental (CIG)
Pour le programme "Gestion des transformations sociales"
MOST

Tercera reunion del Consejo Intergubernamental (CIG)
Del Programa "Gestión de las Transformaciones Sociales"
MOST

UNESCO, Paris – Room/Salle/Sala XII
16-20 June/juin/junio 1997

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS /LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

I.   **Members of the Intergovernmental Council for the Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme/Membres du Conseil intergouvernemental du Programme "Gestion des transformations sociales" (MOST)/Miembros del Consejo Intergubernamental del Programa "Gestion de las Transformaciones Sociales" (MOST)**

ANGOLA

H.E. Mr. Domingos VAN DUNEM, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Angola to UNESCO

Mr. Pr. Pedro Massala NSINGUI-BARROS, Advisor, Permanent Delegation of Angola to UNESCO

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Prof. Kenneth WILTSHIRE, University of Queensland, Brisbane

Ms. Roni ELLIS, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO

Ms. Carolyn IRVING, Australian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

Ms. Anne SIWICKI, Australian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

Dr. Ellie VASTA, University of Wollongong

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE

Mr. Othmar HOLL

Mr. Arne HASELBACH, Commission nationale autrichienne pour l'UNESCO

Mr. Gerhard MAYNHARDT

BENIN/BENIN

Mr. Isidore MONSI, Conseiller, Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de L'UNESCO

BRAZIL/BRESIL/BRASIL

Dr. Vilmar E. FARIA, Special Advisor to the President of the Republic

Mr. Richardo BASTOS, First Secretary, Brazilian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

BULGARIA/BULGARIE

Prof. Nikolai GENOV, Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences, Sofia

CAMEROON/CAMEROUN

Dr. Charles BINAM BIKOI, Director of Cooperation at the Ministry of Scientific and Technological Research, Yaoundé

CANADA

Mrs France LANDRIAULT, Director, Policy, Planning and International Relations, Council of Research in Human Sciences

Mme Elisabeth BAROT, Canadian Commission for UNESCO

CHILE/CHILI/CHILE

Prof. Raúl URZUA, Director del Centro de Analisis de Politícas Públicas, Universidad de Chile, Santiago

CHINA/CHINE

Mr. ZHANG Youyun, Directeur ad.chargé des affaires étrangères et internationales, Académie des sciences sociales de Chine

Mr. TIAN Jiaping, Premier Secrétaire chargé de la Culture, Délégation permanente de la Chine auprès de l'UNESCO

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

Sr. Pablo Gabriel OBREGON, Embajador, Delegado permanente de Colombia ante la UNESCO

Dr. Sra. Penelope RODRIGUEZ, Jefe Programa Nacional de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas – COLCIENCIAS

Sra. Natalia Martin-Leyes BARVO, Consejero, Delegación Permanente de Colombia ante la UNESCO

Sra. Ana Maria UPEGUI, Segundo Secretario, Delegación Permanente de Colombia ante la UNESCO

COSTA RICA

Sra. Gabriela CASTILLO GARCIA, Ministre Conseiller, Delegacion Permanente de Costa Rica ante al UNESCO

COTE D'IVOIRE

Dr. Edi Joseph AKOMIAN, Chercheur au CIRES, Abidjan

Mr. Pierre AKA, Conseiller, Délégation permanente de la Côte d'Ivoire auprès de l'UNESCO

Mr. Kouassi BALO, Conseiller, Délégation permanente de la Côte d'Ivoire auprès de l'UNESCO

CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE/REPUBLICA CHECA

Prof. Michal ILLNER, Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences, Prague

FRANCE/FRANCIA

Prof. Anne-Marie LAULAN, Présidente du groupe de liaison français du MOST, Commission de la République française pour l'éducation, la science et la culture

Dr. Martine BOITEUX, Chargé de mission à la Délégation aux Relations Internationales et à la Coopération, Ministère de l'Education nationale, de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la recherche

Dr. Monique HIRSCHHORN, Professeur de sociologie, Université de Paris V

Dr. Jean-Pierre DOZON, Directeur d'études à l'Ecole des Hautes études en sciences sociales

M. Jean-Paul MARTIN, Conseiller technique à la Commission française pour l'UNESCO

Prof. André BOURGEY, Président de l'INALCO (Langues orientales)

Melle Florence CORMON, Deuxième Secrétaire, Délégation permanente de la France auprès de l'UNESCO

Dr. Pascal BYE, Directeur de recherche à l'INRA

Dr. Francis GODARD, Directeur de recherche au CNRS, Vice-Président du comité Sciences humaines et sociales de la CNF

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE/ALEMANIA

H.E. Mr. Christoph DERIX, Ambassador Permanent Delegate of Germany to UNESCO

Mr. Hans Volker ZIEGLER, Minister-Councillor, Federal Ministry for Education, Science, Research and Technology

Mr. Folkert PRECHT, German Commission for UNESCO

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

H.E. Mr. Szabolcs de VAJAY, Ambassador, Professor of Social Structures, The Central European University, Budapest

INDIA/INDE

Prof. D. M. NANJUNDAPPA, Chairman, Indian Council for Social Science Research, Delhi

JAMAICA/JAMAIQUE

Prof. Donald ROBOTHAM, Pro Vice-Chancellor and Chairman, Board of Graduate Studies & Research, University of the West Indies, Mona Campus, Jamaica

Mrs. Sybil CAMPBELL, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Jamaica to UNESCO

JAPAN/JAPON

Prof. Kenichiro HIRANO, Department of International Relations, University of Tokyo

Mr. Hiroshi YOSHIMOTO, First Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO

LIBYA/LIBYE/LIBIA

Dr. Ali HAWAT, Professor of Social Sciences, El Fateh University, Tripoli

Mr. Mohamed El-MAHDAWI, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Libya to UNESCO

MADAGASCAR

S. Exc. Mme Lila RATSIFANDRIHAMANANA, Ministre de la recherche scientifique

Mme Ravaornalala MASOANAIVO, Délégation permanente du Madagascar auprès de l'UNESCO

Mr. Benjamin BABANY, Délégation permanente du Madagascar auprès de l'UNESCO

MALAYSIA/MALAISIE/MALASIA

Dr. Hussain ZAINUL ARIFF, Secretary-General, Ministry of National Unity and Social Development

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Fauzi YAACOB, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur

Prof. Dr. Amri Baharuddin SHAMSUL, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor

MEXICO/MEXIQUE

Mrs. Zadalinda GONZALEZ y REYNERO, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Mexico to UNESCO

MOROCCO/MAROC/MARRUECOS

Mr. Salah JEMILY, Directeur des affaires sociales, Ministère de l'Emploi et des affaires sociales

Mme Naima SEDRATI, Délégué permanent adjoint p.i. de la Délégation permanente du Maroc auprès de l'UNESCO

Mr. Salah-Eddine EL HONSALI, Délégation permanente du Maroc auprès de l'UNESCO

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS/PAISES BAJOS

Prof. Lieteke van VUCHT TIJSSEN, President, Working Group Social Sciences, National Commission for UNESCO

Mrs. Barbara de KLERK, Secretary, Working Group Social Sciences, National Commission for UNESCO

PHILIPPINES/FILIPINAS

Dr. Virginia MIRALAO, Executive Director, Philippine Social Science Council, Manila
Mrs. Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO, Permanent Delegation of the Philippines to UNESCO**POLAND/POLOGNE/POLONIA**Mr. Marek ZIOLKOWSKI, Professor of Sociology, University of Poznan, President, Social Sciences Committee, Polish National Commission for UNESCO

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE/SUIZA

S. Exc. Mme Sylvie MATTEIUCCI, Ambassadeur, Chef adjoint de la Délégation suisse auprès de l'UNESCO

Prof. François HAINARD, Institut de sociologie et de science politique, Université de Neuchâtel, Président du Comité suisse de MOST

Prof. Pierre de SENARCLANS, Commission nationale pour l'UNESCO

THAILAND/THAILANDE/TAILANDIA

Dr. Supang CHANTAVANICH, Director of Asia Research Centre for Migration, University of Chulalongkorn

Mrs. Saskthara PICHAICHANNARONG, Permanent Delegation of Thailand to UNESCO

TOGO

Dr. Kofi-Lumo Samuel KODJO, Université du Bénin

Mr. Kwame OKOUA
Premier Conseiller, Délégation permanente du Togo auprès de l'UNESCO

TUNISIA/TUNISIE

Dr. Mustapha NASRAOUI, Directeur, Institut National du Travail et d'etudes sociales, Tunis

Mme Anissa BARRAK, Attaché culturel à la Délégation permanente de la Tunisie auprès de l'UNESCO

YEMEN

S. Exc. M. Abadallah Yahya EL-ZINE, Ambassadeir. Délégué permanent du Yémen auprès de l'UNESCO

ZIMBABWE

Mr. Josiah Jasper MHLANGA, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Zimbabwe to UNESCO

2. Observers from Member States, Non-Members States, Permanent Mission of Observation; National Commissions of UNESCO and Permanent Delegations to UNESCO/Observateurs des Etats membres, des Etats non membres, des Missions permanentes d'observation et des Commissions nationales pour l'UNESCO et des Délégations permanentes auprès de l'UNESCO/Observadores de los Estados Miembros, de Estados non miembros, de Misiones Permanentes de Observación y de Comisiones Nacionales para la UNESCO y Delegaciones Permanentes ante la UNESCO

ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

Mrs. Claudia ZAMPIERI, Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO

BELARUS/BELARUS/BELARUSIA

Mrs. Natalia JILEVITCH, Counsellor

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE/BELGICA

Prof. Dr. A. MARTENS, Université Catholique de Louvain, Faculté des Sciences Sociales

BURKINA FASO

Mr. Mamadou SAWADOGO, Conseiller culturel, Délégué permanent adjoint de Burkina Faso auprès de l'UNESCO

CAMBODIA/CAMBODGE

S.A.R. le Prince M. NORODOM Sihamini, Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent du Cambodge auprès de L'UNESCO

M. David MEASKETH, Délégation permanente du Cambodge auprès de l'UNESCO

CUBA

Mrs. María RODRIGUEZ RODRIGUEZ, Specialist at the Cuban National Commission for UNESCO

Mr. Cleton EDGHILL, Conseiller, Cuban Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE/REPUBLICA DOMINICANA

Dra. Luisa NAVARRO, Coordinadora de Ciencias Sociales

ECUADOR/EQUATEUR

H.E. Mr. Juan CUEVA, Embajador, Delegado Permanente del Ecuador ante la UNESCO

Dr. Mauricio MONTALVO, , Delegado Permanente Adjunto del Ecuador ante la UNESCO

Sra. Maria Eugenia MARTINEZ de ROSADO, Asesora de Educación

EGYPT/EGYPTE/EGIPTO

H.E. Prof. Mohsen TAWFIK, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Egypt to UNESCO

FINLAND/FINLANDE/FINLANDIA

Mr. Tuomo MELASUO, Senior Research Fellow, Tampere Peace Research Institute, University of Tampere

Ms. Anna LAMMILA, Deputy Permanent Delegate, Permanent Delegation of Finland to UNESCO

GABON

Mme Caroline MAVOUSSAGA, Commission nationale gabonaise pour l'UNESCO

GREECE/GRECE/GRECIA

Prof. Dimitris CHARALAMBIS

HAITI

Mr. Harry Frantz LEO, Ministre Conseiller, Délégation permanente de Haiti auprès de l'UNESCO

HONDURAS

Excma. Sra. Sonia Mendieta de BADAROUX, Embajador, Delegada Permanente de Honduras ante la UNESCO

INDONESIA/INDONESIE

Dr. Arjuno BROJONEGORO, Deputy Chairman for Social Sciences, Indonesian Institute of Sciences – LIPI

Mr. Imam SANTOSO, Deputy Permanent Delegate, Permanent Delegation of Indonesia to UNESCO

IRAN

Mr. Mohammad MOTTAGHI-NEJAD. Advisor, Iranian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

IRAQ/IRAK

S. Exc. Dr. A. AL-ANBARI, Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent d'Irak auprès de l'UNESCO

Mr. Iyad AFLAK, Délégation permanente d'Irak auprès de l'UNESCO

ISRAEL

S. Exc. Mr. Avi SHOKET, Ambassadeur Délégué permanent d'Israel auprès de l'UNESCO

JORDAN/JORDANIE/JORDANIA

Miss Farida AL-KHALILI, Chief of Organization and External Relations, Ministry of Social Development

LEBANON/LIBAN/LIBANO

Dr. Nagib ISSA, Université libanaise

Dr. Ibrahim MAROUN, Université libanaise

Mme Fadia NASSIF TARKOVACS, Sociologue, chargée de questions de sciences sociales et humaines

LITHUANIA/LITHUANIE/LITUANIA

S. Exc. Mme Ugné KARVELIS, Ambassadeur, Déléguée permanente de Lituanie auprès de l'UNESCO

Mrs. Violeta BARANSHINE, Délégation permanente de Lituanie auprès de l'UNESCO

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA/EX-REPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACEDOINE/EX REPUBLICA YUGOSLAVA DE MACEDONIA

Mr. Vladimir CUPESKI, Conseiller du Ministre des Affaires étrangères de l'ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine

MALAWI

Dr. Gadi G.Y. MGOMEZULU, Deputy Permanent Delegate, Permanent Delegation of Malawi to UNESCO

MALTA

Mrs. Tanya VELLA, First Secretary, Deputy Permanent Delegate

MONGOLIA/MONGOLIE

Mr. Gurjav LKHAGVASUREN

MYANMAR

Mr. Khin Mya KYU

NEPAL

H.E. Keshav RAJ JHA, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Nepal to UNESCO

Mr. Shyamanand SUMAN, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Nepal to UNESCO

NIGERIA

Dr. Umar M. AHMED, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Nigeria to UNESCO

NORWAY/NORVEGE/NORUEGA

Mr. Audun SANDBERG, Chairperson, Norwegian National Commission

PAKISTAN

Dr. R. A. SIYAL, Délégué permanent adjoint du Pakistan auprès de l'UNESCO

PANAMA

M. Jorge PATINO, Délégation permanente du Panama auprès de L'UNESCO

PAPUA NEW GUINEA/PAPOUASIE-NOUVELLE GUINEE/PAPUA NUEVA GUINEA

Mr. Kappa YARKA, Chargé d'affaires à la Délégation permanente de Papouasie-Nouvelle Guinée auprès de l'UNESCO

PERU/PEROU

M. Carlos VESQUEZ, Premier Secrétaire à la Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Alfredo PICASSO de OYAGUE, Conseiller, Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO

PORTUGAL

Prof. Nelson LOURENCO, Portuguese National Commission for UNESCO

QATAR

Mr. Mohamed Fathi AWAD

RUSSIAN FEDERATION/FEDERATION DE RUSSIE/FEDERACION RUSA

M. Valeri SAKHAROV, Conseiller de la Délégation permanente de la Fédération de Russie auprès de l'UNESCO

SAINT LUCIA/SAINTE LUCIE/SANTA LUCIA

Mme. Vera LACOEUILHE, Attaché culturel, Délégation permanente de Sainte Lucie auprés de l'UNESCO

SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES/SAINT VINCENT ET LES GRENADINES/SAN VICENTE Y GRENADINAS

Mrs. Carole ARSAN

SENEGAL/SENEGAL

Mr. Ousman DIOP-BLONDIN, Délégation permanente du Sénégal auprès de l'UNESCO

SOUTH AFRICA/AFRIQUE DU SUD/SUDAFRICA

Ms. Nelia BARNARD, Permanent Delegation of South Africa to UNESCO

SPAIN/ESPAGNE/ESPANA

Dr. Isidoro ALONSO-HINOJAL, Comisión Nacional Española de Cooperación con la UNESCO

SRI LANKA

Mr. Saminda PEREIRA, Permanent Delegation of Sri Lanka to UNESCO

Mr. Piyasiri Vijaya SEKERE, Conseiller, Permanent Delegation of Sri Lanka to UNESCO

SUDAN/SOUDAN

Mr. Khalid ELFAHAL, Délégation permanente du Soudan auprès de l'UNESCO

SWEDEN/SUEDE/SUECIA

Mrs. Birgitta LINDENCRONA, Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences

Mr. Bo OHNGREN, Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences

UGANDA/OUGANDA

Mrs. Norah Leria KATABARWA, Permanent Delegation of Uganda to UNESCO

UKRAINE/UCRANIA

Mr. Volodymyr KHRYSTYCH, First Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Ukraine to UNESCO

VENEZUELA

Mrs. Lola Aniyar de CASTRO, Conseiller

Mrs. Mariana ROMERA, Second Secretary

OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVADORES

3.   International Non-Governmental Organizations/Organisations internationales non gouvernementales/Organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales

Association catholique internationale pour la radio et la télévision (UNDA)

Mme Martine ROGER-MACHART, Délégué auprès de l'UNESCO

Conseil international de la philosophie et des sciences humaines

Ms. Zo RAMAROSANDRATANA

Mr. Luca M. SCARANTINO, Secrétaire général adjoint

International Association of Universities

Mrs. Eva EGRON-POLAK, Director of Cooperation

International Committee for Social Science Information and Documentation

Mr. Serge HURTIG

International Council for Social Science Research

Mr. D. M. NANJUNDAPPA, Chairman

International Federation for Housing and Planning

Mrs. Elsbeth van HYLEKAINA VLIEG

International Federation of University Women

Mme Marianne BERNHEIM

International Institute of Administrative Sciences

Mme. Turkia OULD DADDAH, Directeur général

International Social Science Council

Mr. Leszek KOSINSKI, Secretary-General

International Society of City and Regional Planners (ISOCARP)

Mr. Dominique PAOLI
Mr. Hari BARAL

International Union of Architects (UIA)

Mr. Michel KALT, Directeur du Programme de Travail UIA "Habitat Région 1"

Organization des villes du patrimoine mondial

Mr Denis RICARD, Secrétaire général adjoint

World Federation for Mental Health

Dr. Madeleine RIVIERE, Representative to UNESCO

4. United Nations/Nations Unies/Naciones Unidas

Miss Affaf ABBASS, Research and Right to Development Branch, High Commissioner/Centre for Human Rights

5. MOST Scientific Steering Committee/Comité directeur scientifique de MOST/Comité Directivo Cientifico de MOST

Mr. Norberto LECHNER (Mexico)

Mrs. Arnlaug LEIRA (Norway)

Mr. Elv WHITTAKER (Canada)

Mr. Narifumi M. TACHIMOTO (Japan)

Mr. Davinder LAMBA (Kenya)

Mrs. Licia VALLADARES (Brazil)

Mr. Maurice AYMARD (France)

6. Keynote Speakers/Conférenciers/Conferenciantes

Mr. Stephen CASTLES, University of Wollongong, NSW, Australia

Mr. P.P. PENNEKAMP, Ministry of Public Health and Social Welfare of the Netherlands

7. UNESCO

Mr Federico MAYOR
Director-General

Mrs. Francine FOURNIER
Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences

Mr. Ali KAZANCIGIL
Executive Secretary, MOST
Director, Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mrs. Geneviève DOMENACH-CHICH
Chief, Human Habitat Unit
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mr. Paul de GUCHTENEIRE
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Ms. Nadia AURIAT
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Ms. Christina VON FURSTENBERG
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Mrs. Maria-Luisa NITTI
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Mr. Juan DIEZ MEDRANO
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Mr. German SOLINIS
Human Habitat Unit, Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mrs. Brigitte COLIN
Human Habitat Unit, Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mr. Carlos S. MILANI
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Mrs. Carmel ROCHET
Human Habitat Unit, Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms. Maria GUTIERREZ
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Ms. Ann MENARD
Human Habitat Unit, Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mrs. Rosemary CASTELINO
Division for Social Sciences, Research and Policy/MOST

Mr. Dirk G. TROOST, Chief, Unit of Environment and Development in Coastal
Regional and in Small Islands