Intergovernmental Council of the

Management of Social Transformations

Programme (MOST)

Fourth Session

Paris, 22-25 February 1999

Final Report

UNESCO

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

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

**UNESCO, Paris
22-25 February 1999**

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table of contents

I. OPENING OF THE SESSION

The fourth session of the Intergovernmental Council of the MOST Programme was held at UNESCO, Paris, from 22 to 25 February 1999. The session was opened by Mr Kenneth Wiltshire, representative of Australia and outgoing President of the Intergovernmental Council.

II. ADDRESS BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF UNESCO (Résumé)

After welcoming the audience and Rubens Ricupero, Secretary-General of UNCTAD, the Director-General described the complementary role of UNCTAD and UNESCO, especially in the field of sustainable human development. He underlined that they are carrying out efforts within the highly problematic contexts of "globalization" and rapid social transformations which are the hallmark of the modern world. They also share the awareness that women, the poor, displaced people and those caught in conflict must not be left out of the development equation. It was this awareness that led UNESCO to set up MOST.

As the first intergovernmental social science programme, set up in parallel to UNESCO's international programmes in the natural sciences, it immediately found its place. For four years now, the "Management of Social Transformation" programme has undertaken activities under three main headings: multiculturalism, cities and the interaction between local and global processes. To these three themes have been added the cross-cutting issues of poverty, social exclusion, governance, migration and sustainability.

Over the last four years, MOST has concentrated on building interdisciplinary, comparative research networks around its thematic research areas. MOST also provides the social science dimension in several joint activities with the natural science activities, such as the Man and the Biosphere and the International Hydrological Programmes and the project on Environment and Development in Coastal Regions and Small Islands.

This close co-operation between programmes in the natural and social sciences, illustrated by the joint statement of their Presidents at each session of the General Conference, is a highly positive achievement. UNESCO has unique opportunities to facilitate this integrated approach.

Scientists must listen to what people want and take into account cultural factors and educational needs alongside scientific parameters. Only this approach can deliver the high level of results we have the right to expect of science today.

MOST projects have started to produce policy-relevant results in ethnic conflict-prevention, international migrations, city governance and strategies for coping with globalization.

MOST is also rooted in the Member States and co-operates with their national social science communities, local authorities, decision-makers and social agents. Hence the importance of the MOST Liaison Committees (now close to 50) and their initiatives and activities.

As planned, a mid-term external evaluation took place in 1998. This will provide the basis for concrete and constructive proposals for guiding and adjusting the programme over the coming four years.

MOST themes are more relevant than ever. In fact, when MOST started, globalization was seen as a challenging process, raising complex issues. Since then, the financial crises around the world have raised even greater questions about globalization and sustainability.

In the next four years, the MOST programme will consolidate the results of the international and regional research and policy networks. It will focus in particular on the ways and means of transferring such results to decision-makers and other social partners.

The relationship between science and decision-making will come to the fore at the World Conference on Science in Budapest (26 June – 1 July 1999). In fact, UNESCO and the International Council for Science (ICSU) are working to identify the best possible set of initiatives as a starting point for the practical realisation of the general principles to be proclaimed in Budapest. This process is dynamic and participatory, with proposals coming first and foremost from scientists and science policy-makers throughout the international scientific community.

It is highly symbolic that UNESCO's first *World Social Science Report* will be launched at the Budapest Conference. It is a sign of the continuity and interdisciplinary approach across the whole science spectrum.

III.   1999 MOST LECTURE BY RUBENS RICUPERO,
        SECRETARY-GENERAL OF UNCTAD

We are now witnessing growing signs of a new turning point, one of those rare moments in history when a novel current of thought and action makes its appearance on the world stage.

Underlying the questions of globalization, development and poverty and providing the unifying link among them is a deeper question: what is the nature and sense of the economy? Is it an autonomous and largely self-regulating mechanism like the galaxies of the planetary system, or is it a product of culture and society, the result of societal choices based on values?

Development, poverty and globalization are problems that will only be solved if we go back to the original approach to economics as "political economy", as part of what Adam Smith taught: moral philosophy, that is, the economy as a product of the "polis", the city of human beings. Not as the planetary system whose laws we cannot change, but something that is the result of societal choices based on shared values.

And the first of all values is that the economy was created for man and not man for the economy. That is the only way to promote genuine hope, and faith that the future will be better than the past. As we prepare the tenth United Nations Conference on Trade and Development that is scheduled to take place in February 2000, in Bangkok, Thailand, on the threshold of the new millennium, we decided too as people and organizations all over the world to seek inspiration from what the French parishes did in the Third State elections on the eve of the French Revolution, but to write "cahiers d'espérance" not "cahiers de doléances" to spell out not our wild dreams or unrealistic utopias, but valid, credible reasons to hope for a better future: the new role of women, the need to respect the environment, the priority of eliminating hunger, disease, ignorance, poverty and to foster a better distribution of wealth and income, a kind of development that, in Jacques Maritain's words, will "promote all men and the whole man" (*tous les hommes et tout l'homme*). (The full thext of this Lecture is in Annex II).

IV. ELECTION OF THE BUREAU

Under the presidency of Mr. K. Wiltshire, 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 (re-elected)

Vice-Presidents: Ms Lieteke van Vucht Tijssen (Netherlands) (re-elected)
        Mr. Charly Gabriel Mbock (Cameroon)
        Mr. Raúl Urzua (Chile)
        Mr. Zderiek Uherek (Czech Republic)
        Mr. Theivandran Rajadural (Malaysia)
        Mr. I. Elghaly (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Rapporteur: Ms. Virginia Miralao (Philippines) (re-elected)

V. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

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

VI. CREATION OF A DRAFTING GROUP

A drafting group was formed as follows:

Mr Marshall Conley (Canada)
Ms Elvi Whittaker (Canada)
Mr Isidore Monsi (Benin)
Mr Piyasire Vijaya-Sekere (Sri Lanka)
Mr Marco Llinas (Colombia)
Mr Reza Bayegan (Iran)

VII. JOINT SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC STEERING COMMITTEE (SSC) AND THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL (IGC) AND PRESENTATION OF THE SSC REPORT BY ITS PRESIDENT

The Chairperson of the SSC, Professor Alagh, briefly presented each member of the newly elected board to the IGC.

Prof. Alagh focused on the following highlights of the VIth Session of the Committee (18-22 February 1999):

(1) Multiculturalism and multi-ethnicity

The programme covers three sub-areas of research :

a) *Citizenship and Political Participation*, centred mainly on European countries. It is hoped that similar research will be developed in other regions. Within Europe, studies look at how ethnic minorities and peoples of immigrant origin have become permanent residents throughout Europe. The issue of citizenship and social exclusion will be pursued as a priority in the coming biennium and examined within other regional contexts.

b) *International Migration.* Significant work has been completed by the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network which was formed in 1995 to study migration and ethnocultural diversity in the Asia Pacific region.

APMRN's expected outputs in coming years will include the publication of an International Migration Bibliography by Thailand and the submission of policy recommendations to address the educational needs of children of Burmese migrants. Japan will also host the third international APMRN Conference in Tokyo at the end of this year. The Australian Social Science Research Council has agreed to fund (over an 8-year period) the establishment of a new centre for the study of social transformations called CAPSTRANS. A proposal to establish UNESCO Chairs and training programmes within the Centre will be developed in 1999.

The Network on Migration Research in Africa (NOMRA), launched in June 1998, is focusing on the root causes, especially those related to poverty and consequences of diverse forms of migration, refugee flows and internal displacement of persons in Sub-Saharan Africa. In view of the importance of new and diverse forms of migration during the period of post-socialist transition in Central and Eastern Europe and the need to provide urgent policy responses, the Central and Eastern European Network on Migration Research (CEENOM) was launched in a sub-regional meeting of experts held in Moscow in September 1998. The impact of globalization on migration trends and prospects for the twenty-first century, regional integration and migration were analysed in a regional meeting in October 1998 (Santiago, Chile), which set the foundations for a regional Network on Migration Studies in Latin America and the Caribbean (REMIALC). Activities of the regional networks will be reinforced in the coming biennium and policy implications and scientific results shared between the regions.

c) ***Conflict prevention and peace building.*** The analysis of multicultural societies is one of the major research topics of the MOST Programme. Through interdisciplinary, comparative and culturally sensitive research, the Programme aims to furnish useful information for the peaceful and democratic management of societies characterized by ethnic, religious and linguistic pluralism.

Research in this field should help design policies relevant for achieving equality of citizenship rights between culturally diverse groups and the avoidance and solution of ethnic conflicts. It is in this framework, that the MOST Clearing House aims to strengthen social science research on religious diversity and linguistic rights. It has established several specialised sections on the UNESCO Internet website on issues such as the changing relation between state, national identity and religious traditions, and the policy options for strengthening democratic governance in multi-religious and multi-linguistic societies. It also provides the standard-setting instruments of international human rights law for addressing the rights of persons belonging to minorities.

As regards research and policy development on ethnic relations, several projects are underway in Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Arab States and Africa. The project on *Monitoring of ethnicity, conflicts and cohesion* aims to improve the monitoring of potential ethnic conflict and provide guidelines for a monitoring process that allows reporting in a neutral, non conflict-aggravating manner. The project on *Democratic Governance in Multicultural Societies* will provide training to leading political and academic personalities in Central Asia. Finally, a pilot project has started on the issues of cultural, ethnic and religious diversity in Central Europe and the possible strategies for reconciliation and conflict resolution.

(2)　Urban Governance and Sustainable Development

Understanding urban social processes as a means to monitor urban development is the main objective of the MOST "urban theme". Keeping in mind the implementation and follow-up of the Habitat Agenda, the aim is to enable people to take responsibility for the promotion and creation of sustainable human settlements, reduce social exclusion in cities and produce policy-relevant knowledge on urban governance. This thei e has also branched out into three sub-areas:

a) ***Policy-relevant research and networking***

The international analysis of transformations related to urban development policies is undertaken within three major networks: the social sustainability of cities; City Words (this project focuses on linguistic registers, and the process of linguistic :clusion strengthening the social processes or urban exclusion) ; Cities, environment and gender relations (this project promotes the participation of women in human settlement planning and decision-making).

b) *Sustainable and integrated development strategies on urban revitalization policies and pilot-projects*

Three clusters of action-oriented projects are being implemented:

(i) *Revitalization of inner city areas* (Quito, Tunis and Marrakech);

(ii) *Urban development and freshwater resources: Small historical Coastal Cities* (Essaouira, Mahdia, Saïda). This project is being done in collaboration with the Coastal Zones and Small Islands (CSI) Unit and International Hydrological Programme (IHP), within the network of twelve cities in the Mediterranean, Adriatic and the Baltic seas;

(iii) *Cities: Management of Social Transformations and Environment* for the improvement of living conditions in peri-urban areas. This inter-sectoral project is being carried out with the participation of inhabitants, local NGOs and the support of UNDP, and in co-operation with the UNESCO MAB Programme and the Sector of Education.

c) *Innovative Training and Capacity-Building Programmes for City Professionals*

The first experience, which began in Latin America at Guadalajara (Mexico), consisted of training workshops and UNESCO Chairs on Urban Management and Social Sustainability and Earth architecture. It is foreseen that this activity will also be developed in Asia and the Arab region. The interdisciplinary training of Architects, City and Regional Planners and landscape architects is being pursued with UIA (International Union of Architects), IsoCaRP (International Society of City and Regional Planners) and IFLA (International Federation of Landscape Architects). An architectural redesign competition will be launched in 1999, and an International workshop will take place in the beginning of 2000.

(3) Local and Regional Strategies to cope with global, economic and environmental processes.

Since June 1997, several MOST networks have produced international comparative reports based on the analysis of primary and secondary data concerning the impact of global economic and environmental phenomena at the national/local levels. The networks are seeking to identify which tools and strategies may help counteract marginalisation and underdevelopment in a globalizing world economy. In so doing, they have enhanced the role played by social sciences in devising policies for sustainable human development. They have also increased awareness among researchers of the importance of linkages between the science community and decision-makers. In sum, the main results achieved so far by the various networks have been:

a) The development of innovative strategies for the institutional modernization of social policies, particularly in Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico); the assessment of cultural and social values in regional integration processes as a tool for the further development of activities on the incorporation of social/cultural actors in regional integration strategies; the review of history manuals.

b) Development of national and regional strategies to curtail negative impacts of globalization processes on rural societies in Arab countries. National case studies are being drawn up (Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria) and policy guidelines formulated for Member States.

c) The assessment of coping strategies that help people avoid marginalisation in Northern Circumpolar countries. Within the framework of the *Circumpolar Coping Processes Project* (CCPP), the network has facilitated transfer of experiences through participatory methods of research and interaction with user-communities.

d) Generation of new knowledge by compiling and processing hitherto largely unpublished data on social and economic transformations connected with the international drug problem. In co-operation with the UN International Drug Control Programme, the network has engaged in the comparative analysis of countries and regions, so as to identify more clearly the different historical, cultural, social, economic, legal and political aspects of the development of drug trafficking and the social transformations connected with it.

e) Assessment of policy development on institutional and personal risks of social transformations in Central and Eastern Europe, focusing on the improvement of policies for employment, social cohesion and crime prevention.

f) Scientific capacity-building through networking in the field of sustainability as a concept for public action and the boosting of critical mass in order to have nationally-based research teams working on comparative local indicators of sustainability. Together with the French NGO, Solagral, teaching tools and awareness-building material have been produced on sustainable development and globalization to assist Member States in the training of educators and civil servants.

(4) Mid-term Evaluation of the MOST Programme

The SSC agrees with the broad lines of the report and with the suggestions concerning the role of the SSC. The need for a more focused approach in thematic development is recognized, yet maintaining the plurality of the three themes and the flexibility in methodological approaches is considered as an asset of MOST. SSC Members suggest that the plurality of themes should prevail. However, changes in emphasis and modifications in methodology are necessary, for instance, through a more pro-active approach, focusing on the theoretical connections within the three themes and unifying concepts, such as sustainability and governance. The scientific quality of projects and activities is essential in MOST thematic development. The SSC members highlight the need to reinforce the participation of young scholars in MOST activities. The SSC supports the recommendation that an appropriate communication and publication strategy be elaborated. Different sources of publication (journals, books, articles, etc.) and outputs (training tools, manuals, videos, CD-ROMs) should be explored.

Ph.D. Award

The SSC examined and evaluated a number of promising dissertations submitted for the Ph.D. Award. Prof. Alagh announced that Mr. Saville of the University of Natal of South Africa won the first MOST Ph.D. Award 1998/1999. Mr Saville's excellent dissertation focuses on the optimal utilisation and management of South Africa's renewable marine resources. His work has clear policy relevance based upon scientific interdisciplinary analysis.

Discussion

Several Member States participated in the ensuing discussions, which concentrated on the link between social sciences and policy-making as the cornerstone of MOST, which should be further developed in the next phase of the Programme. It was emphasized that priority should be given to develop and improve the interaction between policy-makers and social scientists. Further the need to create new networks of researchers was emphasized.

It was stated that research has to be made more practical and easily applied.

Strong efforts are needed to examine how to transfer research results to the policy-makers. A website is not enough to reach them. Social scientists should be able to present research in a format which is suitable for policy-makers. In Canada, the Social Science Federation of Canada arranges regular breakfasts with policy-makers, this approach could be copied.

Forging a link between research and policy is a two-way process. Social scientists should learn to listen to decision-makers at all levels of society. We should listen to their suggestions on which issues should be addressed by the researchers. Social scientists should also likewise serve as advisors on which issues should be addressed and which issues should not be addressed. Social scientists have an important role in trying to convince policymakers that a long-term perspective is important in combating social problems. Governments have a tendency to be « short-termists », but problems are normally long-term.

VIII. PRESENTATION BY THE ADG/SHS ON THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2000-2001 (30 C/5) AND ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE

The ADG/SHS confirmed that UNESCO's Executive Board and the Director General fully support the activities of the Social and Human Sciences Sector. SHS has two major programmes which are complementary : 1) Human Rights, Democracy, Peace and Tolerance, and 2) Social Sciences Research and Policy (including the Management of Social Transformations - MOST).

ADG/SHS stated that SHS made a substantial contribution to the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This opportunity allowed to mobilize traditional UNESCO partners for the link

between the promotion of human rights and a culture of peace. SHS is encouraging research on key issues of human rights, in particular cultural rights related to peace, human rights, democracy and tolerance. The sector participates in the follow-up of the major United Nations conferences. The Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy (SRP), which includes MOST will continue its activities of institutional development, capacity-building, transfer and sharing of knowledge, as well as university teaching and research in the social and human sciences. A strong component on youth and social transformations is to be developed.

UNESCO's first World Social Science Report will be launched at the World Conference on Science to be held in June 1999 in Budapest.

In the field of knowledge sharing, emphasis will be on further development of the MOST Clearing House on Internet, the Best Practices Data Bases and thematic discussion fora; projects on information systems; data infrastructures and training; the SHS Documentation Centre with its DARE Data Bank, and co-operation with specialized information-documentation NGOs.

At the forthcoming World Conference on Science, the role of the Social Sciences will be strongly promoted. SHS is now a major partner in the preparation of the Conference. The sector conceptualized Forum II of this Conference on "Science in Society". Major themes concerning the contemporary relations between science and society were selected.

The discussion that followed the presentation by ADG/SHS touched upon the following issues:

- There is a need to increase the participation and visibility of social scientists at the World Conference on Science (WCS).
- While Forum II of the WCS does not strictly focus on social science issues, such issues are likely to be discussed during the forum.
- The need to be sensitive to different cultural and religious backgrounds in drafting the Conference Declaration was emphasized.
- Philosophers will be fully involved in the Conference.
- Young scientists should be included among the members of country delegations to WCS.
- UNESCO and donor countries are encouraged to facilitate the participation of scholars from least developed countries to the WCS.

Presentation by the ADG/SC/ENV

In his presentation to the IGC, ADG/SC/ENV stated that after years of maintaining separate programmes in the natural and social sciences, UNESCO has moved towards bringing these together and encouraging interdisciplinary co-operation, such as that between the MAB Programme and MOST. This paradigm shift came with the 1992 Rio Conference where it was recognized that environmental problems need to be addressed within socio-cultural contexts. Hence, the important role of social sciences in the analysis of environmental issues and problems.

Presentation by the Executive Secretary of MOST

The Executive Secretary of the MOST Programme outlined briefly the main objectives and the structure of the programme (SHS-99/Conf.203/3).

1.   The governing bodies of the MOST Programme are:

• The Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) which determines the scientific quality of the programme. It is composed of 9 social scientists of international renown.

• National Liaison Committees (NLCs) which links the MOST Programme to national governmental and social science bodies.

• IGC, comprising 33 Member States, which convenes every two years to provide policy guidance, thematic priorities, the linkage of the programme to Governments and to review budgetary needs.

Other partners of the MOST Programme are: UN agencies, universities, NGOs and inter-regional social science bodies.

MOST at first focused on 3 major themes, but it also had to take into account the priorities of UNESCO and the UN System. Therefore other relevant themes were added: poverty and social exclusion, governance and sustainable development.

The Executive-Secretary stressed that the first phase of the MOST Programme, which ended with the mid-term evaluation, was a phase of building the programme through a bottom-up approach. About 120 project proposals were received and evaluated by the SSC.   17 projects were accepted.   2 projects have been completed.

The Executive Secretary also reiterated that an added value of MOST is the policy-research component integrated in its programme.   Indeed, MOST fosters international, comparative, policy-relevant research.

Another specificity of the Programme is that it provides expertise, especially through the networks it has established.

The Executive Secretary underlined that, during the second phase, the programme will concentrate on the policy-research linkage and on the transfer of research results to policy communities. This is considered an absolute priority.   The International Conference on Policy-Research Linkage, 13-14 September 1999, hosted by the Netherlands, will be very important in this process.   It will be used by the Secretariat to establish a Plan of Action for the coming period.

When the Final Evaluation takes place in 2002, MOST should be able to present a holistic, synthetic overview of its activities and research results to the policy communities. Finally, MOST will seek to provide a major contribution to the scientific thinking on issues of social transformations such as multiculturalism, social exclusion, urbanisation and the local response to global processes.

Discussion

Several delegates stressed the importance of enhancing the participation of the African region in the MOST Programme's activities and projects.

It was also pointed out that the theme of poverty and social exclusion is of high relevance in the present international context.

The IGC members agreed that the MOST Programme as a whole is performing well and that it is very useful, especially for developing countries and countries in transition. It was stressed that MOST has set a new model for international co-operation in social science research, based upon equal partnership.

IX.   Presentation of the Mid-term Evaluation of the MOST Programme

The evaluators, Dirk Kruijt and Kees Koonings, presented the results of their evaluation of the MOST Programme, copies of which were distributed to the participants.

Mr Kruijt emphasized the external nature of their evaluation. The evaluation team co-operated with the MOST Secretariat in an atmosphere of openness and frankness. He stated that the evaluation shows that the MOST Programme has several strong points, and some weak points.

The Director, SHS/SRP/MOST also emphasized that this is an external evaluation and that it is up to the Executive Board, the Director-General and the IGC to decide on the follow-up to the evaluation exercise. He said that the evaluation provided several interesting recommendations. He drew attention to the fact that the MOST Secretariat does not work in a University atmosphere. The MOST Programme is thus implemented within an atmosphere of the diversity of an international organization. This should be taken into consideration when reading the evaluation.

Discussion

1□   The IGC recognized that the fundamental goals of the MOST Programme as outlined in the Feasibility Study are still valid.

Several delegates underlined that the Programme's focus on international comparative policy-relevant research still stands out world-wide.

It was stressed that MOST could serve as a framework for international co-operation in the social sciences based on equal partnerships. Several delegates also pointed out that the inherent comparative, transdisciplinary and multi-thematic component of the MOST Programme is unique in relation to other social science programmes and that it should be further strengthened.

2□   The evaluation report suggests a need for a more focused approach in the thematic development of the Programme. However, during the discussion

much emphasis was placed on the diversity, the plurality and the flexibility of the three major themes. MOST should emphasize these aspects in order to be able to better respond to the different needs and expectations of Member States.

3☐ Several delegates stressed that MOST should sustain existing projects and networks. Within this perspective, MOST should give priority to linking policy and research. This was considered to be the added value of the Programme. It was also suggested that MOST contribute to the scientific thinking on its research themes and issues, such as globalization, urbanisation, migration, multicultural and multi-ethnic societies and poverty and social exclusion. In doing so, the Programme should adopt a more holistic and synthetic approach.

4☐ The IGC noted that the role of the National Liaison Committees in supporting the Programme's activities and objectives is very important and should be further developed.

5☐ Part of the discussion was devoted to the management aspects of the MOST Programme. This component should be further strengthened, especially by the introduction of monitoring systems at project and programme levels.

6☐ It was emphasized that more synergy be developed between MOST and UNESCO's other science programmes. It was noted that possibilities for co-operation have already been explored and that these should be further pursued.

7☐ Finally, the IGC recommended that the evaluation report be followed up in a concrete Plan of Action which incorporates the recommendations based upon the mid-term evaluation.

X. Panel on Social Sciences and Decision-making: the role of the MOST Programme

This last session of the IGC was devoted to a panel presentation on the role of the social sciences in public decision-making.

The Panel was composed of: Mr Jean-Eric Aubert, Senior Analyst, Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry of the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development); Mr Luk van Langenhove, Adjunct Secretary General, Ministry for Science, Technology and Culture of Belgium; Mr Achille Mbembe, Executive Secretary of CODESRIA (Conseil pour le Développement de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales en Afrique), member of the SSC; and Mrs Alejandra Toreno Moscano, Historian, Vice-president of the SSC.

Mr Aubert provided the IGC with an overview of the social science activities of OECD. Recently, the organization decided to renew its involvement in this field. In April 1998, OECD organized an international seminar on social sciences. In the coming two years, OECD will organize three more workshops on: (1) The use of

databases in the social sciences (Canada, autumn 1999); (2) Inter-disciplinarity in the social sciences (Belgium, spring 2000); and (3) Social sciences and policy-making (Japan, winter 2000). Mr Aubert also noted that the social sciences, by their nature, are critical of societies, pointing as they do to societal insufficiencies and weaknesses. This puts the social sciences in a difficult and complex position. He indicated that there is a need to integrate the work of social scientists in the reflection of societal changes and developments.

Mr Mbembe summarized the objectives of CODESRIA which are (1) to support research on long-term evolutions affecting African societies, (2) to contribute to more freedom for intellectual reflection and research in Africa, and (3) to contribute to the formulation of alternatives in comparison to the existing situation in African countries. CODESRIA is most interested in the idea of linking research and policy-making. However, Mr Mbembe emphasized that the specific national and regional contexts in Africa should be taken into account in the process of establishing these linkages. In his presentation, he also insisted on the importance of fundamental research for the African region.

Mr van Langenhove reflected on the position of social sciences in contemporary society. He stated that currently the social sciences face three problems: (1) lack of unity, (2) lack of quality control, and (3) lack of generative power. In his view, the social sciences are too much influenced by their own disciplinary boundaries. By cutting up social reality in terms of their disciplines, the social sciences have little value for decision-making. New initiatives should be formulated. Social science research should focus more on problems. Social scientists should also disseminate their research and knowledge not only in the form of books and publications, but also in other forms, so that they can influence or participate in ongoing public debates. Likewise, donor agencies should be more proactive in supporting problem-driven research (Mr Van Langenhove's text is in Annex III).

Mrs Moreno Toscano gave a clear presentation of the interaction between social scientists and policy-makers. Both act from different perspectives. Policy-makers are driven by time, consensus and resources. They seek to find a balance between these elements. Social science research on the other hand, is produced on a long-term basis. Mrs Moreno Toscano emphasized that the social scientist has to understand and take into account the position of the policy-maker in order to improve interaction. In her conclusion, she stressed the importance of the MOST Programme in the process of linking social science and policy communities.

Discussion

In the discussion that followed, it was suggested that, instead of seeking to have an impact on policy-making, the social sciences should attempt to become more involved in ongoing public discussions and debates and in the decision-making process itself. Social scientists should be brought into the heart of decision-making.

It was also noted that the social sciences should optimize the use of new information and communication technologies, such as television and the Internet, to bridge the gap between social sciences and policy-making. Social science results must reach a wider public. It is all a question of communication. We have an

overstretched expectation of what general knowledge can do for decision-making. What is important is not how the social scientists see themselves but the subject of study. People should be informed about what the subject of social sciences is in comparison to the natural sciences. Social scientists will not be taken seriously unless this is done.

It was also argued that social scientists should not look upon themselves as the only providers of expertise which exists in the different social environments.

In order for research to have an impact there normally has to be a political situation which favors new ideas. Social scientists function best when they function in open. They should not need to whisper in the ears of those who are in power.

Finally, several delegates stressed the importance of the MOST Programme in reinforcing the role of the social sciences and the interaction between social science research and decision-making.

Recommendations of the Fourth session of the Intergovernmental Council of the MOST programme

The Intergovernmental Council of the MOST programme (hereby called the Council)

Taking advantage of its 4th session that coincides on the one hand with the passage toward the second phase of the MOST Programme and on the other, with the preparation of the World Science Conference, reaffirms that:

The MOST Programme is a major scientific endeavour within UNESCO, that contributes toward improving the policy making process within Member States by stimulating better use of social science research results;

That it should be a reference for responding to the needs of un-reached populations and to increase the voice of women, youth, people of least developed countries, indigenous populations, victims of disasters or of war etc;

That under increasing globalisation, and the recent economic and monetary crisis in particular, social transformations are becoming more serious in many parts of the world, thereby making research on them all the more needed;

That special mention of these population groups within a number of the recommendations serves to underscore their particular relevance to the Programme;

Deliberated on the role and responsibilities of social science research in light of the problems raised and innovations brought through the MOST programme;

1. Recommendation on the World Science Conference

The Council of the MOST Programme:

Noting with satisfaction that the social sciences were given their due role in the preparation of the programme of the 1999 World Science Conference;

Thanking the Director General for his perspective on the Conference as one that concerns all the sciences, both social, economic and natural;

Acknowledging that social and human sciences should not only be welcomed in this conference for their competence in addressing the role and modalities of science on the brink of a new millennium, but also the many socio-cultural matters, that have a major bearing on the future of mankind.

Moreover stressing that the social sciences should be considered on par with the natural sciences in their contribution to formulating and resolving contemporary problems, like natural disaster alleviation, food and water disposal, health, etc..

Emphasising the full co-operation between the social and natural sciences for addressing contemporary issues of science and society, and for contributing toward enhancing the role of science in genuine peace building;

Endorsing all recommendations made to ensure a fair regional and gender representation of scholars, decisions makers, youth and representatives of society as a whole to this important World Conference;

Invites the Director General to:

Grant a prominent role to the Social and Human Sciences Programme in the implementation of the Science Agenda - Framework for Action and in achieving the goals set forth in the Declaration, and to ensure that the different programmes within UNESCO co-operate in designing the science research agenda;

Ensure that the co-operation with the natural sciences, as stimulated by this Conference, continue and be reinforced in the implementation of its plan of action;

Provide logistic and financial assistance to developing countries so as to enable them to fully participate in the Conference;

Ensure that the role of women, youth, indigenous peoples and the particular needs of least developed countries should be accorded due recognition in the preparation for the World Conference on Science;

Strongly encourage Member States to include social scientists, including young social scientists, in their delegations to the Conference;

Ensure that the draft declaration and the Science Agenda-Framework for Action include significant reference to the social sciences and that it build on the issues raised in the Joint Statement of the Chairpersons of the five scientific Intergovernmental programmes;

2.   Recommendation on the priorities of the MOST Programme 1999-2002

The Council of the MOST Programme:

Stressing the importance of the inherent comparative, trans-disciplinary and multi-thematic character of the MOST Programme as key dimensions that enable the Programme to fulfil its dual purpose of responding to the needs of social development and of generating new scientific patterns, methods and practices ;

Emphasising the need to maintain the Programme's thematic diversity through its existing themes;

Meanwhile reaffirming the need to maintain high scientific standards and an organisational infrastructure permitting a more results-based programming;

Recognising the need to focus during the second phase of the Programme on its comparative advantage, which is primarily the provision of an international framework and set of references for a better involvement of social research in the process of economic and social management both at the national and local levels by directing knowledge from research towards a wide range of stakeholders;

Underscoring the importance of streamlining the Programme's operations to give momentum to its core policy-research activities, by filtering out those activities that may have a lower relevance to MOST main goals;

Bearing in mind that one of the original missions of the MOST programme from the beginning was to assume capacity building responsibilities , and *reaffirming* that this responsibility would be operative in every aspect of programme management, to benefit young scholars, Member States, research groups and networks;

Recognising that the Programme has gained momentum from its diversity and flexibility;

Considering that a consolidation of efficient and high quality international networks, to allow them a sustainable role in the growing involvement of new partners into joint research and social management initiatives, and to rely on their multiple capacity building abilities, is a good way of implementing over time the MOST agenda and these recommendations;

Recognising the need for the Secretariat's role to gradually shift to upstream guidance, further elaboration of activities and dissemination of results, together with overall management of the Programme in the long run,

Invites the Director General to ensure that the Programme:

Concentrate its key objective of improving the transfer and use of social science findings to a diverse array of policy makers and to a wider general public by: developing a methodology for linking policy making to the social science research process; furthering good practice in this area; stimulating exchanges between the social sciences and policy makers; and encouraging networking of current and potential policy-makers in the Programme's activities;

Recognises that the Programme's original themes as well as its cross-cutting areas remain of high priority, as does its overarching objective of fostering research-policy linkages;

Contribute to clarifying the notion of policy-making, by highlighting those obstacles that may impede the influence of social science research in decision-making, and by identifying the range and levels of policy-makers so as to enable social and human science research to better accompany the decision-making process;

Adopt a more results-based strategy that includes a framework for constant monitoring both within the individual projects and for the Programme as a whole, and build more coherence by focussing on strengthening the policy-research links;

Play an active and efficient role in contributing to the development processes through its capacity to draw upon high quality social and human science research;

Grant greater visibility to its activities by developing a publication and diversified dissemination strategy, with emphasis on quality and diversity of output to promote the Programme's key objective of involving policy makers or their advisors;

Encourage current and future policy makers to involve social science research to a maximum extent in the development of social policies and to call on Member States to facilitate this objective and contribute to development by stimulating public debate;

Maintain its capacity to respond within its basic and cross-cutting themes, to the diverse regional needs of Member States as brought out by the requirements of peace and development, (as outlined in the follow-up to the major UN conferences: Beijing, Copenhagen, Istanbul, Rio de Janeiro, Cairo), as well as the follow up of the World Science Conference;

Further develop its capacity building dimension, by supporting those Member States in regions with a clear need in this area, and by promoting the participation of women, youth and other relevant stakeholders in its activities;

3. Recommendation on the Mid-Term Evaluation of the MOST Programme

The Council of the MOST Programme:

Appreciating the mid-term evaluation of the MOST Programme, takes note of its results with satisfaction

Taking note of the Scientific Steering Committee's deliberations on the mid-term evaluation, and *welcoming* their recommendations on the Report

Noting with satisfaction that the report considers the Programme's achievements in terms of its networks and results and concludes that its rate of success is commendable for the first phase of the Programme

Recalling that the Programme's strengths lie in its capacity to provide impulse to a new way of thinking, doing and using research through relevant programmes and activities, such as co-operative and comparative research, sustainable networks, dissemination of knowledge and well reviewed best practices - which altogether further the link between scientific research and social management;

Bearing in mind the crucial importance of time, continuity and sustainability in the relevance and success of scientific ambitions of that magnitude;

Invites the Director General to ensure:

Development of a strategy for the second phase of the MOST Programme, in partnership with the Intergovernmental Council, Scientific Steering Committee and National Liaison Committees, that also addresses the issues of sustainability of its networking activities and the quality of is academic output - combined with the criteria of relevance, timeliness, efficiency, and impact - as key components for attaining the programme's operational overarching goals;

That the SSC consider all current and future activities in the MOST Programme, monitor the suggested redeployment of efforts in favour of a better integrated core programme, and apply systematic rules and principles for the selection and monitoring of projects;

That budgetary information, both at the programme and project level be included in the report of the Secretariat to the Council;

That the Secretariat has a key responsibility for building, from the outputs of the networks, a scientific and operational framework enabling relevant stakeholders to develop new patterns of thought, action and problem solving;

That the Secretariat make an effort to develop means of assessing the impact of the Programme and its activities both from a scientific and a policy making perspective;

That the report of the mid-term evaluation be transmitted to the Executive Board and to the General Conference at its 30th session, together with the recommendations of the IGC;

The Council further recommends that the Programme:

Increase its focus on youth, both by developing policy oriented research activities on youth problems and by involving youth in its activities;

Pays special attention to women and indigenous people in its activities to ensure further equitableness and inclusiveness;

Emphasise activities related to understanding and eliminating poverty
(as per *155 EX/4.1 para.49*), in relation to the core MOST themes and in close connection with all other attempts within and outside UNESCO to tackle this important issue, with a view to giving the MOST Programme significant outcome in this field;

Ensure the continued quality and scientific rigour of the Programme by maintaining the highest levels of competence amongst all partner of MOST;

4. Recommendations on the Funding of the MOST Programme

Considering the interest raised by MOST in Member States

Noting the activities developed by MOST and the scope they acquired over the first 4 year phase of the Programme

Expressing the appreciation to the Executive Board and the Director-General, for the significant increase in the MOST budget in the Draft Programme and Budget for 2000-2001 (30 C/5) that was decided, putting the MOST Programme at par with other Intergovernmental Scientific Programmes of UNESCO

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

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

Recommends:

That the MOST Secretariat, in co-operation with members of the Intergovernmental Council, enhance its fund-raising strategy and that efforts be intensified to develop fruitful relations with international donor agencies, national public donor agencies, national scientific funding organisations, private funding entities and other multilateral organisations;

That with a view to further raising extrabudgetary funds, the Secretariat consider organising toward the end of the second phase, an assessment process on the impact of MOST Networks, and appropriate means of dissemination of results achieved so as to plan the future orientation of the programme;

That efforts be made to clarify the nature of the Programme, as one providing seed funding and not one that functions as a research granting programme, and that new projects be examined in light of their policy relevance, scientific merit and potential capacity to attract extra-budgetary funding;

That Member States and the Secretariat support MOST initiatives through the Regular programme and the Participation Programme, and be actively involved in raising extra-budgetary funding for MOST, and take initiative vis a vis national and international sources in due co-operation with the Secretariat.

5. Recommendation on National Liaison Committees, Scientific Steering Committee, Intergovernmental Council, National Commissions and Member States responsibilities towards the MOST Programme's second phase

The Intergovernmental Council of the MOST Programme:

Recognising the very important role of the MOST national liaison committees in promoting the programme, formulating new MOST activities, and contributing to transferring the policy implications of the research to national and local decision-makers

Emphasising the need to better utilise the academic resources available through the regional social science networks, which are close partners of the programme

Noting that the MOST endeavour to renew social and human sciences research and roles will fall short of sufficient success unless taken over by broader scientific communities and institutions, and that the responsibility of Member States is directly called upon by their constant commend of the MOST initiative and achievements whether in the Executive Board or the General Conference

Invites the Member States of UNESCO to oversee:

That all Member States be encouraged to establish National Liaison Committees with the support of the MOST Secretariat so as to enhance the Programme's outreach;

That National Liaison Committees be further engaged in developing activities that assist the Programme in meeting its key objectives and, particularly in this second phase, in proposing how social science research results can be used more effectively by key policy-makers, and that that these Committees represent as wide a range of stakeholders as possible (social scientists, policy makers, NGOs, trade unions, business, grass root organisations, architects, natural scientists, and other relevant professionals);

That National Commissions and National Focal points be more directly involved in planning the second phase of MOST;

That appropriate agreements be considered with National Liaison Committees so as to strengthen their role and institutional position with respect to the MOST Programme;

That measures be taken to strengthen the communication and dissemination of research results to decision- makers, and to further involve their major scientific institutions and universities in the MOST endeavour;

The Intergovernmental Council:

Reaffirms the strategic role of UNESCO in the world-wide development of the social and human sciences

Strongly underscores the essential multidisciplinary development of the social and human sciences for the understanding and formulation of solutions to contemporary social problems

Strongly suggests that the MOST programme is a vital instrument for this development and should hence be supported

Expresses its confidence in the MOST Secretariat for ensuring that the Programme obtain its expected results, in close co-operation with the National Liaison Committees, the Scientific Steering Committee and the Intergovernmental Council

Further Recommends:

That the Secretariat, in order to provide the Programme with a strategic vision, prepare a concrete Plan of Action, in consultation with the SSC and the Bureau of the IGC;

That toward the end of the second phase of the Programme, a stocktaking exercise, supported by extra-budgetary funding, be undertaken so as to reflect on its achievements and provide guidance for its future orientation.

**United Nations Conference
on Trade and Development**

Address by

Rubens Ricupero
Secretary-General of UNCTAD

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, ladies and gentlemen, my friends.

Let me first express my gratitude to my colleague and friend, Mr. Federico Mayor, and to the secretariat and the members of the MOST committee for their kind invitation to me. In reality, I do not intend to give a lecture as such, but rather to share a series of remarks with you. I will circulate a text which embodies most of what I want to say; I had actually prepared it for *Le Courrier de l'UNESCO*, but I wrote maybe double the amount required by the magazine, and so it became a text of about eight or nine pages.

I have been looking forward very much to the opportunity of coming to UNESCO, because I have always been a strong admirer and a supporter of its work and also because in UNCTAD we share the same basic cultural and humanistic approach to economic and social matters that has always been the distinctive trademark of UNESCO. So it is for me a matter of personal pride to participate, even in a modest way, in your efforts, and it is also an opportunity for us to learn from your concerns with the social aspects of economic development, as in UNCTAD we devote ourselves more to what one could describe as the "hard-core economics" of development.

UNCTAD, as you know, began life in the mid-1960s, a time when many transformations were taking place in the world, and it is a typical "child of the 1960s" in that it is the child of a small group of people with ideas. Prominent among them was a group of Latin American economists, namely Dr. Raul Prebisch, a distinguished Argentine economist, Celso Furtado, who lives here in Paris, one of the leading names in development in Latin America, and Professor Anibal Pinto, a distinguished Chilean economist who died only a few years ago.

UNCTAD's task has been to use the tools of trade and investment to promote development, and particularly the development of the least developed countries, the 48 countries where people

have to live on less than one dollar a day; these countries present the most difficult challenge to the international community because they are the weakest and most vulnerable members of that community. And it is exactly at this moment, on the eve of a new century and a new millennium, and in the middle of one of the most devastating crises for development, that we have to pause to reflect a little on the experience of development in the last 15 or 20 years, and to try to draw some conclusions.

I am going to try to describe current efforts to reach some kind of an emerging consensus on the best way to approach development, while avoiding the pitfalls of the uni-dimensional approaches that have been followed over the last few decades. We should, as always, start from reality itself. When we look around us and try to assess the current economic crisis, which started out as a financial crisis in Asia but which has now become an economic crisis of worldwide dimensions, we see that it includes finance and that it has also devastated trade. It is even starting to have serious consequences for long-term investment. This crisis, perhaps the worst that the world has known since the Bretton Woods system was established in 1944, has already provoked a good deal of reflection, and different ways of explaining its causes and consequences have been suggested. Irrespective of these diverse ways of approaching the problem, there are at least two conclusions that come out very clearly, and which are factual and indisputable. One is that the crisis has affected the developing countries much more than the industrialized ones. The second conclusion is that, contrary to conventional wisdom, it has had more negative effects for the relatively more advanced developing countries than for the poorest developing countries.

Let us start by looking at the impact of the crisis on the developing world. Of the three major industrialized economies in the world, Japan was already in a difficult situation before the Thai devaluation, since the speculative bubble of the late 1980s had burst. Japan's own economic problems were not a consequence of the Asian crisis, although there is an interaction between the economic problems in Japan and the prospects for recovery in East Asia. The other two major industrial economies in the world, those in Europe and the United States, have so far been less affected by the crisis. To some extent they have even benefited from the crisis in terms of the extremely low prices of commodities - in some cases, such as oil or copper or coffee, the drop in prices over the last 12 months has been about 40 per cent, to an almost unprecedented low level for commodity prices. The developed economies have also benefited from the lower prices of manufactures exported from countries that had to devaluate their currencies, and they attracted the financial flows withdrawn from the crisis-hit countries (in the so-called «flight to quality»). The United States economy continues to grow and it is only now that some of the European economies that were heavily dependent on exports, such as Germany's, have begun to show some signs of slowing down because of the drop in demand for imports. But, in general terms, the crisis has been much more negative for the developing world in general. This is true of the Asian countries, it is true now of Latin America, which will have a very difficult year in 1999, and also true of Africa, because of the sharp fall in commodity prices.

For the first time in many years, the estimate for the economic growth of the developing world this year is much lower than that for the industrialized countries (it is less than half). Of course, this will have the serious consequence of further aggravating the wide gap that already

separates the wealthy economies from the poor countries. The second conclusion to be drawn from the crisis is that it was some of the most advanced developing countries that were particularly affected. This was the case, for instance, of most of the Asian countries, where the crisis was felt extremely strongly; it was the case of Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, and particularly the Republic of Korea. Brazil, in Latin America, has now also been hard-hit. This raises the question: how can you explain that countries that were generally regarded as success stories in terms of development could be so vulnerable, including some countries that had all the economic fundamentals right? The Asian countries had very low inflation and no budgetary deficit. On the contrary, they had been posting a surplus in the budget for years. Most of them had very high saving rates, so they were not in too great a need of savings from abroad. Despite all this, they were affected extremely negatively by the crisis. If development is a process that is supposed to reduce the vulnerability of countries to external shocks, how can we explain that some of the countries that have advanced furthest along that road, namely the Republic of Korea and Malaysia, were more affected than the weak African economies? Is it not because the most advanced were much more integrated in the world economy? And, in that case, why is that a particular type of integration should increase, not reduce, vulnerability?

Thus, this situation forces us to reflect on the whole concept and the whole experience of development in the last few years, and to examine closely the recipes or formulas that have been advanced for economic development. Of course, it is not only a problem of economic development or a problem of poverty; the impact of this crisis is much broader. In reality it affects the world economy in general. It raises questions regarding financial liberalization even in industrialized countries, but I will concentrate here mostly on questions related to economic development and the social implications of economic development, while keeping in mind that there is an underlying link that connects these three aspects - economic development, poverty and globalization - and this link is the role and the scope of the economy nowadays. How should we approach the economy? Do economics belong to the realm of the exact sciences? Is the economy something that has laws, like the planetary system, or is it a product of culture or the result of choices made by society on the basis of shared values? This is the basic problem that underlies the debate.

What we are witnessing nowadays is a search for an alternative to the paradigm of development that has been hegemonic in the last 12 years, the so-called «Washington consensus». The Washington consensus took its name from a famous article by an economist, John Williamson, who tried to codify the paradigm in a series of 10 principles. He did not try, like President Wilson, to have 14 points and so avoided the criticism levelled at President Wilson by Clemenceau, who said that even the good Lord had contented himself with only ten commandments, and so must have been much less ambitious than the American President. Williamson tried to codify the ten commandments of what he considered the «accepted wisdom by all serious economists», as he put it. His approach to development was based on three major areas. First, sound macroeconomic policies, that is, low inflation, minimal budget deficits and balanced external accounts. Secondly, the advice that countries should open up and should follow the path of trade and financial liberalization. Although these two concepts use the same word, liberalization, they are different animals. Financial liberalization is much more difficult to deal with than trade liberalization, as the Asian experience has shown. The Asian countries were very successful in trade liberalization, but

not in financial liberalization, though the Washington consensus did not make any major distinction between the two concepts. Finally, the third element was to promote the role of the market much more than the role of the State, through privatization and the reduction of the role of the State to essential tasks, deregulation and connected matters.

These three areas have been basically enforced by the IMF and the World Bank over the last 12 or 13 years in a sort of a top-down approach, an approach imposed through the conditionalities of the loans of the IMF or the World Bank, and the principles that were the inspiration for the so-called structural adjustment programmes, applied over many years now in many different countries. Those are the assumptions that now are coming under increasing scrutiny. One could say that there are now three major alternatives to the Washington consensus, not in the sense of rejecting that approach outright, but in the sense of trying to identify where the Washington consensus was inadequate, where it should be rectified, or on what matters we should introduce a different balance. Of course, many economists share several of the premises that were embodied in the Washington consensus.

There are then three basic alternatives. One came from the human development concept, initiated by the UNDP under the guidance of the late Dr. Ul Haq from Pakistan, with a very significant contribution from Professor Amartya Sen. The human development concept puts the emphasis on aspects that go far beyond the mere accumulation of capital, the increase of economic productivity and the growth of the economy, emphasizing the quality of life and drawing attention to education, life expectancy and the quality of the health system. It is also an approach that tries to start from the bottom and build upwards, building upon community-based organizations and non-governmental organizations, with much more equal participation. Perhaps one of the problems of the human development concept is that it is still relatively weak on the economic fundamentals, that is, on how to have a productive underpinning that would allow a country really to adopt the social policies that the human development concept advocates.

The second basic alternative is the one now coming from the World Bank, which is increasingly distancing itself from the more orthodox path that they were following until recently in many areas, such as its approach to the problems of the highly indebted countries or its reaction to the Asian crisis, which are now viewed from different perspectives by the IMF and the Bank. Despite all the diplomatic attempts to minimize these differences, no-one can hide the fact that the chief economist of the World Bank, Professor Joseph Stiglitz, is a strong dissenter from some of the basic premises of the Washington consensus. But now the World Bank has gone beyond what until recently was seen as the personal approach of Professor Stiglitz. As a result of the policy options put forward by Jim Wolfensohn, the President of the Bank himself, the Bank has formally announced that it is adopting a new approach to development, the so-called "comprehensive framework", or "comprehensive strategic framework for development", which the Bank intends to implement at country level. They have already started to select a number of countries, one of which is Bolivia, where the "comprehensive framework" is to be applied. The framework embodies a number of different aspects, including some that are meta-economic, such as institutional, legal and good governance aspects. It is curious that many of these elements are aimed at reinforcing the State, thus reversing the recent trend that preached a reduction in the role of the State.

Finally, the third approach, with which UNCTAD is more directly concerned, is in direct line of succession to Prebisch's thought. It is an attempt to combine the traditional Latin American approach of the so-called "historic-structuralist school", derived from the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), with the practical experience of East Asian countries, and to try to adapt the lessons from this experience to the economies of Africa or the least developed countries. The latter are very different in structure from both the East Asian and the Latin American countries, which were intermediate industrialized countries trying to catch up with the industrialized countries; most of the economies of the African and least developed countries are still almost exclusively agricultural economies, extremely dependent on a few commodities and with a very narrow productive basis. How can you develop a coherent series of approaches, policies and measures that could be relevant and helpful to these economies?

Speaking about alternatives, I should like to stress that no-one should try to make of this debate a new version of the wars of religion. No-one denies, for instance, that there is much which remains valid and imperative in the Washington consensus. Professor Stiglitz himself entitled one of his lectures, "Beyond the Washington consensus", and we are all intent on advancing beyond this. He rightly stated in that lecture that some of the Washington consensus prescriptions are necessary but not sufficient on their own, and that other policies had not received the same attention as these prescriptions: for instance, he stresses that privatization is not always a necessary condition for development, citing the case of China, the most successful example of economic growth since 1979, which has achieved growth without privatization, while guaranteeing a minimum degree of competition in the economy.

We are trying to look beyond the Washington consensus in order to reach a common consensus that could be widely shared, a consensus built on the need for balance, equilibrium and a sense of proportion, that would not reopen the old ideological battles of the 1970s or the 1980s, but that would strive to integrate more fully the complexity and diversity of conditions that influence development. So there is still a great deal to be done in terms of trying to reconcile apparently contradictory extremes, such as the role of the State and the market, price stability and economic growth, flexibility of the labour market and job security, or integration into the world economy and the building up of a national industrial base. All those aspects have often been presented as antagonistic, mutually exclusive positions, but the search now under way for alternatives is precisely inspired by the need to take a more multidisciplinary approach and see to what extent we can make these goals mutually reinforcing and complementary.

We need, then, a thorough and comprehensive study of the experience of development over the last few decades, with three basic objectives. The first is to take stock of what went right and what went wrong in terms of development. The second is to identify what was missing in the original approaches and concepts. At the beginning, in the 1950s and 1960s, the approach was much too macroeconomic; it emphasized aspects such as economic growth, capital accumulation and productivity increases, but it did not give sufficient attention to the quality of development, the quality of life and social aspects such as the distribution of income or the distribution of wealth. Other aspects that were totally ignored in the 1960s, of course, were the environmental dimension,

the so-called sustainable quality of development, the role of women in the economy and the role of minorities and indigenous communities. The third objective of the study should be to identify the challenges ahead: what is the challenge facing development in the next century, in the next millennium?

To realize these objectives is of course a tall order, and I would refrain from giving the false impression that anybody in the world has a ready recipe. No-one, I believe, can say that we already have sufficient knowledge to solve all the apparent antinomies of development. Just to give one example, economists do not know enough about how to conciliate capital accumulation with a less unequal income distribution. There are economists who consider that there is no way to promote rapid capital accumulation without a simultaneous increase in the concentration of income. There is still much we do not know, and this is why research and the multidisciplinary approach of the social sciences is badly needed. We need it in the same way as we need research to find a cure for AIDS - in a sense, it is the same kind of problem. People often think that an epidemic is different in nature from the problem of development, as if in development all the answers are known and it is only a matter of applying those answers. This is not true. There is much that we still do not know about social and economic development and about how to make one compatible with the other.

One of the biggest challenges of this kind is to reach this harmonious complementarity in a world of globalized finance, where, as we recently witnessed in Asia (particularly in Indonesia), the progress achieved over 30 years in reducing poverty can be wiped out in a matter of two or three weeks. One should beware of thinking that as soon as these economies recover, their societies will immediately and automatically recover the social level they enjoyed in pre-crisis times. That has not been the experience in Latin America, where, even today, 17 years after the beginning of the Mexican foreign debt crisis, followed in 1982 by crises in Argentina, Brazil, Peru and others, the continent has not yet gone back to the pre-crisis level in social indicators. The excellent report by ECLAC entitled "The social panorama of Latin America", published in May of last year, shows that even now the level of poverty in Latin America still stands at 39 per cent of the population - that is, there are in Latin America 209 million people who are poor - and this rate is 4 percentage points above the pre-crisis level of 35 per cent in 1982. Despite all the suffering and hard work, we have not been able to go back to where we were in 1982. In the case of some individual countries, such as Chile, the results are better, but ECLAC is speaking about the average of the continent as a whole.

Another example relates to the measure of indigency, that is, households that are not able to feed themselves in an adequate way even when they spend their whole income on food. Indigency in Latin America stands now at 17 per cent of the population: one in every six families is indigent. This is two percentage points above the level in 1982. It is clear, therefore, that there is no automatic social recovery from an economic crisis, that is, even after economies resume growth, there will be no immediate recovery to past social standards. This experience should be carefully considered by the Asians if they are to avoid repeating the same mistakes and correct the perverse mechanisms that decouple social progress from economic growth.

I would like to dwell in my concluding remarks on one of the aspects of this new emerging paradigm that will only materialize if we work together to produce it. One of the aspects of this

desirable paradigm which is, I imagine, particularly dear to UNESCO, is the central importance of knowledge and information in the economy of the future. Professor Stiglitz, in his academic career, has made an important contribution to the new branch of economics that economists call "information economics". This does not refer, as some people think, to electronics or the way we transmit information through telecommunications. It refers to information in economic terms. The classical economists tended to consider that information had a zero cost or a negligible cost; that is, every actor in the market had equal access to information about the market, and so the cost of acquiring information about the market could be considered to be zero or negligible. The main contribution of the information economists has been to show that this is not true; information does have a cost, the so-called "transaction cost", and sometimes this transaction cost is the difference between success and failure. Firms can be considered as systems dealing with information, and in dealing with information, some people, some firms and some countries are more able than others. Those who have had a good education or training tend to be better at dealing with information and to succeed where others fail. The problem is, what to do with the failures - the legion of unskilled workers in industrial countries, or the poor countries that are not able to compete in the market place because they do not have appropriate access to information.

This is a particularly acute and important problem today, for the simple reason that we are moving towards a new kind of economy and a new form of development, where the decisive factors are no longer capital, cheap labour or an abundance of natural resources. More and more, the central, crucial factor is knowledge, information, patents, how to deal with the knowledge that is being constantly generated. As we move towards a knowledge-intensive economy, access to information and to knowledge becomes the difference between prosperity and poverty, and between domination and liberation. This is why information and knowledge will have to be increasingly considered in the rule-making negotiations on trade and on investment, and in relation to economic life in general. Based on my own personal experience during the Uruguay Round negotiations, I can tell you that trade negotiators have a tendency to approach the problem of competition by reducing it to a question of rules and arbiters. Competition has many analogies to a game and it is not by accident that game theory, with its mathematical formulation, is nowadays frequently applied to competition. As in every game, competition certainly needs fair rules, such as the norms of the World Trade Organization, and it also needs an impartial arbiter, as in the dispute-settlement mechanism of that organization. Governments and trade negotiators think that once we have fair rules and an impartial arbiter, the perfect conditions for competition will be in place. They forget of course a third and fundamental element of competition. In order to play a game, it is not enough to know the rules and to obey the arbiter, you have to learn how to play it; you need to be educated and trained. No-one can run the 100 meters in the Olympic Games only because there are rules and arbiters! So how can we include this element of learning and training as an integral part of competition in order to have a truly level playing field? Although we cannot ensure equality in the results of the competition, because people will perform differently, we should at least have equality of opportunity in access to training for the competition. And this is not happening.

Let us turn now to another example in trade. Federico Mayor has said that "trade not aid" should be the instrument of development and everybody agrees with this. Thus, you would think that trade-related technical cooperation would be a very significant part of what happens in the field of

technical cooperation. Well, I can tell you that it is not. The OECD figures show that in fact only 2 per cent of technical cooperation is trade-related. No-one is really trying hard to teach countries how to produce, how to trade or how to compete. This is why information economics should be an important element in the revision of the rules concerning development, where we understand "development" to be a continuous learning process.

In reality, we have to admit that globalization has been over-sold to the public since 1989, the year of the fall of the Berlin Wall, and in the decade since then there has been much emphasis on globalization as a process that would bring greater prosperity and faster economic growth for all. As a matter of fact, the first decade of globalization has a dismal record in terms of economic growth. It has had one of the lowest economic growth rates of the last 50 or 60 years - even more mediocre than that of the 1970s. Of course, one could say that globalization is still in its early days. However, one of the problems with this concept is that is was impoverished by being presented as practically synonymous with the integration of markets for trade, finance and direct investment on a planetary scale. It is true, of course, that globalization is the unification of economic space, but globalization is essentially more than that; it is a cultural and historical phenomenon. At the root of all movement towards globalization, there has always been a revolution in ideas, in science and in technology. It was so at the beginning of the expansion of the West with the Galilean revolution in the sixteenth century, it was so with the Newtonian revolution in the eighteenth century leading up to the Industrial Revolution, and it is again so. The difference this time is that the revolution is about time and space: the previous revolutions were about matter and energy. This time it is the very concept of distance and time that is being changed by telecommunications and by informatics, and this is why the problem of access to information becomes central. The fact that information, technology and science are fundamental components of human development does not in itself guarantee that these elements will not again be used for oppression or domination. In the past, scientific knowledge was too often used for oppression and domination. We should not be naive and think that access to information is just a matter of pedagogy, of learning, of education. There is an element of power - of market power and political power - in controlling information. But information will remain the crucial condition for development.

I very much like a phrase by Norbert Wiener, the founder of cybernetics. He used to say that to be informed is to be free. He meant that to be free is to be able to make choices, to choose among options. But in order to be able to choose, one needs to have knowledge about what the options are, if there are indeed options, and about the relative costs and benefits of each option, because in political life, as in culture and in the economy, you always have a trade-off - you win some and you lose some. In order to choose an option, you need information. Let us hope that, this time, information will serve not to oppress and to exploit the new dependants, but will really serve to liberate humankind and promote true human development.

Thank you very much.

* * * * * * * * * *

RETHINKING THE SOCIAL SCIENCES? A POINT OF VIEW[1]

*Luk Van Langenhove, Secretary General, Belgian Prime Minister's Services
for Scientific, Technical and Cultural Affairs*

Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to present a concise "state of the art" of critical thinking about the social sciences and review some recent proposals to restructure them. To be sure, the organisation of the social sciences has often been criticised and "new" or different approaches have been wished for. Thus, this presentation will hardly be original, but it aims to contribute to developing the debate about the future of the social sciences within the OECD's work on the science system.

A word about the concept "social sciences" is opportune. There are those who believe that there is room for only one social science, but most colleagues who see themselves as members of an institutionalised social science discipline wish to distinguish themselves from members of other such disciplines. Obviously, the plural also refers to related concepts such as "human sciences(s)" or behavioural science(s).

The invention of the social sciences

There was a time when there were no institutionalised social sciences, but today many academic disciplines present themselves as social sciences. Thus, the social sciences are much younger than the classic natural sciences, and also, like the natural sciences, they are organised by disciplines. To understand how the social sciences work (How do they proceed? What are the results? What are the societal impacts?), these two points are important.

This presentation therefore starts by putting the social sciences in historical context and pointing to a crucial theme in understanding their achievements and problems and their complex relationship with the natural sciences. The history of the social sciences is complex and cannot be equated with their institutionalisation. For example, the history of psychology is not the history of laboratory research starting with Wundt and leading to the creation of academic departments, learned societies and the profession of "psychologist".[2] Instead, the emergence and development of psychology and all other social science disciplines is part of a broader process with four aspects:

- the realisation that certain human phenomena are subjects for study;

- the idea that any such study requires "consulting reality";

- the possibility of access to the phenomena one wants to study;

- the development of adequate methods and techniques for studying human phenomena.

Only then are the conditions of a new "social" or "human" scientific domain present. Whether that domain "survives" as an independent institutionalised practice is the result of societal and academic forces. In the context of this paper, the first condition is of special importance.

Over time, considerable knowledge of social practices has accumulated and has traditionally fulfilled a legitimating function. It was part of the socio-economic ideology in which it originated. As such, early "scientific" models of man and society were in fact only a justification and legitimisation of existing social practices: nothing was questioned because nothing seemed to require explanation. The concept of God played a central role in these models: things were as they were because God wanted it that way. As it was not possible to challenge religious dogma, the study of man and society was long almost impossible. Consequently, the first step for the social sciences had to be the removal of the religious obstacles to the study of man and society, which occurred as a result of the Enlightenment. Political and ideological obstacles remained. Because the first forms of systematised social knowledge had a legitimating function, they were not neutral. Laws, for instance, were established for very practical reasons by representatives of the ruling classes of different societies.

A more "critical" study of existing practices only became possible when: a) those in power were faced with new problems with which they had to cope; or b) other groups needed social knowledge in order to question the power of the ruling groups. In other words, there needed to be change and problems that required a social study. It can be shown that from the seventeenth century onwards, new ideological, political and natural science practices emerged and gave rise to social, cultural, economical and psychological problems. For example:

- On the ideological level, humanism came to play an important role, and with it came an interest in certain classes of people who differ from "normal people". Children and fools were "discovered" as were specific mental states like "romantic love". Practical questions required answers. If children are not mini-adults, how should we treat them (how should they be educated?). Why can love result in severe physical distress (hysteria)?

- On the political level, modern states emerged along with trade among them. This called for new techniques of organising the state and trade. At the same time, modernism and the ideology of liberalism emphasized the possibility of managed change. For this, political governance had to be entrusted to competent persons (schooling was necessary) who could act on the basis of relevant information. Says Wallerstein (1997), "In order so to act they needed knowledge about how the social order really functioned, and this meant that they needed research, and researchers. Social science was absolutely crucial to the liberal enterprise."

- On the scientific level, progress in the natural sciences resulted in the development and use of technologies, some of which posed social or psychological problems. For example, it was through experiments involving telescopes that it was discovered that people have different reaction times to visual stimuli.

Whatever one's perspective on the present state of the social sciences, one should never ignore the historical context of their emergence: its relationship to power, to coping with problems and to societal change. The emergence of the social sciences is closely linked to the search for answers to concrete problems. Thus, and perhaps surprisingly, this makes it possible to differentiate the intellectual roots of the social sciences from those of the natural sciences: they are closely tied to what we today would call applications. The natural sciences, on the contrary, have their intellectual roots in the effort to understand the world. They have moved from a peripheral place in society (a pastime of the clergy and the affluent) to

play a central role in the pursuit of wealth, owing to the eighteenth century link between science and technology and between technology and economic development, while the social sciences have so far not become linked to economic development or to any other concept of societal development.

As a result, society is now full of the visible results of the "progress" of natural science: nuclear power plants, cellular telephones, biodegradable soap. All are closely linked to science and technology. Who can tell, on the other hand, where the social sciences have led? What societal changes can be attributed to developments in the social sciences? In other words, how different would our society have been without Habermas, Foucault, or Giddens? Or without Freud and Marx? Many social scientists, indeed, would question whether the latter two are part of their community!

What are the institutional problems of the social sciences?

The modern social sciences present themselves as academic disciplines, that is, as institutionalised practices. Like all other institutions, this means that they have "official" histories which partly serve as self-justification and partly as a tool for initiating new members. Since the main disciplines were only founded at the turn of the nineteenth century, such "official" histories always include a pre-scientific period. What Ebbinghaus once said about the history of psychology is also true of the other social sciences: they have a longer past and a shorter history than the natural sciences. A longer past because their pre-scientific practice was indispensable to the organisation and functioning of all society. A shorter history, because their scientific establishment was only achieved as the result of a series of specific societal processes and conditions (briefly described above).

As a result, we live today in a world where, as Karapin (1986, p. 236) said, hundreds of thousands of social scientists go to work every day. A significant number are very critical of their colleagues' work (and their own?) and devote at least part of their time to writing articles and books to complain that the social sciences are irrelevant, incomprehensible, of low quality or simply wrong. Such views are often shared by the rest of the world, especially among those with responsibilities for funding social science research. The United States offers the most dramatic example, where the House Science Committee voted to eliminate social science funding for the financial year 1997. One of the arguments made by the Committee's chairman was that social science research is "not real science".

As a result of such criticism, other social scientists complain that their work is not used as it should be, that funding is lacking, and that while there may be problems with the present social sciences, these can easily be overcome with more money and time. It seems unlikely that more money and time alone will solve the problems of the social sciences, which primarily appear to be the lack of unity, of quality control and of generative power.

Lack of unity

The history of the social sciences shows three clear lines of cleavage (Gulbenkian Commission, 1996) : i) the separation of the study of the "Western" from the non-Western world; ii) the separation between the study of past and present; and iii) the separation of the study of individuals, markets, states, and civil societies. These cleavages have given rise to four main institutional and epistemological problems: the emergence of disciplinary boundaries, the proliferation of schools within single disciplines, the question of method, and the emergence of interdisciplinary fields with new boundaries. As a result, the social sciences are, at the end of the twentieth century, in a state of division and discord.

First, there are the disciplinary divisions. All too often taken for granted today, they were, as Manicas (1987, p. 5) noted, only constituted in the 20 or 30 years around the turn of the nineteenth century. While

the much older divisions among the natural sciences obviously make sense, those between the social sciences do not (at least not in the same way). In the natural sciences, one can explain the phenomena studied by one discipline without recourse to concepts from another (one can, for example, explain or predict chemical phenomena without using physics). Social phenomena, instead, cannot easily be split up by disciplines, such as economics, psychology, sociology. Whatever criticisms one might have of disciplinary boundaries, the main problem is that those boundaries now coincide with well-established professions and are therefore very difficult to change. As Ansoff (1986) noted, this may be the source of the dramatic gap between researcher's choices and society's needs: the fact that most research is being done from the vantage point of single disciplines, whereas the key social problems require multidisciplinarity.

A second kind of division within the social sciences, and a subject of much discord, is the fact that each of the established disciplines is in turn divided into many competing (or even mutually ignoring) theoretical and/or methodological schools. Each is often organised like its mother discipline, with its own textbooks, journals, and sometimes even degrees. There is nothing wrong with scientists having competing ideas on their subject, but the situation is perverse, as most of the schools picture themselves as the only true representative of their discipline. For a behaviourist, only behaviourism is "real" psychology. Again, the situation is quite different in the natural sciences, where there is also much theoretical and methodological debate. However, taking a position in that debate does not mean that one immediately adheres to an institutionalised camp with its own journals and so on.

However, the most important dividing factor today seems to be the general call for interdisciplinarity! This relatively recent fad works according to the following principle: take two well-established social science disciplines, define their conjunction as a specific subject matter, and create a new sub-discipline (economic psychology, sociology of law). Each of these new sub-disciplines will then use its own professional organisations, professorships, journals, etc., to mark the boundaries of its subject matter.

Methodology is the fourth major source of division and discord in the social sciences. It runs across all disciplines and sub-disciplines and sometimes even across schools. Baldly stated, there are two major methodological paradigms: the "general" and the "particular", also known as the nomothetic and ideographic approaches. The word "nomothetic" is used to characterise the search for general laws (applicable on all occasions and at any time). The word "ideography" indicates a concern for what is particular to the individual case. The nomothetic approach has pushed the social sciences towards a "positivist" quest for reliable and replicable data (Van Langenhove, 1996). As Wallerstein (1997) noted, the price to pay for having reliable data has been closeness to the laboratory situation - in other words, a preference for artificial situations or arbitrary focuses at the expense of acknowledging the dynamism and complexity of social reality.

The social sciences are dominated today by positivism and nomothetic and quantitative thinking. However, unless a non-positivist view of science is adopted, social sciences will not be able to make much progress in explaining and understanding man and society (R. Harré, 1979; Harré & Secord, 1972, and many others). Such a view implies an emphasis on qualitative methods, case studies, action research and above all on dialogue between researchers and those who are the "subjects" of research (Smith *et al.*, 1996a; 1996b).

To sum up, the social sciences today, although they all are concerned with man and society, are divided into many disciplines and sub-disciplines. There is no consensus about how to study phenomena, and most academic social sciences are profoundly alienated from praxis. Superficially, this might appear little different from the natural sciences, but that would be a misconception. The divisions and discord in the social sciences are very different from those in the natural sciences because they were the product of a

process of institutionalisation closely linked to political and societal questions. That is, given other political and societal constraints, different kinds of social sciences might have emerged.

Lack of quality control

Scientific work can be judged in terms of its quality. Good research can be said to contribute to the advancement of our understanding (scientific progress) or to the capacity to contribute to solving problems. In the natural sciences, the distinction between scientific value and practical use exists, but there seem to be criteria for monitoring quality in both realms: next to peer review, one can apply criteria from "good laboratory practice" (GLP), measure patent output, etc. In the social sciences, the main indicator of quality seems to be peer-reviewed publications. This poses many problems related to the institutional situation of the social sciences. Not only does it imply a disciplinary approach and method/school-driven judgement, it also amply allows judging the practical use of a research project.

This, then, is related to the issue of the output of a research project. Most natural science projects have, in addition to publications, material or intellectual outputs, such as a new molecule or a patent for a new mode of production.

According to Deutsch (1986), "Social scientists should have the courage to ask themselves the question if there have been real, substantial advances in the social sciences in the twentieth century. The problem in posing that question is of course the lack of accepted criteria to answer it. Scientific progress is difficult to measure, especially in the social sciences. One possibility is to define scientific progress as an 'increase in range of understanding and control - an increase in what people can recognise, what they can predict, and what they can do'." In other words, one of the great challenges for the social sciences is develop adequate quality control systems focused on tangible research outputs.

In the sixteenth century, Francis Bacon, in his book *De Heresibus*, stated that "knowledge is power". However, to be of practical value, knowledge must be sufficiently complete, reliable, accessible and timely. Knowledge generated from social science research is all too often not relevant for those who have to make decisions relating to the problems of change.[3] Social science has to be brought into the public sphere by promoting research that brings together researchers, those who play a role in the phenomena researched, and those who are in a position to make decisions about the phenomena studied. We are urgently in need of a scientific research community that seeks to advance the scientific study of societies and people so as to generate theoretical and practical insights that can lead to the empowerment of people in governments, industry and civil society.

Lack of generative power

The plea for thorough quality control focused on practicability should not be misinterpreted as a plea for social sciences that are only "applied" and not basic. On the contrary, much more investment in basic social sciences is needed, although this is probably best done outside the disciplines. Just as the natural sciences have not only contributed to solving many practical problems, but also made it possible for lay people to understand many aspects of the material world they live in, the social sciences should contribute to the general public's understanding of our societies. Kenneth Gergen once called this the "generative power" of the social sciences: the power of theories to "upset the common assumptions within the culture

---

3. F. Heller (1986) has addressed the issue of social science and its uses. He and his co-authors have critically examined the scope as well as the limitations of the utilisation thesis.

and thereby open new vistas for action" (1982, p. 133). Gergen argued that modern social psychology has little or no generative power, and the same is likely true of most of social science research today.

The social sciences have not achieved the same "results" as the natural sciences which, by developing new technologies, have become a major force in development world-wide, as well as a major source of risk. There are enormous private and public investments in natural sciences and technology-oriented R&D, on the one hand, and meagre resources for the social sciences, on the other. However, there is more to it than mere funding. There are also problems relating to social science practices that cannot be reduced to a mere lack of appropriate funding. Many social science initiatives are not contributing anything towards understanding society, let alone towards solving societal problems. Society seems to learn little or nothing from social science!

Rethinking the social sciences?

It is remarkable that throughout the history of the social sciences, many voices have seriously questioned the practice of the social sciences. This, of course, can be related to the above-mentioned institutional problems. One might think that this would have provoked radical changes in how social science research is conducted, but the many critical questions about the subject of a discipline, its boundaries, or about what is methodologically correct have on the whole not changed the mainstream activities of the academic community. At best, it has only resulted in excitement or healthy self-reflection. At worst, it has been experienced as anxiety-provoking and threatening. Nevertheless, there seems to be a growing consensus about the deficiencies of the social sciences and about possible remedies. After the ground-breaking work of many scholars and that of UNESCO (Lengyel, 1986), one of the most interesting analyses has been that of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Rethinking of the Social Sciences. Its report, *Open the Social Sciences* (1996), addresses three major issues.

First, it shows how social science was constructed as a form of knowledge and why it was divided into a specific set of disciplines in a process that took place between the late eighteenth century and 1945. Second, it reveals how world developments in the period since 1945 have raised questions about this intellectual division of labour and therefore reopens the question of the organisational structure put into place in the previous period. Third, it presents ways in which the social sciences might be intelligently restructured in the light of their history and recent debate. In this context, the Gulbenkian Commission proposes the possible "expansion of institutions, within or allied to universities, which could bring together scholars for (...) work in common around specific urgent themes". It also stresses the need for establishing integrated research programmes that cut across traditional lines.

If one accepts this analysis, the questions are, "What can be done?" and "Who should do what?" From an intellectual point of view, there are at least three defendable positions.

The first is business as usual, that is, nothing should be done. Even if they accept parts of the critical analysis, many social scientists will undoubtedly argue that all goes well and one should simply await the further development of the social sciences. Peer review will filter out bad research and with sufficient time, the social sciences will become as robust as the natural sciences. If society wants more "results", then the thing to do is to allocate more money to the social sciences.

A second fully supports the critical analysis presented here but adds that there is a problem with how governments support the social sciences. They should not only fund social sciences but also intervene in the dissemination of results. However, this can be done within the existing disciplinary structures.

The third and most radical viewpoint is that the social sciences need a totally new approach, including new subject matter, new institutions, and new epistemologies. The Gulbenkian Report defends this position.

Of course, it implies that those who fund the social sciences are willing to look for new initiatives.[4] Indeed, such a radical rethinking of the social sciences does appear necessary. An organisation such as the OECD can play an interesting role in such a process by making governments aware of the problems in their national social science systems and by stimulating the development of new approaches.

At the beginning of this paper, change, problems and power were presented as crucial elements in the relationship between society and the social sciences. They can serve as means of rethinking the social sciences.

A paradigm shift from disciplinary-driven research agendas to research driven by problems and their driving forces is urgently needed. In this respect, ground-breaking work has been done by the Dutch initiative "Overlegcommissie Verkenningen" which developed a most interesting framework for social science research focused on quality of life. Its starting point is the identification of four driving forces in societal development: internationalisation, technological development, changes in the welfare state, and the increasing flexibility of an individual's life pattern. These were related to four main research themes (human capital, industrial development, social cohesion, and environment), although others are of course also possible. From this was developed a 4 x 4 matrix, within each cell of which possible problem-oriented research projects were placed. Such exercises should be multiplied and could help governments radically change their social science research policies.

In addition, the result of any social science project should not be limited to the production of books and articles in scientific journals. Here the paradigm shift needed is one from publication-driven research towards change-driven research. The social sciences have to be able to generate knowledge that can be relevant for all those who want to change a given situation. Therefore, social science research should try to bring researchers together with those who are part of the phenomena researched and those who are in a position to make decisions about the phenomena studied. However, the social sciences cannot claim to act as an agent of change on behalf of the rest of society. Social scientists have to work with industry, governments and civil society. The key issues are empowerment through social sciences and participatory research involving all stakeholders.

The shift to a focus on problems and change can perhaps only be realised through a paradigm shift in science policy, with funding agencies becoming more proactive in order to change political and social constraints. The institutional organisation of the social sciences will be a major obstacle to change. Governments can intervene by using public money to stimulate new transdisciplinary initiatives. They could also set an example by using innovative social science research projects as much as possible in their own functioning.

Hayward (1984) stated that of all branches of human knowledge, the social sciences are the most exposed to the danger of being cast in the role of scapegoat when public policy runs into trouble. For Hayward, "trouble" meant "lack of money". Today, instead, the trouble is that public policy as well as industry and civil society need the social sciences to contribute to solving major societal problems. If one believes that they cannot do so as long as disciplinary funding within academic institutes continues to be the rule, the

---

4.   This might prove to be a major difficulty as governments will more easily turn to "classic" institutions such as universities. Funding through foundations can be an alternative. In this regard a recent initiative deserves mention. Academics, administrators and graduates of the College of Europe in Bruges have created a Foundation (the *Fondation Salvador de Madariaga, Fondation scientifique pour le Collège d'Europe*) that is launching the BRIOSS project. BRIOSS is the *Bruges Research Initiative for Opening the Social Sciences*. This initiative aims to establish an independent and international research centre for policy-oriented basic research in social science aimed at studying societal change from a European perspective and from a transdisciplinary, comparative and participatory research perspective.

only way forward would appear to be public and private initiatives to create innovative interdisciplinary research centres whose goal is to contribute to solving global and local societal problems and to advance social science theory and methodology. The challenge for the OECD is to help create stimulating environments where social sciences can develop and interact closely with industry, governments and civil society.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Fourth session of the Intergovernmental Council (IGC)
for the "Management of Social Transformations" (MOST) Programme

UNESCO, Paris – Room IV
22 to 25 February 1999

AGENDA AND TIME-TABLE

Monday, 22 February

9:00-9:45   Welcome and registration

10:00   Opening session: Welcome by the Director General of UNESCO

10:15   Keynote address - *Development and globalization*
               by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD (Geneva),
               Dr. Rubens Ricupero

11:30   Coffee break

12:00   Election of the Bureau
               -      Welcoming speech by the President of the IGC
               -      Adoption of the Agenda
               -      Election of a Drafting Group

13:00   Lunch

15:00   Joint session of the Scientific Steering Committee and the
               Intergovernmental Council of MOST

16:15   Coffee break

16:45-18:00   Continuation of the discussion

18:30   Reception

Tuesday, 23 February

9:00   Meeting of the Bureau

10:00   Presentation by ADG/SHS on 30 C/5 and World Science Conference

10:25	Presentation by the Assistant Director-General of the Bureau for Co-ordination of Environmental Programmes, Mr G. Glaser, concerning the co-operation with the MOST Programme
10:30	Report by the MOST Secretariat
11:15	Coffee break
11: 45	Film on Yeumbel - Discussion
13:00	Lunch
15:00	Presentation of the report on the mid-term evaluation of the MOST Programme
16:15	Coffee break
16:45-18:00	Continuation and end of discussion

Wednesday, 24 February

9:00	Meeting of the Bureau
10:00	Panel on social sciences and decision-making: the role of the MOST Programme
11:00	Coffee break
11:30	Continuation of panel
13:00	Lunch
15:00-18:00	Meeting of the Bureau and of the Drafting Group

Thursday, 25 February

10:00-13:00	No plenary meeting
14:00	Meeting of the Bureau
15:00	Discussion of draft report and recommendations
16:00	Coffee break
16:30	Closing session: - Adoption of report to the General Conference - Adoption of recommendations
18:00	Closure of the meeting

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

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

Fourth Session of the Intergovernmental Council (IGC)
for the "Management of Social Transformations" Programme (MOST)

Quatrième session du Conseil intergouvernemental (CIG)
pour le Programme "Gestion des transformations sociales" (MOST)

Cuarta reunión del Consejo Intergubernamental (CIG)
del Programa "Gestión de las Transformaciones Sociales" (MOST)

UNESCO, Paris – Room/Salle/Sala IV
22-25 February/février/febrero 1999

<u>LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS /LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES</u>

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 *Gestión de las Transformaciones Sociales* (MOST)**

ANGOLA

M. Pedro M. Nsingui-Barros
Conseiller, Délégation permanente de l'Angola auprès de l'UNESCO

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Prof. Kenneth Wiltshire
President, IGC
Director, Centre for Public Administration
The University of Queensland

Ms. Anne Siwicki
Australian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE

Mr Arne HASELBACH
Austrian National Commission for UNESCO

Prof. Rudolf RICHTER
Ministry of Research & Transport

BENIN

M. Isidore Monsi, Premier Conseiller,
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO

BRAZIL/BRESIL/BRASIL

M. Ricardo Bastos,
Délégation du Brésil auprès de l'UNESCO

CAMEROON/CAMEROUN/CAMERÚN

Prof. Charly Gabriel Mbock
Director of Research
Ministry of Scientific Research

CANADA

Prof. Marshall Wm. Conley, Vice-President
Canadian Commission for UNESCO
Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, Canada

Prof. Elvi Whittaker, Department of Anthropology & Sociology
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

CAPE VERDE/CAP-VERT/CABO VERDE

Ms. Ana Maria Morais Lomba, Directrice du Cabinet d'études et développement social, Ministère de l'emploi, formation et intégration sociale

M. Mário Ferreira Lopes Camões
Chargé d'Affaires auprès de l'UNESCO

CHILE/CHILI

Mr Raúl URZUA
Coordinator
UNESCO Chair on Public Policies

Mr Marcel YOUNG
Conseiller, Délégation permanente du Chili auprès de l'UNESCO

CHINA/CHINE

Mr Zhang Youyun, Deputy Director, International Division,
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

Excmo. Sr. Augusto Galán Sarmiento
Embajador
Delegado Permanente de Colombia ante la UNESCO

Sr. Marco Llinás, Primer Secretario

COTE D'IVOIRE

S. Exc. M. Bakary Tio-Touré, Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent de
Côte d'Ivoire auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Pierre Aka, Conseiller

Mr. Kouassi Balo, Conseiller

CUBA

Sr. Juan Luís Martín Chávez,
Director del Centro de Investigaciones Psicológicas y Sociológicas
del Ministerio de Ciencias de Cuba

Sra María Teresa RODRIGUEZ, Social Science Specialist, Cuban National Commission for UNESCO

CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE/REPÚBLICA CHECA

Dr. Zderiek Uherek, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE/ALEMANIA

Mrs Prof. Dr. Lenelis KRUSE-GRAUMANN
Institute for Psychology of the Hagen University

Dr. Folkert PRECHT
German Commission for UNESCO

HUNGARY/HONGRIE/HUNGRIA

Prof. Szabolcs de VAJAY
Ambassador

Prof. György ENYEDI
Academician, President of the Hungarian National Commission for UNESCO

IRAQ/IRAK

Mr. Kyad Aflak, Conseiller, Délégation permanente d'Irak auprès de l'UNESCO

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN/REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D'IRAN/ REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DE IRÁN

Mr Javad Safaei, Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of the
Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO

Mr Reza Bayegan, Permanent Delegation of the
Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO

ITALY/ITALIE/ITALIA

M. Giovanni Puglisi, Secrétaire général de la Commission
nationale italienne pour l'UNESCO

H.E. Mr Gabriele Sardo, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Italy to UNESCO

Mr Pietro Sebastiani, Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Italy to UNESCO

Ms Marina Misitano, Permanent Delegation of Italy to UNESCO

Ms Silvia Lombardi, Permanent Delegation of Italy to UNESCO

JAMAICA/JAMAIQUE

Ms Sybil Campbell, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate,
Permanent Delegation of Jamaica to UNESCO

JAPAN/JAPON

Prof. Dr. Kenichiro HIRANO
National Commission for UNESCO

Mr Daisuke MACHIDA
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO

Ms Rika SHIBAO
International Scientific Affairs Division
Science and International Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Education

LEBANON/LIBAN/LIBANO

Ms Joanna AZZI
Diplomatic Attaché, Permanent Delegation of Lebanon to UNESCO

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA/JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE/ JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBIA

Mr. Ibrahim Elghaly, Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'UNESCO

MALAYSIA/MALAISIE/MALASIA

Mr Iheivawdran Rajadurai, Secretary General
Ministry of National Unity and Social Development

Mr Muchtar Boerhonnoeddin, Malaysian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

MOROCCO/MAROC/MARRUECOS

Mr Driss Dadsi, Counsellor, Minister of Social Development,
 Solidarity, Employment and Professional Training

Mr. Saleh-Eddin El Howsan, Délégué adjoint du Maroc auprès de l'UNESCO

NAMIBIA/NAMIBIE

Mr Marius Kudumo, National Commission Secretariat,
Chief Programme Officer for Education and Social and Human Sciences

NETHERLANDS/PAYS BAS/PAISES BAJOS

Ms Van Vucht Tijssen
Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO

Mrs. Barbara De Klerk
Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO

PERU/PEROU/PERU

Mr. Alberto Carrion
Délégué permanent adjoint du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO

Mr. Carlos Vasquez, Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO

PHILIPPINES/FILIPINAS

Ms Rosario G. Manalo, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs and Acting Secretary-
General of the UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines

Ms Virginia Miralao
Commissioner, Committee for Social and Human Sciences
UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines

Ms Deanna Ongpin-Recto
First Secretary and Senior Foreign Affairs Adviser for UNESCO
Permanent Delegation of the Philippines to UNESCO

POLAND/POLOGNE/POLONIA

Prof. Marek Ziolkowski
President Social Sciences Sector, Polish National Commission for UNESCO

ROMANIA/ROUMANIE/RUMANIA

Prof. Victor Iancu
Secretary-General, Romanian National Commission for UNESCO

SPAIN/ESPAGNE/ESPAÑA

Sr. Pablo Benavides
Delegado Permanente Adjunto ante la UNESCO

Sr. Juan Luis Recio Adrados
Commission nationale espagnole pour l'UNESCO
Profesor de Sociología, Universidad Complutense

Mr. Maximo Diaz-Casanova
Commission nationale espagnole pour l'UNESCO
Profesor de Sociología, Universidad Complutense

SRI LANKA

M. Piyasiri Vijaya-Sekere
Deputy Permanent Delegate, Permanent Delegation of Sri Lanka

TOGO

Dr. T.A. Assih, Vice-présidente, Commission sciences sociales

Mr. Kodzo S. Noglo, Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'UNESCO

II. Observers from Member States, Non-Member States, Permanent Missions 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 no miembros, de Misiones Permanentes de Observación y de Comisiones Nacionales para la UNESCO y Delegaciones Permanentes ante la UNESCO

ALGERIA/ALGERIE/ARGELIA

Mme Nouria REMAOUN
Directrice du Centre de Recherche
 en Anthropologie Sociale et Culturelle d'Oran

ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

Mrs. Claudia Zampieri
Délégation permanente de l'Argentine auprès de l'UNESCO

BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA/BOSNIE & HERZEGOVINE

Mr. Zelko Jerkic, Permanent Delegate

BURKINA FASO

Mr. Mamadou Sawadogo, Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'UNESCO

CAMBODIA/CAMBODGE/CAMBOYA

H.E. Mr. Sihamoni Norodom, Senior Minister, Ambassador

Mr David Measketh, Second Secretary

COSTA RICA

Mrs. Iris Leiva-Billalt, Délégué permanent adjoint du Costa Rica auprès de l'UNESCO

Ms. Rosa Jiminez, Avocat

Ms. Gabriela Castello, Ministre conseiller, Délégation permanente du Costa Rica auprès de l'UNESCO

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA/REPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE DEMOCRATIQUE DE COREE/REPUBLICA POPULAR DEMOCRATICA DE COREA

Mr. Jae Hon Kim, Deputy Permanent Delegate, Korean Permanent Delegation for UNESCO

Mr. Sok Chol Han, First Secretary, Korean Permanent Delegation for UNESCO

DENMARK/DANEMARK/DINAMARCA

Mr. Emil Paulsen, Deputy Permanent Delegate

Mr. Christian Hestbaek, Stagiaire

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE/ REPUBLICA DOMINICANA

Sr. Carlos Dore, Secretario de Estado, Encargado de la Dirección de Información, Análisis y Programación Estratégica de la Presidencia de la República

Mrs. Laura Faxas, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate

ECUADOR/EQUATEUR

Mr. Mauricio Montalvo, Délégué permanent adjoint, Délégation permanente de l'Equateur auprès de l'UNESCO

EL SALVADOR

Mr. Ramiro Zepeda, Embajador, delegado permanente

Mrs. Rosa Tioreira de Lemoine, delegado permanente ajunto

Mrs. Nanette Viaud Desroches, Consejero

FINLAND/FINLANDE/FINLANDIA

H.E. Ms Taina Kiekko, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate

Ms Anne Lammila, Deputy Permanent Delegate

Mr Tuomo Melasuo, Director, Tampere Peace Research Institute,
University of Tampere (Member of the Sub-Commission for Social and Human
Sciences of the Finnish National Commission for UNESCO)

Ms Satu Heikkinen, Secretary for International Exchanges, Ministry of Education

FRANCE/FRANCIA

Mme Anne-Marie Laulan, Présidente du Comité français pour le MOST;

Mme Martine Boiteux, Chargée de mission au Ministère de l'Education nationale, de
la recherche et de la technologie;

Mlle Florence Cormon, Deuxième Secrétaire à la Délégation permanente de la France
auprès de l'UNESCO;

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

GUATEMALA

Excma. Sra. Gloria Montenegro, Embajadora, Delegada Permanente ante la UNESCO

Sra. Ana Juarez-Barthez, Collaboratrice Ambassade

INDIA/INDE

Mr. Gauri Shankar Gupta, Conseiller, Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO

INDONESIA

H.E. Mr Soedarso Djojonegoro
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Indonesia to UNESCO

Mr Imam Santoso
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Indonesian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

ISRAEL

S. Exc. Avi Shoket, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Israel to UNESCO

KAZAKHSTAN/KAZAJSTAN

Mr. Rustani Mireafavov, First Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Kazakstan for UNESCO

KENYA

Ms Margareth Wanjiru Makena
Assistant Secretary-General in the Social Sciences Sector, Ministry of Education, Kenya National Commission for UNESCO

LAOS

Mr. Khamliene Nhouyvanisvong, Délégué permanent adjoint

LITHUANIA/LITUANIE/LITUANIA

Mme Ugné Karvelis, Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent de Lituanie auprès de l'UNESCO

MADAGASCAR

Mrs. Ravaomalala Rasoanaivo, Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'UNESCO

Ms. Hanta Simon, Conseiller, Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO

MEXICO/MEXIQUE

Dr. Luis Alejandro Astorga Almanza, Investigador del Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)

NEPAL

H.E. Mr Indra Behadur Singh, Royal Nepalese Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Nepal to UNESCO

NICARAGUA

Arquitecta Ximena Flores Loaisiga, Representante Permanente Alterna, Delegación de Nicaragua ante la UNESCO

Licenciada Milena Lanzas, Ministro Consejero de la Embajada de Nicaragua

NIGERIA

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

NORWAY/NORVEGE/NORUEGA

Mr Audun Sandberg, Deputy Chair of the Norwegian National Commission

PAKISTAN

Mrs Riffat Masood, Second Secretary,
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Pakistan to UNESCO

PANAMA

Mr. José Llopis, Délégué permanent, Délégation permanente du Panama auprès de l'UNESCO

Ms. Maria Elena De Aguilar, Délégué permanent adjoint, Délégation permanente du Panama auprès de l'UNESCO

PORTUGAL

Mr. Luis de Albuquerque Veloso, Secrétaire de l'Ambassade

RUSSIAN FEDERATION/FEDERATION DE RUSSIE/FEDERACION RUSA

Mr. Andrei Skachkov, First Secretary, Russian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO
SAINT LUCIA/SAINTE LUCIE/SANTA LUCIA

Ms. Vera Lacoeuilhe, First Secretary, Permanent Delegation

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

Ms. Carole Arsan, Attaché, Permanent Delegation

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE/SUIZA

Prof. François Hainard, University of Neuchâtel

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE/
REPUBLICA ARABE SIRIA**

Ms. Nabila Chaalan, Délégué permanent de la Syrie auprès de l'UNESCO

TANZANIA/TANZANIE/TANZANIA

Mr. Mohammed S. Sheya, Deputy Permanent Delegate to UNESCO

TURKEY/TURQUIE/TURQUIA

Mr Özgür Uludüz
Third Secretary, Turkish Permanent Delegation

UGANDA/OUGANDA

Mr. Godfrey Knoba, 3rd Secretary, Uganda Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

URUGUAY

Sr. Ministro Pedro Mó Amaro, Delegación Permanente de Uruguay

VENEZUELA

Ms. Cristiane Engelbrecht, Second Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO

ZIMBABWE

Mr. Josiah Mhlanga, Deputy Permanent Delegate to UNESCO

III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVADORES

ATD Quart Monde
    Mme Françoise Coré

Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO)
    Emilio H. Taddei, Coordinateur Académique

International Association of Universities
    H. Van'Tland, Programme Co-ordinator, Paris

International Committee for Social Science Information and Documentation (ICSSD)
    Catalina Saugy, Secretary-General
    William Turner, LIMSI, Paris

International Federation for Housing and Planning
    François Parfait

International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA)
    Mr. Philip De Roo, Vice-President

International Federation of University Women
    Mme Marianne Bernheim
    Representative to UNESCO

International Organization for Migration (IOM)
    M. Albert Khouth
    Correpondant de l'OIM, Paris

International Social Science Council (ISSC)
    Maria Pilar Magannon
    Lzhua Zhang

Ligue des Etats Arabes, Mission de Paris
    Ambassadeur Mohamed Trabelsi, Représentant Permanent,
    Observateur auprès de l'UNESCO
    Mr. Abdelmajid Klai, Attaché d'information
    Mrs. Haka Kodmani

NALCO
    Mr. Muzaffer Adali

SOROPTIMIST International
    Jeannine Jacquemin
    Yseuit Kaplan
    Monique Pinthon

World Federation for Mental Health
     Madeleine Rivière, Representative to UNESCO

WILPF
     Simone Landry

IV.   UNITED NATIONS/NATIONS UNIES/NACIONES UNIDAS

The United Nations University
Dr Peter Könz & Ms Caterina Casullo, Silvia Vignetti, UNU Office in Europe (Paris)

V. MOST Scientific Steering Committee/Comité directeur scientifique de MOST/Comité Directivo Científico de MOST

H.E. Professor Yoginder Alagh
Member of Parliament (India)

Prof. Maurice Aymard (France)

Prof. dr. Arie de Ruijter (Netherlands)

Prof. Dr. Lenelis Kruse (Germany)

Mr. Achille Mbembe (Senegal)

Dr. Alejandra Moreno Toscano (Mexico)

Prof. Anatoly G. Vishnevsky (Russian Federation)

VI. Keynote Speakers/Conférenciers/Conferenciantes

Dr. Rubens Ricupero
Executive Director
UNCTAD, Geneva

Mr Achille Mbembe
Executive Secretary
Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA)
Dakar, Senegal
Member of the MOST Scientific Steering Committee

Dr. Luk Van Langenhove, Deputy Secretary-General
Services du Premier Ministre de la Belgique,
 Affaires scientifiques, techniques et culturelles

Mr Jean-Eric Aubert
OECD, Direction de la Science, de la Technologie et de l'Industrie

Mrs Alejandra Moreno-Toscano
Member of the MOST Scientific Steering Committee

VII.   **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 of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

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

Mrs S. TIMUR
Chief, Population Unit
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms Maria Luisa NITTI
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mr P. de GUCHTENEIRE
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms C. von FURSTENBERG
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mrs Alia SAADA
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mr Germán SOLINIS
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms Brigitte COLIN
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms Nadia AURIAT
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Mr Carlos SANCHEZ-MILANI
Assistant Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms Cecilia GOLDEN
Associate Expert
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms P. VAN VUCHT TIJSSEN
Consultant
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms C. BAUER
Social and Human Sciences Documentation Centre
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms Maria J. GUTIERREZ
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms Geneviève BLACKBURN-KLAJMAN
Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy

Ms Carmel ROCHET
Human Habitat Unit, Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy