

**Conférence générale**

31<sup>e</sup> session  
Document d'information

**Генеральная конференция**

31-я сессия  
Информационный документ

**inf**

Paris 2001

**General Conference**

31st session  
Information document

المؤتمر العام  
الدورة الحادية والثلاثون  
وتبقة إعلامية

**Conferencia General**

31<sup>a</sup> reunión  
Documento de información

大会  
第三十一届会议  
资料性文件

31 C/INF.24  
12 November 2001  
Original: English

**ORAL REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF COMMISSION IV**

Thank you, Mr President, for giving me this opportunity to present this report on the work of Commission IV.

Mr President of the General Conference,  
Madam Chairperson of the Executive Board,  
Mr Director-General,  
Distinguished Delegates,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour for me to present to you the outcome of the work undertaken by Commission IV for adoption at this plenary meeting of the General Conference. The decisions taken are reflected in document 31 C/64 and 31 C/64 Addendum and Corrigendum which incorporate the amendments suggested during the adoption of the report by our Commission.

Mr President,

I am sure you will agree that the work of Commission IV holds particular significance for us now as we find ourselves at the dawn of a new millennium.

This 31st session of the General Conference is taking place in the aftermath of the events of 11 September. Yet amidst uncertainty, we have come together in a spirit of true intercultural dialogue. As so many delegates have noted, never before have the themes of culture and respect for diversity taken on so much meaning and importance.

At no time has it been more essential for wisdom and courage to take precedence over our differences. We can be proud of the work we have accomplished together in Commission IV, and proud of the contribution we are poised to make through the adoption of this report for the advancement of world peace and understanding through culture.

Given time restrictions, this presentation cannot be exhaustive. I will nevertheless endeavour through this report to reflect accurately the nature of our discussions and the statements made by participants. I will not mention the names of specific Member States taking part in the debates, unless such an indication has been explicitly requested.

Briefly, then, the work of our Commission was divided into five debates.

The first debate provided delegates with an opportunity to present their views on the Medium-Term Strategy and the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget for 2004-2005. Debate 2 covered the Draft Programme and Budget for 2002-2003 as well as the Draft UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity and its accompanying action plan. In debate 3, we proceeded to consider acts constituting a crime against the common heritage of humanity; the proclamation of 2004 as International Year to Commemorate the Struggle against Slavery and its Abolition; UNESCO's association with the World Book Capital; and finally, preparation of a new international standard-setting instrument for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. In debate 4, we discussed the draft convention concerning the protection of the underwater cultural heritage. And lastly, in debate 5, we addressed the issue of Jerusalem and the implementation of 30 C/Resolution 28, followed by consideration of 30 C/Resolution 54 concerning educational and cultural institutions in the occupied Arab territories.

I shall start with the first debate on the Medium-Term Strategy, which opened with presentations by the Director of the Bureau of Strategic Planning and the Assistant Director-General for Culture.

Overall, the response to document 31 C/4 was very positive and most of the speakers welcomed its quality and concision. They approved its new lines of emphasis and expressed their satisfaction with the three strategic objectives presented in the field of culture. In particular, they expressed support for strategic objective 8 concerning cultural diversity, pluralism and intercultural dialogue, which some of them wished to see strengthened. Many speakers emphasized the obvious but often forgotten links between education and culture programmes, and called for better coordination.

Delegates acknowledged the emphasis placed on world heritage in document 31 C/4 and expressed their willingness to pursue efforts in this area. Other key issues raised were the dialogue among cultures and civilizations – underpinning the notion of protection of cultural diversity – and the strengthening of standard-setting work in the areas of cultural diversity and the protection of the intangible and underwater cultural heritage. However, some delegates also expressed concern that the link between culture and development did not emerge clearly enough from the Medium-Term Strategy and that the new avenues opened up by the Stockholm Conference may have been left too far aside.

With regard to the drafting and implementation of standard-setting instruments (strategic objective 7), Member States recalled the twofold role of UNESCO, first in proposing new instruments and secondly in enforcing them. The 1972 Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was unanimously recognized as the pillar of standard-setting action of the Organization in this domain and the basis on which any further normative work in the cultural field must be developed. During the debate, there was also discussion about the moral duty of the Organization to react and to mobilize the international community when cultural heritage is looted, stolen or destroyed.

On the subject of cultural diversity, pluralism and dialogue (strategic objective 8), delegates reiterated their unanimous support for the Declaration on Cultural Diversity, which they wished to see adopted by the General Conference during its present session. Some delegates stressed that culture and diversity are dynamic in nature and therefore not in need of protection *per se*. More important would be to look at measures that safeguard the conditions

necessary for their continued existence and evolution. In this same spirit, delegates emphasized that dialogue amongst civilizations and cultures must be sustained in order to counteract misunderstanding and mistrust. A review of the activities carried out during the International Year of Dialogue among Civilizations was requested and some States asked that its principles continue to inspire the activities of the Organization.

Finally, the Commission recommended to the General Conference that the recommendations by the Executive Board contained in document 31 C/11 be adopted, with the exception of paragraph 64 regarding the title of strategic objective 8. In particular, the word “pluralism” was to be retained, as are the recommendations emanating from the Drafting Group on document 31 C/4. The delegate of Germany wished to have these points reflected in the present report.

Delegates then addressed the linkages between culture and development (strategic objective 9). Strong emphasis was placed on new cultural approaches to sustainable development, the collection of statistical data and the elaboration of cultural indicators to support the preparation and implementation of adequate cultural policies. In addition, cultural policies, it was said, could not be determined without the full participation of all stakeholders in society, including creators, artists, educators, minorities and other marginalized groups. Delegates also underscored the central importance of mobilizing international multilateral bodies to sustain training in cultural management and related cultural professions, particularly in Africa.

Delegates unanimously recognized the priority given to the promotion of domestic cultural industries and crafts, and many of them warmly welcomed the proposal for a Global Alliance for Cultural Diversity with most praising its front-edge, innovative nature. Some delegates highlighted the importance of cultural tourism and asked for UNESCO’s support in this area. Finally, delegates underscored the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as key partners in implementing UNESCO’s culture programmes; they called for greater resources for art education and recommended greater involvement of young people in safeguarding the heritage.

## **Debate 2**

During its third to sixth meetings, the Commission examined item 4.3 on the Draft Programme and Budget for 2002-2003; Major Programme IV – Culture, as a whole; and item 8.3 concerning the Draft UNESCO Declaration on Cultural Diversity.

Immediately after some clarifications provided by the representative of the Director-General on item 8.3, the Commission recommended by acclamation and without debate the adoption of the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity together with the main lines of its action plan.

After the adoption, some delegates expressed concerns and/or comments on this item, which they wished to have put on record. The delegates of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom stated their concern about the inclusion of the words “legal instrument” in the first paragraph of the action plan. The delegate of Barbados expressed her uneasiness with the wording of the first sentence of Article 11 of the Declaration considering that it could give rise to differences of interpretation, and she stressed that market forces are not intrinsically a positive or negative factor in the preservation and promotion of cultural diversity.

Furthermore, the delegates of Slovenia, Belgium and Finland made suggestions and observations on the implementation of the action plan.

During debate 2, most delegates underscored that, now more than ever, there is a need for intercultural dialogue and respect for cultural diversity. This appeal set the tone of our discussions. It was thought that the unanimous adoption of the first international text on cultural diversity would be viewed as a major landmark for UNESCO's programme during the coming years and for the international community as a whole. As numerous delegates indicated, this Declaration represents considerable progress. But it will henceforward be necessary to implement the principles that it sets out, to develop its action plan and to adjust UNESCO's action towards that purpose. In this regard, although there was ample and general support for the draft programme as it was presented in document 31 C/5, many speakers called for a systematic assessment of results and an evaluation of the implementation of the next programme and budget.

The key role of the world heritage programme was once more stressed, although delegates of Pacific States asked for a more balanced World Heritage List. Support was expressed for the promotion of the 1972 Convention on the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. The World Heritage Centre was congratulated on its work, but several delegates spoke of the need for better integration and coordination between the Centre and the Culture Sector. A good many delegates also emphasized the need for stronger action to implement the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.

Delegates also expressed strong support for the development of a new standard-setting instrument for the protection of the intangible cultural heritage, seen as a logical continuation of the 1972 Convention. They insisted, however, that more conceptual clarity was required before establishing such an instrument. That effort should be carried out with the participation of the bearers of such heritage, in particular indigenous peoples. It should be undertaken in close cooperation with sister agencies in the United Nations system, particularly the World Intellectual Property Organization, to avoid overlaps. Several delegates also mentioned the importance of UNESCO support for regional or single-country actions in the revitalization of the intangible cultural heritage and praised concrete programmes in this area.

As in the case of the heritage programme, delegates welcomed actions proposed in document 31 C/5 for encouraging creativity, developing and strengthening the arts industries, design and crafts. With regard to the interactions between UNESCO's work and that of other international bodies, specific mention was made of the nature of UNESCO's action in the area of copyright. The value of the Global Alliance for Cultural Diversity for all cultural industries, such as books, music and film, was again emphasized by several speakers.

With a view to strengthening dialogue among civilizations and cultures, many delegates expressed their appreciation of the general and regional history projects. The delegates of Argentina, Panama, Turkey, Uruguay, Honduras, Venezuela, Colombia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Georgia, Brazil, and Barbados underlined the need, particularly urgent in the current situation, not only to complete these projects but also to exploit the new knowledge they provide in innovative ways. In renewing their support to this programme, delegates requested the assigning of additional resources to complete these projects. Delegates also commended the work accomplished by UNESCO partner institutes for intercultural dialogue, particularly in Central Asia and the Indian Ocean.

In conclusion, delegates emphasized: (i) further support for the conception and implementation of cultural policies and professional training in the field of culture; (ii) greater attention to linguistic diversity; (iii) the need to link cultural diversity to productivity in cultural industries and, finally, (iv) increased attention to art and heritage education.

The representative of the Director-General replied to the various questions raised during the debate and thanked all those who had contributed to the preparation of the Draft Declaration on Cultural Diversity.

The Commission then proceeded to examine the 27 draft resolutions submitted by Member States concerning Major Programme IV and the recommendations of the Executive Board in document 31 C/6. In addition, the Commission examined the budgetary provision for Major Programme IV. Upon completion of its review, the Commission decided to transmit its recommendations to the General Conference. They are contained in the written report of Commission IV (31 C/64 and Add. and Corr.).

### **Debate 3**

The sixth meeting of the Commission was devoted to debate 3 on items 5.5, 5.9, 5.15 and 8.6 of the agenda, covering diverse topics such as the protection of our shared heritage, commemoration of human history and projects to bolster creativity and development. Delegates discussed these items in a single debate. For clarity, however, we shall present them in the order of the debates as set out in the timetable of work.

Item 5.5 – Acts constituting a crime against the common heritage of humanity. Numerous speakers expressed their interest in, and concern for, the strengthening of UNESCO's action to protect the tangible cultural and natural heritage from intentional acts of destruction. The interventions dealt with three main issues, namely, the terminology to describe such acts, the ways to prevent their occurrence and the need to promote and apply more vigorously the existing standard-setting instruments. Overall, it was thought that UNESCO's role in this domain should be that of an educator rather than that of a "censor". Therefore, the organization should further emphasize education about cultural heritage values to counter acts of destruction and reinforce other preventive actions already led by the World Heritage Committee. Delegates also expressed their wish that any normative action in this area should be developed respecting existing international law and the sovereignty of States.

The Commission retained the proposal to pursue work on a draft declaration concerning the intentional destruction of cultural heritage, rather than on the intentional destruction, and it recommended to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution proposed in paragraph 7 of document 31 C/46 as amended.

Item 5.9 – Proclamation of 2004 as International Year to Commemorate the Struggle against Slavery and its Abolition. The Commission welcomed this initiative proposed by Haiti. Slavery was strongly associated with acts of violence and identified as one of the vectors of racism and intolerance. The persistence of slavery today – under new forms – should be condemned, as mentioned by the delegate of Finland. Delegates gave a positive assessment of the impact of the Slave Route project, particularly on Caribbean heritage. The Commission then recommended to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution in document 31 C/COM.IV/DR.3 as amended.

Item 5.15 – UNESCO’s association with the World Book Capital. A number of delegates highlighted the importance of this project proposed by Spain, which aims to promote literary culture and receives wide support. On the understanding that all world regions would be involved, the Commission recommended to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution in document 31 C/70.

Item 8.6 – Preparation of a new international standard-setting instrument for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. A large majority of delegates spoke on the need for an international standard-setting instrument to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage following the widely supported 1972 Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Many of them emphasized that, in the light of the threats facing traditional cultures in a globalized world, such an instrument was urgently needed to protect the fragile nature of this heritage. In addition, the importance of the full participation of the bearers and transmitters of this heritage was unanimously underlined and, in some specific contexts, close cooperation with interparliamentary bodies and indigenous peoples was proposed.

However, some delegates stressed that it was necessary to clarify further the concept of “intangible cultural heritage” and continue with the efforts already under way. They recommended caution in establishing criteria to define “intangible culture heritage” given its dynamic and evolving nature. Other delegates recalled the importance of working in close cooperation with other concerned international bodies, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization, in order to avoid overlaps.

At the end of the debate, four amendments were introduced respectively by Grenada, Australia, the Netherlands and Algeria concerning the draft resolution proposed in document 31 C/43. The amendments proposed by the Netherlands and Algeria were withdrawn by their authors. The amendments by Grenada and by Australia were put to the vote.

The amendment proposed by Grenada consisted in replacing paragraphs 4 and 5 of the proposed resolution in document 31 C/43. This amendment was rejected by 36 votes against, 19 votes in favour and 0 abstentions. The amendment by Australia in paragraph 5 of the proposed resolution concerned replacing the word “regulation” by “standard-setting”. This amendment was adopted by 37 votes in favour, 0 against and 18 abstentions.

After the vote, the Commission recommended to the General Conference that it adopt the proposed resolution in document 31 C/43 as amended in the light of the debate.

During the adoption of the Commission’s report, 18 Member States formally asked me to report to you about their reservations in relation to various concerns.

Please allow me to read the names of the Member States who have expressed their reservations in writing: Argentina, Barbados, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Grenada, Greece, Mexico, Norway, Netherlands, Portugal, Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and the United Kingdom.

First, it was firmly stressed that the issue is a delicate and complex one which requires a cautious approach.

Secondly, it was considered premature to decide at this stage on the nature of the required international standard-setting instrument.

Consequently, it was not considered appropriate to keep in the proposed resolution, in paragraphs 4 and 5, mention of an “international Convention”, preference being given to the wording “international standard-setting instrument”.

Lastly, some Member States wished the “Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions covered by the terms of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution” to be strictly applied.

#### **Debate 4**

The Commission then considered and debated item 8.4 concerning the elaboration of a new international instrument concerning the protection of the underwater cultural heritage on the basis of documents 31 C/24 and Corr. 1 and 2 and Rev.

The Chairperson of the fourth meeting of experts on the draft convention concerning the protection of the underwater cultural heritage, Mr C. Lund, was invited to present a brief summary of the background to the negotiations on the draft convention.

While all delegates indicated their support for UNESCO’s work on the protection of the underwater cultural heritage, some States thought more time should have been given to the negotiations and regretted that it was not possible to adopt the convention by consensus. Most States, however, emphasized the delicate balance that had been reached and the spirit of compromise that had prevailed during the formal and informal work carried out by the Secretariat in recent years, as well as the intensity of the negotiations, both formal and informal.

A vast majority of delegates – including the Group of 77 – were in favour of the draft convention and wished to adopt it without amendment. A number emphasized the urgent need for the convention. Others had reservations relating to the provisions concerning control on the continental shelf and the handling of warships. While some thought that it was not compatible with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), others regretted that, because the underwater cultural heritage convention was based on the Law of the Sea, it excluded States that were not party to UNCLOS. The majority of States, however, thought that the new convention did conform to the Convention on the Law of the Sea. All Member States reaffirmed their commitment to the Rules set out in the annex, which were inspired by the Charter of the International Council on Monuments and Sites.

At this stage of the debate, the representative of the Director-General intervened to stress the urgent need for suitable protection of the underwater cultural heritage, along the lines of the protection granted to archaeological excavations on land. He highlighted the considerable step forward that such a fourth standard-setting instrument for heritage protection would represent if adopted. To that end he urged States to deposit, as soon as possible, the 20 instruments of ratification required for it to enter into force.

The Commission then turned to consideration of the draft resolution. The Russian Federation and the United Kingdom jointly moved an amendment that was voted on and not retained. France withdrew its proposed amendment. The Commission then voted on the adoption of the Convention as reflected in document 31 C/24 and decided to recommend its adoption to the plenary of the General Conference with 94 votes in favour, five against and 19 abstentions.

Fifteen Member States made declarations to explain their vote and one Observer delegate made a statement. During the adoption of the Commission's report, some Member States formally asked me to report to you about their reservations in relation to various concerns and some provided these in writing.

Australia voted for the Convention because it represented a delicate balance struck over many years' negotiations and on the understanding that Article 2, paragraph 11, which was added after the approval of the text by the expert committee, referred only to territorial disputes.

Cote d'Ivoire voted for the Convention because the need for training is urgent, and a training seminar for African States should be included in the programme of the Culture Sector.

Finland voted for the Convention, but regretted the absence of consensus and gave its interpretations of four of the Convention's provisions.

Venezuela and Turkey voted against, since both had problems with the provisions on dispute settlement, which relied on those in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 1982 (part XV) and neither are party to that Convention. They also did not accept the exclusion of reservations.

Turkey did not accept the use of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as a basis for the underwater heritage Convention.

Venezuela, for its part, stated that its position in no way means fundamental differences on the substance of the text adopted by Commission IV, as stated within the Group of 77 and GRULAC.

The Russian Federation and Norway voted against on the grounds that the text was not compatible with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and noted that the new Convention could not bind non-Parties.

Norway reserved its right to revert to this question in another forum. The Russian Federation thought Article 10 could be interpreted as giving new rights to coastal States, which would lead to inefficacy of the Convention in respect of flag States' rights and was concerned about the inviolability of sunken warships.

Uruguay and Greece abstained on the ground that coastal States' rights were not sufficiently protected by the Convention; Greece also was concerned with the provision which does not meet its critical concerns and with the complex system of Article 4 and Rule 2, which it believed was unworkable. Uruguay felt that it was also not sufficiently compatible with existing acquired rights.

Chile abstained on the ground that some of the provisions might conflict with its national legislation on the law of property and the scope of application of the Convention.

Colombia supported the protection of the underwater cultural heritage but needed more time to study issues of sovereignty and jurisdiction.

France and the United Kingdom abstained because of dissatisfaction with the articles on warships. The United Kingdom also feared that the provisions on the continental shelf eroded



the provisions in UNCLOS, and that the Convention would require it to extend the same very high levels of protection to all the many thousands of wrecks in its territorial waters.

Sweden also abstained, regretting in particular the lack of consensus on warships and on coastal State jurisdiction on the continental shelf and in the exclusive economic zone: not all States active in the Baltic Sea were in agreement and it feared a possible clash of regimes.

The Netherlands abstained from voting but reassured the Commission that it would continue to look for possibilities for accession and implementation.

Israel, which also abstained, believed that, with more time, a consensus could have been reached and stated that the Convention would apply only to States Parties. These views were also shared by Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United States, as Observer.

The United States of America, as Observer, explained that, while it supported many parts of the Convention, if it had had a vote, it would have voted against, because it objected to the provisions on jurisdiction, the reporting scheme, warships and the relationship of the Convention to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In conclusion, most of the States which abstained or voted against the adoption of the Convention expressed their satisfaction with the Rules in the annex which had been adopted by a broad consensus and many indicated their willingness to apply them unilaterally even if they did not become party to the Convention or did already have similar rules.

## **Debate 5**

The last session of our Commission, debate 5, was devoted to items 5.2 and 5.3 pertaining to Jerusalem and the implementation of 30 C/Resolution 28 and the application of 30 C/Resolution 54 concerning educational and cultural institutions in the occupied Arab territories.

With regard to item 5.2, and on the suggestion of the Chairperson, the Commission decided by consensus to recommend draft resolution 31 C/COM.IV/DR.2 to the General Conference for adoption. The representatives of Israel and Palestine took the floor. The representative of Israel informed the Commission that he did not wish to be associated with the draft resolution and that he was not part of the consensus and transmitted his observations in written form to the Commission.<sup>1</sup>

The Commission then examined item 5.3. Draft resolution 31 C/COM.II-IV/DR.1 had been discussed and adopted by Commission II. On the suggestion of the Chairperson, the Commission also recommended by consensus that the General Conference adopt this draft resolution. The representative of Israel reiterated to the Commission that he did not wish to be associated with the draft resolution and that he was not part of the consensus. He transmitted his observations in written form to the Commission.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The statement by the representative of Israel on this agenda item during the adoption of the Commission's report is reproduced in the annex to this document.

<sup>2</sup> The statement by the representative of Israel on this agenda item during the adoption of the Commission's report is reproduced in the annex to this document.

Mr President,

I have now completed the presentation of the report of Commission IV. I should like to take this opportunity to extend once again my appreciation to all those who, in a spirit of cooperation and goodwill, participated in the Commission's work. My thanks also go to all the members of the Bureau of the Commission for their collaboration as well as to the representative of the Director-General and his colleagues, to the Secretary of the Commission and to his staff for their guidance and assistance. Last but not least, I should like to thank the interpreters, translators, room clerks and technicians without whose support and cooperation we would not have been able to have our debate.

Thank you, Mr President.

**ANNEX**

**Statement made by the representative of Israel on item 5.2 of the agenda  
during the adoption of the report of Commission IV**

1. The resolution on Jerusalem is political and biased. Its real goal, that of certain countries in the Arab Group, is to put pressure on Israel with arguments based on propaganda that have nothing to do with reality. Jerusalem, the three thousand year-old capital of the Jewish people and of Israel, is a superb city whose cultural heritage is carefully preserved by experts of high calibre, some of whom were with us last week at UNESCO. Jerusalem is a city that is open to all, and that has been so only since its reunification in 1967. Millions of pilgrims and tourists, including Muslims, visit it every year and can attest to this.
2. Similarly, there is no mention in this resolution of the acts of violence and vandalism committed by Palestinians from the Temple Mount against the Jewish faithful praying at the Wailing Wall. To this must be added work done by the Waqf on the Temple Mount, which has caused irreparable damage from the archaeological point of view.
3. Israel is profoundly conscious of the universal interest in Jerusalem and its holy places. Our policy is to preserve the unity and peace of this city, ensure access to the sites of all the religions and protect its cultural, historical and religious values.

**Statement by the representative of Israel on item 5.3 of the agenda  
during the adoption of the report of Commission IV**

1. This resolution makes no mention of the *intifada*, that campaign of incitement to hatred, violence and Palestinian terrorism, which is the main cause of the sealing-off measures and actions taken by Israel in self-defence. There is not a single criticism of the Palestinian Authority when its forces attack Israeli schools. Palestinian terrorism struck again yesterday, at Hadera, and the many victims included schoolchildren and students. There is not a word either in this resolution about the closure of the universities in Gaza by Y. Arafat and the killing two weeks ago of Palestinian students by the police and the Palestinian Authority itself, not by Israel.
2. To that must be added the total silence both in the report and in the resolution on education for hatred in Palestinian schools. There is nothing in these UNESCO documents on the methodical and systematic indoctrination by the Palestinian Authority's teachers of a new generation of children.

In classrooms and summer camps, on the television and the radio, in cartoons and books, Palestinian children are surrounded by a language of hatred and violence. They are trained to kill and are taught to give their lives by serving as human bombs.

A whole generation is being sacrificed by the Palestinian Authority to create a new generation of terrorists.

3. Last Thursday, during the vote on the budget in the European Parliament, an amendment was adopted as a framework for the financing of education provided by the Palestinian Authority. It was amendment 168 relating to programmes of action for the Middle East which specified, and I quote:

“These appropriations may not be used to support any actions, projects or programmes promoting principles or views which are incompatible with the fundamental values of the European Union; rather, they may be used only for projects supporting peace, understanding, reconciliation and the breaking down of hatred”.

The justification accompanying the amendment expressly refers to “schoolbooks which contain racist and anti-Semitic material”, and goes on to say “The Commission must work towards ensuring that European funding is not used either, by the EU or by multilateral institutions, to promote authorities or curricula and schoolbooks the content of which conflict with the fundamental values of the European Union”.

I draw the attention of delegates from the European Union to this important decision and I call on UNESCO to follow the example of the European Union. It goes without saying that the international community must not finance any education that corresponds neither to the values of democratic societies nor to the Constitution of UNESCO.