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ABSTRACT

Within the body of international development literature there are critiques of the homogenous agenda that can be a part of the process of globalization. Globalization can be a means of forwarding a particular agenda on to the world's stage — for example capitalism or human rights — an agenda that may include a single set of criteria to be followed by those involved in it. But can universal standards exist such that they may be unproblematically applied to all peoples, in any place? Some global organizations have built themselves upon the premise that universal standards are not only viable, but that they are necessary bonds between members of the human race. For instance, UNESCO is a specialized arm of the United Nations with a mandate to encourage and promote education around the globe. Because UNESCO's General Conference is composed of representatives of the Member States belonging to the organization, and since it is mandated to uphold the conventions established in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, UNESCO considers its programmes to be of universal necessity. But by looking more carefully at UNESCO's Basic Education programme and noting the *structure* of that programme, some non-universal assumptions come to life. The self-evident way in which UNESCO discusses the importance of educational planning and institutions, as well as administrative monitoring techniques, establishes as universal assumptions that can be traced to specific geographical and historical localities. For example, educational buildings are built on historical plans of self-discipline and moral instruction, and cartographical tools such as statistical charts and graphs construct localities and the people within them. This framework has its roots in a specific form of thought relating to the practice of governance in Western Europe, and as such can hardly be described as universal. By introducing this non-universal educational structure into disparate localities, UNESCO is actively encouraging a global conformity of educational space. This space is attached to and likewise promotes, a developed lifestyle modeled upon a particular historical experience.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The concept of 'globalization' continues to be widely used in both academic and popular circles at the beginning of the twenty-first century, often without any established, concrete definition for the term. One unfortunate consequence of the contemporary media's casual use of the terms 'global' and 'globalization' is that these words take on a popular meaning that is insinuated rather than explicitly stated. This popular definition correlates the process of globalization with a global economy, and therefore ignores the plurality of meanings which have been ascribed to globalization within academia (see for example, Appadurai 1996; Esteva and Prakash [1996] 1997). Through the mediums of television and newspapers the world is portrayed as a conglomerate of localities which are becoming increasingly more interdependent upon each other. This interdependence creates a situation that may seem to warrant the existence of institutions built to maintain the interests of a smooth global network rather than the interests of a particular nation or other locality.

With the alleviation of national border constraints for some entities and situations -- for example multinational corporations, global commodities trading, tourism -- a level of governance that supersedes the nation-state is required. Global institutions fill this void each according to their specialty, without necessitating a move towards building a global citizenry that would require a tangible, solidified government as opposed to more malleable institutions of governance. The idea of governance implies regulation and surveillance without the (somewhat limited) accountability of democratically-elected governments. Who is regulating at a global level, and to what purpose? And how can one standard of regulation conceived of at a particular place and time by a certain small group of people, be considered globally or universally applicable?

---

1I am speaking here of my personal experience with Canadian and some American media in the form of television programs and newspapers.
The United Nations (UN) stands out from the numerous global institutions in existence, based upon its claim to be able to become involved in an exhaustive array of local social, political, cultural or economic life, as opposed to specializing in one, or part of one of these areas. For example, the UN has a mandate to set standards in the field of 'human rights' for all people regardless of their local citizenry. These standards are meant to reflect rights that UN delegates voted to adopt as reflections of inherent basic tenets due to every person on the basis of their membership within the human race. To practically accomplish worldwide rights fulfillment, the human rights standards establish parameters which can be used to determine whether or not a locality has met, exceeded, or fallen short of, the rights due to all peoples living there, and where there is a failure to meet the UN standards, rights may be imported or developed by UN or other, technical staff. However some development theorists have questioned the 'universal' notions of the 'need' for development (Escobar 1995; Esteva 1992), or the concept of one world (Sachs 1992b). These theorists claim that these universal concepts are actually definitions that have been constructed and understood by political and economic elites within the developed countries in the years following World War II. How these specific constructions are furthered as globally applicable may be understood by examining the physical spaces that are constructed around and by them, therefore becoming global standards.

A close reading of a system's organizational spaces can unearth reasons for a particular spatial construction, reasons that have a specific historical and geographical context (for an example of this discussion, see Markus 1993). By revealing a particularized context claims to universality become suspect and destabilized, and this in turn allows for differing interpretations of the space in question to emerge. Therefore to inquire into the standards set by the process of globalization is to determine whether or not this process exists as a vehicle for the propagation of culturally-specific values, beliefs, and assumptions into disparate localities. It is to determine whether the UN's concept of
human rights is a conflation of specific beliefs rather than supposedly 'true' reflections of globally-held understandings.

By emphasizing universal standards of human rights, the UN is creating a climate of global regulation. This is not to say that the UN creates an army of government regulators and overseers who scour local communities for human rights transgressions. But by their monitoring of local life through their data gathering and statistics calculating, the global organization creates a climate where one set of standards is used to evaluate and, through risk of world-wide censure, regulate the existence of rights. This is not to suggest that the globe has become a standardized, regulated orb under the auspices of institutions such as the UN. My belief in the unpredictable power of human agency leads me to expect that different peoples coming into contact with uniform standards would react to them and incorporate them (if it all) in an infinite number of ways. To explore even a small number of these reactions falls far outside the scope of this paper. Instead I am more interested in the attempt made by an institutional body to construct a single standard of knowledge regarding human activity. Also of interest is the identification of the non-universal assumptions that form the history of those standards, and perhaps some speculation as to who or what could benefit from their global incorporation.

In this thesis I explore parts of the notion that human rights may have a non-universal basis by examining in closer detail one UN Agency — the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) — and its interpretation of one of the UN's Universal Rights, the right to education. I discuss UNESCO's Basic Education programme in terms of its claim to universality and evaluate it in light of some of the local particularities of its programme implementation. In Chapter II, I employ theories of space, development and educational structures to gain some understanding of the UNESCO programme's proposed effects upon localities through its reorganization of educational spaces. By examining UNESCO's global standards and questioning their universal applicability, a method for examining other global institutions is put in place,
adding a new dimension to critiques of various forms of globalization without condemning the idea of the process itself. In Chapter III, I focus on the particularities of UNESCO and the Basic Education programme; its history, and the historical constructions of the schoolhouse and its use of educational statistics. The importance of education not only as a part of an overall development programme but as a vehicle to legitimate the need for development within localities is used to question development's universal applicability. Chapter IV explores examples of UNESCO's introduction of its educational standards within different localities, including methods of local education self-regulation. Implications of this standard-setting and the introduction of regulatory tools into localities are then assessed in Chapter V.

The articulation of global standards in education by UNESCO is neither a treatise on education ratified by all peoples of the world, nor is it a natural concept of education mirrored in all of earth's cultures. Instead, it is a standard of education imposed by a small group of people who for the most part, share an understanding of education that has its roots in specific historical and geographic locales. This work identifies some of the local roots of UNESCO's educational structures, and it offers examples of the articulation of UNESCO's education into local spaces. UNESCO's use of space to impose a homogeneous educational programme structure upon all localities is examined because it is through the relation of space that the global is able to interact with and upon the local\(^2\). It is through this imposition of global standards that UNESCO is able to manage, regulate and reform ostensibly localized education. I contend however that education and its attached meanings (such as 'being educated') can not be disassociated from their social contexts, and that any changes in their organization effects many other local spaces as well.

\(^2\)Of course it is also possible that the local may react upon the global, reframing spaces to local rather than global standards. Such possibilities are noted here but will not be discussed, as the focus of this work remains centred on UNESCO and its mandate to standardize educational spaces.
By using UNESCO and its Basic Education programme as a case study in this work, I run the risk of personifying UNESCO into a 'thing' which has its own beliefs. Just as this global institution must manifest itself locally and therefore never quite uniformly, the organization is composed of men and women who each have their own differing opinions, expectations and experiences in the realm of Basic Education. When I refer to UNESCO's beliefs in this thesis, it is to those which the official seal of the organization has been applied. Often the official UNESCO texts will simply be authored by 'UNESCO', or if there is an individual's name then the agency has had certain qualified personnel review the work to ensure that it reflects established UNESCO mandates. This is not to state that there are some universal assumptions that dwell in the minds of each UNESCO staff member and that these have become the organization's official bottom-line. Rather, through processes of voting and decision-making by UNESCO officials, a set of mandates, rules and regulations have come to be composed and put-forth as official work without necessitating total personnel agreement. Some elements of an official view of UNESCO and its Basic Education programme are elaborated in the following section, and will serve to set the groundwork for the remainder of the work.

**UNESCO and Basic Education**

The standards set up by the United Nations to regulate human rights, like the purpose of the rights themselves, are designed to affect all aspects of social life regardless of the particular local context. The UN detaches specific concepts of rights from each other and creates expert organizations to specialize in the care and furthering of these human rights fragments. It is along these lines that UNESCO is portrayed as the UN organization which is placed in charge of education, science, culture and communication. Like the UN and other UN-affiliated agencies, UNESCO considers itself to be a global institution based in part upon its membership (national heads of state who have voluntarily decided to join the UN) and its mandate: pursuing a world peace by applying the tenants outlined in the
UN-constructed *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR; proclaimed and adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948). UNESCO's role in the UN's goal of furthering world peace is shaped by its areas of expertise. For instance, UNESCO's educational mandate includes attempts to plant the seeds of peace 'in the minds of men' through intellectual endeavours, since the organization claims that world peace cannot occur without a human understanding of its benefits (UNESCO 1995). As one step toward the establishment of peace within people's minds, UNESCO has defined a global minimum of education and associated it with the right to education as outlined in Article 26 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. This minimum is the Basic Education programme which emphasizes certain aspects of UNESCO's concept of education: literacy, 'early childhood development', and 'life-long learning'. The organization stresses these concepts as an important foundation for all other education, including general life development.

But while UNESCO doesn't directly dictate the content of Basic Education programmes to localities that implement it, the organization does make assumptions about the validity of a specific space and structural shape of education for all peoples. UNESCO, like its parent organization the UN, sets global standards that localities are expected to conform to. UNESCO's standards of education are meant to re-shape the spaces of education in any locality that they are introduced into. For instance, UNESCO recognizes Basic Education when it is organized into structures such as that of the schoolhouse and the classroom (UNESCO 1993). It also 'maps' people into quantifiable and measurable categories so that individuals are 'seen' in terms of their educational status, as well as in their relation to others (UNESCO 1995). Lefebvre ([1974] 1991) suggests that the reframing of spaces is a subjective and powerful act, since standards and structures are composed with purpose. In this way, UNESCO is helping to develop and redevelop discursive frameworks within localities by means of its educational mandate and structures.

The identification of UNESCO's Basic Education programme as a promotion of certain discourses is an important point to consider since this global institution attempts to
physically reshape one aspect of a locality (its education) in line with a uniform set of standards and guidelines that are meant to be applied universally. However, homogenous standard-setting is an expression of specific objectives (Rahnema 1976), in this case UNESCO's educational aims. These education objectives, and the shape of the means by which UNESCO hopes to achieve them, are not the result of a single global declaration. Rather, the shape of Basic Education has its roots in the Western European history of the schoolhouse (Hunter 1994), as well as in the purposes of post-World War Two development programmes (Huxley 1947). The historical reasons for the physical shape and spaces of education remain reflected within UNESCO's current assumptions about schools and learning, and this becomes intertwined with assumptions regarding education's role and purpose within overall social and economic development programmes. This means that while UNESCO's education programmes may not overtly state a non-educational agenda, the programmes' histories have stamped them with purposes of control, morality, scientific progression, and a place within larger discourses of economy and politics. In calling its Basic Education programme a global minimum to the right of education, UNESCO conflates its local, historical conception of education while negating those from which it is different.

UNESCO constructs frameworks and definitions of education and then equates participation in those structures with one's ability to function within society (UNESCO 1995:16), and through these actions UNESCO discounts alternative, local conceptions of education. By assessing localities and determining their lack of Basic Education, UNESCO is casting those spaces as below-average (or abnormal) and the people within them as in need of educational aid. Although there have been cultures and civilizations that have survived for centuries without the Basic Education programme, UNESCO conceives of a world where Basic Education skills are necessary for any sort of enjoyment of a quality of life. UNESCO's programme thus becomes a universally-acknowledged necessity only for those who see an educational reality reflected within the organization's
standards and structures. In this thesis I problematize the educational reality identified by UNESCO, by tracing the organization's global educational programme to a specific geographical and historical locale. UNESCO did not canvass the globe for educational ideas, standards and practices, but instead created its programmes from ideas about education that seemed to be self-evident to its founding members. Where did those educational ideas come from and what purpose did they fulfill? By placing Basic Education within its localized context of meaning and purpose, UNESCO's claim of a neutral, global educational standard may be challenged.
CHAPTER II
Conceptual Framework

The process of globalization is not a unified movement that bonds people together through mutual understandings and goals. Instead, any analyses of the global requires an incorporation of ideas that go beyond the rhetoric of national governments or institutional heads. It is not enough to listen to the careful words that are spoken by those who advocate for universal rights, even if those words are proposing an application sensitive to local cultures. One must instead delve deeper into the concept of 'universal' to understand what particularities are being hidden or favoured. For instance, development theorists have long been wary and critical of Northern interests which involve the implantation of 'universal benefits' into the South. Theorists such as Esteve and Prakash ([1996] 1997) have taken pains to demonstrate that global ideas regarding universal benefits have run contrary to beliefs held by peoples in differing localities. Critiques such as theirs indicate that universal notions may be subjective and particular, and in need of closer examination.

Some explorations of seemingly neutral organizations, institutions and belief systems, have taken the form of genealogies (such as Foucault's work on the western hospital and the prison, or Hunter’s investigation of the school). Such works contribute to our understanding of the peculiarities as well as the particularities of the socio-historical-localized contexts that have influenced the construction of current concepts, notions, and structures. Very often these genealogies illuminate strategic purposes of design, organization and spatialization that have become lost or 'taken for granted' as time has passed or location has varied. Therefore re-examining the apparent neutrality of space can reveal meanings that can in turn open up new avenues of inquiry and understanding.

In this thesis I contend that UNESCO presents a single programme of education to a highly diverse global population. However, it is important to note that UNESCO does not have a list of mandatory curricula that it disseminates to all educational facilities around
the world. Nor does the Organization demand global literacy to be within a single language, or request that all education programmes be exactly identical to one another. It does however impose, as natural and unquestionable, certain guidelines and assumptions about Basic Education regardless of the location of its implementation. This section examines the concept of universal education in light of the theories of development, space, and education. These theories set the stage for Chapters Three and Four where the exposition of UNESCO's attempt to change non-educational social spaces through its introduction of specific educational measures is discussed. The history of UNESCO's educational programmes is discussed and placed within their discursive contexts within this Chapter, in order to argue that the 'global' in the organization's definition of Basic Education denotes the international institution's belief rather than world-wide agreement. And while each locality introduced to these 'global' packages of education reacts to them in different ways therefore defying any sort of homogenous description of the local consequences of Basic Education's implementation, the point is that UNESCO has a mandate to alter different social aspects of localities through the introduction of their education package.

*Development, Space and Education*

Theories of international development, social space, and educational programmes and policies, have all crossed paths with one another within their respective literatures. For instance, the power that can be hidden within the production of social spaces has been discussed in conjunction with theories of both education and development. Theorists have also problematized the education that forms a part of development schemes (for example, see Illich [1971]1997), as well as realized the potential of education to develop, form, and aid in shaping social spaces (for example see Hunter 1994). This work examines the case of the seemingly benevolent UNESCO Basic Education programme and its attempts to affect localities, by drawing on the interrelations of these three sets of bodies of literatures.
These theories aid in particularizing UNESCO's universal Basic Education, which in turn allows for a critique of the programme based upon its application of locally-derived assumptions upon a world-wide populace. Before a combination of these theories can be discussed however, it seems prudent to examine each in isolation so as to paint a clearer picture of what is meant by the terms 'space', 'development' and 'education'.

First I want to clarify how I am going to use the literary body of work that discusses development since the development literature comprises a large and diverse body of knowledge. Perspectives regarding development can range from introducing new plans and models intending to 'speed up' and improve the process of a peoples' transition to becoming developed (as variously described in Hettne 1995; Esteva 1992; de Senarclens [1988]1997), to critiquing the purpose and need of development from cultural, economic, gendered and many other perspectives (see for example, Rahnema 1997; Araghi 1995). This work draws on the parts of that literature that views development from a critical perspective and that does not narrowly define such a process along exclusively economic lines (see for example, Lehman 1997; Escobar 1995). These development theorists and others like them propose alternative perspectives to mainstream development projects. The more mainstream projects often tend to concentrate on making the developing locality a more powerful player within the global economy, which usually includes unforeseen repercussions in all aspects of local life. This type of development becomes justified on grounds such as the obviousness of universal human needs/rights as articulated by the UN (Yalden 2000; Cooper 1998; Mayor 1998), which are applied to all members of the human family for the moral cause of world peace.

By equating development with peace and human rights, the term has also become associated with notions of progress (Shanin 1997; Illich 1992; de Senarclens [1988]1997). This equation means that development is seen as progress towards such goals as world peace and the elimination of poverty. To fulfill the development dream a package or plan is introduced that encompasses all aspects of life including industry, economic
(re)organization, medical treatments, and, for the purpose of this discussion, education. But Escobar (1992:134) notes that "[p]lanning inevitably requires the normalization and standardization of reality, which in turn entails injustice and the erasure of difference and diversity". This viewpoint sees development as a modern colonial movement (Rahnema 1997a) that destroys local ways of life, or alters them in a way that is beyond the control of the population being developed. The force of this change does not necessarily emerge through the military strength of potential developers, but through the construction of discourses articulated by the peaceful 'world community' such as the UN and its agencies (Rahnema 1997a; Escobar 1995; Sachs 1992a; Sachs 1992b). Escobar notes that these development practices are regarded by the developers as rational and objective, and therefore potentially universally sound (see also Shanin 1997); yet they carry with them cultural assumptions regarding reality (Sachs 1992a; de Senarclens [1988]1997). Escobar (1992:140; see also Esteva 1992) asserts that "knowledge produced in the First World about the Third gives a certain visibility to specific realities in the latter, thus making them targets of power". This First World knowledge is reified as a standard of normal life which can be measured in localities as a goal that has been met, surpassed, or that has fallen short of its aim.

This standard-setting process is akin to how Ball discusses Foucault's concept of normalization, which then becomes tied into notions of value and judgment:

By normalization Foucault means the establishment of measurements, hierarchy, and regulations around the idea of a distributionary statistical norm within a given population -- the idea of judgment based on what is normal and thus what is abnormal (Ball 1990:2).

By constructing a sense of normalcy around the notion of development, developers imply the abnormality of those places that fall short of the established industry standards (Escobar
Developers live within societies that fall within the established standards of normalcy and so attempt to encourage the idea that a development package is necessary within localities that are considered sub-standard. These experts are therefore the ones that people within the locality must turn to in order to rectify their abnormality since only the developers hold the knowledge and the means for becoming developed. This work takes up critiques of this type of development, and I attempt to add to them through my focus on UNESCO and its (re)framing of educational spaces. For while much has been written on general development policies including those propagated by the UN and its organizations (Sachs 1992b; de Senarcens [1988]1997), there has been a lack of focus on UNESCO's Basic Education programme.

Space enters into a discussion of both development and educational policies because theories of space remind us that its organization and production are socially constructed and as such have cultural meanings attached to them (Spain 1992). The space around us and the objects within space (including ourselves) are organized in certain ways for specific purposes. As such space is not a neutral concept, although it often seems as if it were. The historical and theoretical purposes of a particular spatial organization may be hidden from view so that the construction of the space in question appears to be natural and without agenda. With the reasons for a particular space's construction obfuscated, there is a temptation to believe that either there are no meanings attached to spatial organization, or that meaningful space does not exist at all. However space does not simply exist, it is actively constructed through words, meanings, and physical presences. In this way, space is "an object of discursive and technological construction" (Barry 1993:463; see also Hetherington 1997; Luke 1996), and it must therefore be produced and continuously reinforced and reproduced (Munro 1997).

The concept of space as a social construction has been used by authors to explore the meanings and practices attached to a number of social relations, such as gender (Blunt
and Rose 1994; Spain 1992) and colonization (Gregory 1998). In each case space is
discussed as a means of organization constructed by groups seeking knowledge about
another category of people. This organized knowledge is then mapped so that the "empty
and uninscribed" spaces of the latter (Blunt and Rose 1994:9), could be read and
understood by the former. Gregory (1998:75) describes the ability to map within the
context of the European colonial project as "not so much the rationalization of space as an
identity between Reason and Space". What I take Gregory to mean is that through the map
a visual identify is formed that displays a link between an idea about the world and an
ordering of that world based upon that idea. Therefore the map itself is not limited to the
form of an atlas but may be composed of statistical tables and charts, or whatever produces
the effect of ordering people, places, and things.

The organization of space also allows the mapped to 'see' themselves in relation to
those constructing the map. The importance of this is that those mapped can see
themselves as others have constructed them. For example, nineteenth century colonists
produced cartographical instruments that located peoples in geographical positions in
relation to a centrally placed Europe (Gregory 1998; Blunt and Rose 1994; Miller 1992).
Statistics of a population could be acquired in order to compare levels of achievement in
various social phenomena (levels of education, economic production) between colonizer
and colonized, problematizing the latter against the norm of the former (for an example of
how these techniques fit into notions of planning, see Escobar 1992). Under the auspices
of patriarchy, women are isolated as an identifiable group whose accomplishments can be
compared to a standardized, male norm. These representations of space are constructed
within a particular framework of knowledge, and as such reflect both the terrain mapped
and the assumptions of the mapper.

Discursive constructions do not only reside in such abstract conceptions as the
maps, charts and statistical techniques which allow people and places to be quantifiably
seen. Gregory (1998:84) reminds us that Foucault saw a disciplinary power in physical
spaces such as "enclosed institutions like barracks, schools and workshops", where the framing of physical spaces and the objects or people who live in them reflect cultural meanings and knowledges (see also Markus 1993). Spain (1992:3) also demonstrates that physical spaces can be constructed to allow access to specific knowledges to only certain groups of people so that "the organization of space may perpetuate status differences".

Because the idea of space, whether social space or physical space, seems like such an intangible concept, there has been a tendency to reify or naturalize the 'order of things' within space, without examining the reasons for that order. When the reasoning behind the imposition of an order is lost or forgotten by those upon whom it is imposed, then spaces become naturalized as do the cultural assumptions and meanings which are incorporated into them. This is what Pile and Thrift call the "practice of authority" (1995:49). When a discourse has been articulated or authored and then its writing becomes forgotten, all that remains is the knowledge of its existence. The ability to author discourses in the sense of Pile and Thrift's usage, is generally a prerogative of the powerful. But can there be universally articulated spaces?

This last question remains at the crux of the matter for universal organizations such as UNESCO. UNESCO has declared Basic Education to be of general concern, a human right which supposedly transcends local differences to create globally-applicable spaces of education. However Sachs (1992b:109-110) describes 'universalisms' as unsettling to cultures which are enmeshed in their own unique imagination; "[s]ince these cultures are connected to particular places with their own particular peoples, memories and cosmologies, they are vulnerable to a mental style which is not linked to any place, but rests instead on the concept of space". A universal concept such as UNESCO's Basic Education becomes unconstrained by boundaries of place or locality and particularness. Instead, it (re)shapes spaces into its own image which is reflective of the 'natural' order of things. But by bringing the authors or the reasons of existence back into the equation, the naturalness of an authoritative universal space such as Basic Education becomes undone
and the production of such a space can be deconstructed and reread (Lefebvre 1974:1991:17).

In this work the larger space of a global institution (UNESCO) is examined through one of the spaces which it manufactures, universal Basic Education. UNESCO and the UN claim to embody globality because their jurisdiction is confined to that which they have defined as world-encompassing: the quest for world peace and the maintenance of human rights. By constructing the space of the global along terms that are defined as universal (mainly that peace will occur through the safeguarding of the declared Human Rights), the UN and UNESCO have conferred upon themselves their own legitimacy which they bolster by specializing in the technicalities of their world-wide spatial sphere. How Human Rights or quests for peace become understood is up to localities to decide, as long as the global structures that the UN and its affiliates have erected are not contravened. To the UN and UNESCO, localities are defined as the 'non-global'; they are spaces that do not inhabit the organizations' own planet-encompassing ones, but rather only pieces of it. By this logic, international regions, countries, provinces, states, kingdoms, cities, towns and neighbourhoods (to name but a few spatial demarcations) all become localities when compared to the UN's globality.

However, the local which UNESCO most often deals with are the national representatives of its Member States. This is in keeping with the UN system of not interfering with a country's policies regarding its own people, unless the UN is attempting to rectify a gross human rights violation. UNESCO's programmes manifest themselves in many localities however, whether at the national level or in answer to a nation's request to install an educational programme in a town or region within the nation's borders. UNESCO can also provide statistics and surveys that further divide the locality of a nation into smaller localities of province, region, country-side, etc., so that an educational programme may target a specific area more effectively. Compared to UNESCO's globality however, these are all localities with which UNESCO interacts. While each of these
localities may be radically different from each other, they all share in the lack of claim to
universal ity which UNESCO legitimates for itself. Therefore for the purposes of this
thesis, localities will be considered as all various non-global entities with which UNESCO
comes into contact.

UNESCO's ability to frame space, to erect boundaries around how a space is
conceived and thereby limit the imaginative possibilities of that space, is due in part to its
ability to map. Maps themselves are shaped by contextual meanings and discourses which
render their information intelligible only within specific parameters. UNESCO's ability to
see, understand, and interpret localities quantifiably through statistical charts and tables,
can only make sense when the particular histories of these instruments and the expertise
surrounding their utilization is localized. Rose (1999:75) discusses experts as a
phenomenon tied to the governance of a population; experts can assess the normalcy of an
occurrence, and give instructions on how to correct abnormalities. This concept of expert
advice and strategies has a history connected to liberal European governments and the
discipline of their home populations as well as their colonial subjects. For UNESCO, one
of its main strengths lies in its ability to be a source of expertise for those localities
developing a Basic Education programme. The organization relies on the information
provided by acknowledged experts in a particular field, who lend their name to the research
upon which UNESCO may base its recommendations (see for example, Buchert 1998).
The acknowledgment of who can qualify to be an expert lies in the professional titles
earned by individuals through education and employment, such as the "policy-makers,
planners and educational practitioners" consulted for Chinapah's publication Hand book on
Monitoring Learning Achievement: Towards Capacity Building (1997). These expert
qualifications are reinforced within UN programmes aimed at providing multilateral
working experience for experts from developing countries who at a minimum must possess
"a university degree at MSc or MA level" or "a degree at BSc or BA level with a minimum
of three years' working experience in one's native country or two years' working
experience in another developing country" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1998). Experts communicate the shape of education which has helped to form their own professional lives.

It is through its experts that UNESCO has given context to certain non-global spaces, and has contextualized them within a hierarchical system that puts certain aspects of these spaces under UNESCO auspices. Localities are defined as being part of the North/developed nations/West, or the South/developing nations/Third World, and then further categorized by UNESCO in terms of its areas of expertise: education, science, and culture. The normal populations are those that fulfill their human rights obligations and have achieved specific standards for (in the case of the present work) the Basic Education needs of their population. Through UNESCO's cartographical devices, populations within the mapped localities are determined to be with or without literacy, basic life skills or elementary education. It is then based upon these identifications that programmes to rectify these deficiencies are developed. And it is through their identification and measurement of populations that UNESCO maps the globe and accords spatial dimensions to all facets of it. These dimensions become complex as they group people and places into a multitude of categories. Each of these labelings denotes a different shade of meaning regarding people's social and (in this case) educational welfare, and then compares these meanings to an institutionalized norm. This norm is the right of education that UNESCO measures as occurring within, or missing from, its targeted populations.

This work's critical engagement with UNESCO's universal assumptions focuses on the organization's attempts to shape certain spaces. UNESCO's globality is considered through some of its universal structures that it erects around the concept of Basic Education; for instance its physical demarcations embodied in the form of the schoolhouse and the classroom. As well, Basic Education is discussed in relation to the social spaces that are created through its cartographical techniques (statistical charts and maps). And while the focus of this work is upon UNESCO's Basic Education programme and its self-conscious attempt to reframe local spaces, another side of spatial theories reminds us that
UNESCO's universalized constructions must be manifested locally, and therefore interact and be affected by the uniqueness of local peoples and contexts (Appadurai 1996; Lefebvre [1974]1991). The impact of the local upon the global can change the structure of the latter space in untold, unforeseen ways – either in a positive or a negative sense. Undertaking to study such local impacts would move far beyond the scope of the present study however, and so the focus remains upon the stronger, more unified and heavily funded force: the UN organization UNESCO, and its Basic Education programme.

A third body of literature that is included in this study describes a particular educational theory and history that is the basis of UNESCO's Basic Education programme. This discussion of education centres around the pedagogical techniques that have influenced UNESCO, including the history of particular educational methods and the physical structures which house them.

UNESCO is mandated to concern itself with education as described within its constitution, in order to 'build the defenses of peace within the minds of men' (Power 1998:5). UNESCO's notion of education is also wrapped up with the concept of the universalization of rights, and global development (UNESCO 2000; Caillods 1997; UNESCO 1995; Mayor 1993; de Senarclens [1988]1997:199; Special Committee to the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization 1947). This entwining of the concepts of peace, education, and development occurs to the point where one of UNESCO's departmental directors has declared that "[t]he fight against illiteracy is an absolute priority among the Organization's [UNESCO's] activities, since collective development proceeds from the education given to each individual human being" (Symonides 1998:80; see also Buchert 1998; Power 1998). The conception of education as a tool of development has a history that includes education's role as a tool of colonization (Ki-Zerbo, Kane, Archibald, Lizop and Rahnema 1997). This point is an important component of this work because institutions can be considered
reflections and perpetuators of their creators' 'view of the world' (Illich [1971]1997).

Taken in this sense education is seen as a cultural practice (Grossberg 1994). In fact, Illich contends that the institution of the school as promoted by development organizations such as UNESCO, actually limits one's ability to conceptualize alternative forms of schooling.

The intense promotion of schooling leads to so close an identification of school attendance and education that in everyday language the two terms are interchangeable. Once the imagination of an entire population has been 'schooled', or indoctrinated, to believe that school has a monopoly on formal education, then the illiterate can be taxed to provide free high school and university education for the children of the rich (Illich [1971]1997:97).

Illich draws conclusions about the consequences regarding the institutionalization of a specific form of education which are beyond the scope of this particular study. But he recognizes that producing a definition of the parameters of what education can or can not be constricts local imagination. When an authority creates and promotes a school system, only those spaces created to house and organize the sanctioned learning become legitimate. What takes place in those spaces of learning becomes an official education that includes knowledge of the society shaping and shaped by the spaces of education. What falls outside of those spaces is considered to be at best, a sort of folk knowledge that can not be related to the developed world in which the schoolhouse belongs. This point has implications for our examination of UNESCO and its universal definition of the right to Basic Education. By privileging one form of school above all others, UNESCO is making a larger statement about a general form of social organization which it would like to see incorporated unilaterally across the globe.

If institutionalizing forms of education is part of a process of limiting local imagination, then it becomes important to ask how and why a particular form of education
has come about. One answer to this question as it relates to UNESCO's Basic Education takes into account theories relating to the structure of educational buildings. This includes the many-faceted meanings associated with the historical form of popular education that emerged from Western Europe (Hunter 1996; Hunter 1994), as well as the original intent behind the inception of Basic Education. One of the reoccurring themes that embodies both the physical structures and the historical purposes of education, centres around the notion of education as a practice of self-knowledge and control through self-regulation (Rose 1996; Ball 1990). In this sense, the goal of education becomes to alter one's behavior along specific lines (Hunter 1996; Rose 1996; Marshall 1990), and to construct a belief in the legitimacy of the particular goals being taught in the minds of those receiving the teaching. In the nineteenth century, this was an important tool for governments in Europe looking to legitimate not only their own control, but also to include all classes and populations of citizenry into working towards the welfare of the state (Hunter 1996; Rose 1996). Hunter (1996:155) explains that, "[p]opular education was not an attempt to realize the individual's inner self but a means of enclosing populations in a purpose-built pedagogical milieu capable of creating socially disciplined persons". Education was not conceived of as a path towards personal fulfillment, but instead instigated by governments hoping to legitimate their control over their population through teaching them a docile acceptance of their prescribed social expectations and standing.

Historically, the introduction of popular education was done for a variety of nationally specific reasons. For instance Prussian leaders introduced education to their population in order to promote the importance of urban centres over rural habitats, while in Britain schools stressed the importance of morality and diligence (Hunter 1996). These reasons of state were coupled with the educational buildings and methods of the Christian pastorate, which had for some time been instructing its 'flock' on the rules of moral self-governance through techniques of surveillance (Hunter 1996; Hunter 1994; Markus 1993).
How these ideas regarding the meanings of education shaped the educational spaces formed by Basic Education, is elaborated in Chapter Three.

In this work the three aforementioned bodies of literature are combined, and their point of intersection is used to narrow the focus of this study upon UNESCO's mandate to introduce a universal education programme that is intended to produce effects to be felt in all corners of a locality's social spaces. Basic Education will be outlined and discussed in this work, and the ability and desire of UNESCO to either contain education within a separate sphere or allow it to expand into other domains of social life, will be explored. By understanding the purpose behind UNESCO's choice of educational framework, especially in light of the goals and ambitions of general development programmes, the production of space involved in the Basic Education programme can be discussed more critically. For instance, Lummis (1992) reminds us that if we compare the fortunes of similar structures (trans)planted into dissimilar spaces, then we are committing ourselves to cultural blindness. Why look at the world as if only one method of cultural application is tenable, when we could see "not just two possibilities -- development or its absence -- but a multiplicity of actual and possible ways of ordering communities" (Lummis 1992:49). It is through the combination of spatial and development theories that various authors have been able to critique different development practices as failing to see forms and productions of space other than Western ones. Many mainstream developers believe that they are implanting progressive packages into seemingly empty or at best backward localities (Araghi 1995; Escobar 1995; Sachs 1992b). These localities are conceived of as empty because they are held up against a developed norm and found lacking. Perhaps they fall below some statistical mean that measures the number of schools per one hundred students, or some startlingly low percentage of the population can not claim to be literate. This emptiness can be seen by developers through cartographical or statistical techniques, charts
and diagrams, which inscribe a quantifiably defined reality upon the space in question (see Ilcan and Phillips 2000; Osborne and Rose 1997).

Cartographical techniques such as those described above are defined by Ilcan and Phillips (2000:472) as "the general ways in which peoples' relationships to others and to their social environment are plotted and coordinated in space by modern "mapping" scientists, such as development planners and specialists". Since space "is not a thing but rather a set of relations between things (objects and products)" (Lefebvre [1974]1991:83), the (re)framing of social spaces in localities by developers changes local relations. The role of education fits in with development's reframing of space since the purpose of the new social spatial structure can not naturally be intuitively understood, but must be taught. The knowledge of the meaning of the new developed space must be communicated and believed by those receiving the information if it is to become part of a new social structure or reality. Spain (1992:7) cites Hiller and Hanson (1984) when she states that "[t]he spatial structure of buildings embodies knowledge of social relations, or the taken-for-granted rules that govern relations of individuals to each other and society". In other words, the perceptions and organization of spaces cannot be separated from the social context that forms and is formed by them. By following this perspective I hope that this work contributes to a growing body of literature where development theories intertwine with spatial and other theories to form a well-rounded and compelling analysis of specific development programmes or organizations, and their attempts to affect local life (see for example, Ilcan and Phillips 2000; Araghi 1995; Escobar 1995).

Method

Within this work I am concerned that UNESCO is construing as universal an educational programme which is composed of specific geographies and histories. By conflating a localized programme into a global practice, the organization is (re)producing specific cultural assumptions within the spatial constructions of Basic Education. To help
demonstrate the non-universality of UNESCO's Basic Education programme, I briefly discuss the history of the phenomenon of elementary education in Chapter Three and how the purposes for its inception have become part of UNESCO's belief in its importance. This history is not a globally shared history and its design is of a specific purpose. In relating the history of the spatial purposes of mass public education, I am following in the methodological footsteps of genealogists such as Rose (1999), Dean (1998) and Hunter (1994), who trace the historical attempts, contingent conditions, and accidents, that have established institutions and practices and that made "a difference to particular spaces and the actors that inhabit them" (Dean 1998:185). Secondly, a close reading of UNESCO's contemporary models of Basic Education demonstrates the specificity of its shape (i.e., that the spaces of education are not left to local interpretation). The theories previously discussed within this study's conceptual framework as well as the formerly articulated historical reading, will provide a new and more critical analysis of the spaces of UNESCO's education. The history of the organization's educational programme exposes assumptions that are locally -- as opposed to globally -- articulated, while theories of space, development and education provide new means for understanding those assumptions.

A discursive analysis of the spatial constructions embedded within UNESCO's Basic Education (or what Rose (1999) calls 'perspectivism'), is an important tool to use when discussing issues relating to space. Barnes and Duncan (1992a:8; see also Ball 1990:2) describe discourses as "frameworks that embrace particular combinations of narratives, concepts, ideologies and signifying practices, each relevant to a particular realm of social action". My interest in UNESCO's Basic Education is in its framing of educational and certain social spaces, that then allows these spaces to serve as a vehicle for the reproduction of those discourses and practices which UNESCO introduces into them. A discursive analysis examines the structures or cartographical frames (Harley 1992) that are erected around the things that can be thought of and understood (Ball 1990:2), giving them a specifically demarcated space. Manufacturing these structures involves the
production of a knowledge (Gregory 1998) that names something, that creates facts about and quantifies it, and then compares it to a norm and problematizes it.

Within the bodies of literature discussed in this thesis, discursive analyses have been used in various ways to illuminate new meanings for a variety of topics. For instance Escobar (1995) has noted that the manufacture of development discourses has helped to produce notions regarding the poverty of the Third World. Poverty is a named condition that illustrates those stricken with it as lacking particular resources as compared to those who are not. Never mind that a lack of one resource may be accompanied by the bounty of another, one perhaps that remains unnoticed or seems inconceivable as something worth having to those who have expertly labeled the situation as inadequate. A discursive analysis is therefore essential, because it responds to a view of reality without succumbing to a further quest of an exposition of a true reality.

This juxtaposition of concepts of multiple points of view to a notion of the truth or of reality is the key to understanding a discursive reading. For instance Hamilton suggests that,

there is no "pure" reality outside of what is represented in discourse. There is no "something" outside of that which is already interpreted, except that which is to be interpreted in some future moment. In this sense, discourse does not represent reality; it shapes and creates that-which-is-believed-to-be-reality (Hamilton 1996:25).

Exposing discourses as constructions rather than as a natural truths may make a space for that thought which falls outside of discursive boundaries. Ball (1990:3) reminds us that, "[t]he world is perceived differently within different discourses. Discourse is structured by assumptions within which any speaker must operate in order to be heard as meaningful". In order to examine the space that UNESCO has constructed around an education which it
labels as both universal and basic, and to identify some of the assumptions that support this view, a closer look at the texts of the organization are entered into and actively reread (Barnes and Duncan 1992a). In this case UNESCO's texts are given a close reading in light of critical development, spatial and educational theories, while keeping in mind the organization's hoped for outcomes intended for the localities accepting its programmes. This critical reading will keep in mind questions that ask: how is space reorganized through Basic Education? Why is it reorganized in this way? Are there any other intended consequences (on the part of UNESCO) connected to this spatial reorganization? If there are, what can then be said about UNESCO's Basic Education in particular, and perhaps other global institutions more generally?

In this work, UNESCO's programme of Basic Education is analyzed using both official and unofficial UNESCO texts. The official texts (e.g., UNESCO 2000; Johnson and Symonides 1998; Chinapah 1997; UNESCO 1995; Lacoste 1994; Inter-Agency Commission 1990b) are more heavily relied upon as they can be expected to paint a picture of Basic Education that the organization will stand behind as UNESCO-sanctioned. Unofficial texts (e.g., Buchert 1998; Power 1998; Prasertsri 1996; Scriven and Associates 1975) are those that are often published/funded by UNESCO, although the non-UNESCO-affiliated authors stipulate that the views within their texts are in no way reflective of official UNESCO policy. However, these texts can be quite useful in elaborating upon cases where Basic Education programmes were implemented, or in questioning the relevance of certain policies that were enacted by UNESCO. Put together, all of these texts contribute to a description of UNESCO and its Basic Education programme which I continue to elaborate upon in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III
UNESCO and Basic Education

UNESCO’s founding members did not invent the concept of a popular ‘basic’ or ‘fundamental’ education programme. Nor was the creation of an international education agency an idea newly borne into fruition with the ratification of UNESCO’s constitution. In fact, both the idea of mass education as well as an international education institution have histories that greatly precede UNESCO’s inception. What UNESCO did that was unique was to inflate a specific notion of popular education into a universal concern, despite its local and historical origins. In this chapter I briefly discuss a history of the reasons for, and the shape of, the European schoolhouse that had an influence upon UNESCO’s Basic Education programme. This discussion includes an examination of the UNESCO definition of education: how the organization defines education and where that definition comes from. I argue that Basic Education is a programme defined by specific parameters that include a mandate to shape educational programmes around the world. However, this particular definition of education can be given a geographical and historical location which undermines its claim to embody a natural, universal Right. By ungrounding UNESCO’s claim to world-wide applicability, the discussion in this chapter lays the groundwork for a closer examination of the spatial assumptions associated with Basic Education.

UNESCO: an Overview of the Organization

The United Nations was formed in 1945 as a reaction to the horrors of the Second World War, and amidst hopes that it would become a force for peace with a mandate to curtail the ambitions of any prospective border-expanding despots. The initial founders of the UN believed that a key tool for the maintenance of world peace would be to establish a set of universal criteria, or Human Rights, to which everyone would be entitled. The fulfillment of these Rights for each person would generate an overall feeling of satisfaction,
thereby curbing the necessity for war. The founders of the UN were committed to the position that all of the universal rights were indivisible from each other — that they were construed as a package. They insisted on this view because the impetus for their occurrence, Nazi Germany, demonstrated that developed modernity was not necessarily correlated with peace and tolerance since "[i]n the middle of the 20th century — at the hands of an educated and technologically-advanced nation — the idea of human rights was simply extinguished" (Cooper 1998:303). The atrocities perpetuated by the Nazis during World War II changed how people conceptualized human rights from a "concern of sovereign governments" to the responsibility of all peoples of the globe (Cooper 1998:303). It was this idea of human rights that was eventually reflected in the constitution of the UN, as well as in the speeches from the Allied leaders, especially Churchill and Roosevelt.

Churchill and Roosevelt's conception of human rights assumed primary importance because the historical beliefs that informed the basis of the constitutions of their countries (i.e., the British Magna Carta and the American Bill of Rights) provided the basis for the formation of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) (Cooper 1998:302; see also Johnson 1998:34 for the influence these works had on the drafting committee for the UDHR). The importance of human rights became further emphasized by people and organizations who worked within the sphere of international development, most notably the American non-governmental organizations (Cooper 1998:303-304; see also Johnson 1998). Johnson notes that in the eventual forming of the UDHR, the concept of what human rights should consist of seemed self-evident to those involved. After all,

> even those members of the Commission [formed to create the UDHR] who represented non-European countries were, themselves, largely educated in the European tradition, either in Europe or the United States or

---

3 Both the British Magna Carta and the United States' Bill of Rights are based on the concept of 'natural law' which supposes that all people are born innately good.
in the institutions established in their own countries by representatives of
European colonial powers (Johnson 1998:47).

This 'universal' Declaration was therefore created within a non-universal discursive
framework that in turn has helped to establish the placement of subsequent Rights-based
development programmes.

But because the UDHR has been signed by a multitude of differing nations, some
authors suggest that that allows the Declaration to rise above its Western roots into the
realm of global applicability (Yalden 2000). Others simply state that "[h]uman rights are
universal because they transcend cultural differences and political systems and should be
guaranteed without exception" (Fournier 2000:384; see also Mayor 1998:5). However, in
order to agree that these Rights have global relevance, we must first believe that every
national leader speaks for his or her people, and that every signature on the UDHR means
complete national compliance with its tenets4.

With the UDHR established and ratified, any contravention of the Rights by a
government was supposed to legitimate international intervention within the offender's
national borders. The UN thus took it upon itself to develop human rights within those
localities which lacked either some or all of them. The aim of the UN was to assist "the
poorer countries in the world" (Cole 1987:4), and this mandate was included within the
United Nations Charter, the UDHR, and the Charter of the World Bank (United Nations
Conference on Trade and Development 1985:9). It was thought that intertwining notions
of development, Universal Rights, and peace, would create the tool that would allow the
UN to facilitate a progression into a more benevolent future5 (Mayor 1998; for examples

4I am reminded here of the Quebec government's response to the demonstrators at the OAS
summit in Quebec City recently. The force displayed by the government (Canada has
signed the UDHR) contravenes Article 20 of the Universal Declaration -- the right to
peaceful assembly -- among others.
5Of course, as the memories of the Second World War began to fade and the Cold War
loomed large, the impetus to 'develop' the Third World took on a different urgency. While
the rhetoric of peace through prosperity remained, Third World development also became a
and a discussion of the UN's faith in progress and peace, see UNESCO 2000:75; Sachs 1992b:103; de Senarclens [1988]1997:190; Cole 1987:7). In this way the UN produced discourses that claimed:

> to be ahistorical and apolitical on subjects as varied as planning and investments, agrarian reform and public administration, as if the understanding or management of those development elements could be conceived in terms that are universally beyond challenge (de Senarclens [1988]1997:195).

How these Rights are constructed and implemented under UN auspices however, indicate that whether or not the belief in these Rights is universal, their method of delivery is not. Commonsense notions regarding how education should be structured and evaluated for instance, carry historical and localized cultural values that fall far short of universal understanding. By recognizing this particularity, the UN finds itself in a position where it is required to educate populations on the existence of its UN-constructed Universal Truths.

Since Universal Rights are meant to cover all areas of an individual's life as one way to protect "against being justifiably used or sacrificed in certain ways for purposes worthy or unworthy" (Nagel 1999:35; see also, United Nations [1978]1983a:1), the UN has constructed different agencies to specialize in each of the Declaration's Articles. This means that each organization has jurisdiction over a different component of an overall development programme. UNESCO was created to handle UN business concerning issues dealing with education, science, or culture, and believes itself uniquely situated to "both plan and carry out actions which take into account the interrelationship between these different fields" (UNESCO 1993:14). For the purpose of this paper however, it is UNESCO's participation in the field of education that remains the focus.

Education is defined as a Universal Right by the UN in Article 26 of the *Universal Declaration*. The desire to have education available and accessible to all took shape because "[e]ducation is both a human right and a vital means of promoting peace and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms generally" (Matsuura 2000:5; see also UNESCO 2000:16). Education is a Right in and of itself, but it also becomes a means of introducing the concepts of Universal Rights to others (United Nations [1978]1983b:4). How does UNESCO contribute to the furthering of Rights and universal development? Before continuing a discussion about UNESCO and its Basic Education programme, a brief description of the structure of the organization is in order.

UNESCO was born soon after the official launch of the United Nations. At the first conference that formally established the UN, there was a recommendation that a second meeting take place in order "to draw up the statute of an international organization on cultural co-operation" (Valderrama 1995:21; see also Lacoste 1994:20). The conference was attended by delegates from forty-three countries who negotiated a constitution for UNESCO which then became a fully ratified organization of the UN in 1946 (Lacoste 1994:27). UNESCO's original and continuing mandate is of a technical rather than a funding nature, and includes:

6Forty-three countries seems like a large and potentially diverse cross-section of nations, although in Wells' discussion of the first five years of UNESCO's existence, a vast discrepancy lay between the number of representatives from the 'developed' North/West -- which also included territories in the South adhering to Northern policies, and the 'under-developed' South.

[T]he West (that is, the USA, Latin American countries still for the most part adhering to US positions, Western Europe and the White Dominions) constituted a comfortable majority on UNESCO policy-making bodies, being regularly represented at the General Conference [of UNESCO] by between 30 and 40 Member States. By contrast, representation for the Third World as a whole (Asia, Arab States and black Africa) ranged from a low of 7 countries at the 2nd session in 1947 to a high of 18 in 1949 and 1950 (Wells 1987:114-115).

If we accept that interests between 'developed' and 'under-developed' nations were not the same, then the unequal representation of interests will be reflected within UNESCO's final, formalized policies.
[f]ostering awareness and stimulating action; drawing up experimental models and pilot projects; furnishing technical assistance and consulting specialists; acting as a source of documentation and information; providing training — a fundamental resource generating multiplier effects; engaging in major intergovernmental projects, especially in the sciences; setting standards; developing seminal ideas that form the mainsprings of action and, with time, come to be valued as a rallying cry ... (Lacoste 1994:11).

In short, UNESCO's duties are to plan, organize and monitor projects in those areas that fall under its realm of specialization.

Because of its particular duties, UNESCO is a source of information and expertise that can be used to initiate, develop, and define educational parameters, rather than being a resource for Members to approach when they are looking for financial backing for their education schemes7 (Courtney 1999; UNESCO 1993; UNESCO 1991). To increase its network of experts UNESCO establishes relationships with other agencies, either within the UN or outside of it. This enhances UNESCO's image as an international player that participates in many projects without having to be solely financially responsible for them, or have staff who are experts in the subjects of any or all of the projects. Therefore, "NGOs are prominent partners of UNESCO, since their members are internationally known specialists on subjects falling within the Organization's field of competence" (Lacoste 1994:14). NGOs can be external sources of expertise for UNESCO which saves the agency from having to ensure that it houses an exhaustive array of experts on its staff. As well, an NGO may gain some prominence from its association with UNESCO which lends global legitimation to the NGO agenda, while diversifying the cost of the

7 Although UNESCO does not fund projects itself, it can help raise money from multilateral and bilateral donors on a recipient's behalf, or assist countries in preparing proposals for project funding (Escobar 1995; UNESCO 1993:10).
implementation or the source of expertise, of whatever project is underway. For instance, in the Monitoring Project that UNESCO participated in with UNICEF as a follow-up to 1991's Jomtien conference, the distinction between the two roles played by the different agencies became one of expertise (UNESCO) versus one of funding (UNICEF) (Chinapah 1997). In other words, "UNESCO remains the project's "think-tank", providing technical expertise, conducting training courses, designing and pre-testing software, and promoting exchanges between participating countries" (Chinapah 1997:126).

This distinction between UNESCO as an organizing, as opposed to a funding institution, is important for two reasons. First, UNESCO's budget is used to fund its own expertise and knowledge regarding education, and then to disseminate that knowledge. All of its energies are put into developing (sometimes in conjunction with other institutions or states) educational plans and programmes that may then be universally applied. In this way, UNESCO remains the undisputed final expert within the field of education, which gives it the credibility and legitimacy to be dispensing advice to its Members regarding educational matters. Secondly however, one wonders whether the importance of educational programmes does not depend upon the local social and economic context rather than an overwhelming global desire. While the mandate of UNESCO stresses the importance of universal education, the organization does not have the budget (as determined by its members) to fund a global education programme. Instead it must wait until either a state representative or a funding agency agrees that education is necessary within a particular situation, and then approaches UNESCO for help in either implementing a plan of education, or incorporating one into an already existing development plan. This policy is in line with the UN mandate to not interfere with national politics and government, but it is underlined in UNESCO's case by the agency's lack of funding. If we measure a programme's relative importance based upon the financial support that it receives, we can infer that while education was deemed important enough to be included within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the implementation of universal Basic Education
depends upon UNESCO's advertising, and the desires of funding agencies and their recipients (Courtney 1999).

But who specifically gives the technical, expert advice that countries can approach UNESCO for? Courtney (1999:122) explains that UNESCO has a "network of national officials and independent professionals" that compose its constituency and also makes up its sources of expertise (Lacoste 1994:14). While these individuals are representatives of over 140 Member States, development theorists such as Rahnema (1997; see also, Nandy [1987]1997) remind us that these professionals are elites within their own countries who have been educated to understand education within a certain structured (spatial) imaginary. A broader discussion of UNESCO and its role as an organization of educational experts will be elaborated in Chapter Four.

While the desire for a universal Basic Education programme may wax or wane depending on the time and place, the idea of such a programme has enjoyed some longevity. For instance, the concept of an international educational institution did not originate with UNESCO. UNESCO had a predecessor called the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation (IIC), from which it eventually inherited a large source of educational data (Lacoste 1994). In fact when the idea for UNESCO was put forward at the first UN Conference by the Minister of France, it was in reference to a desire to see a revived IIC institution. This institution had not simply gathered educational data, but had been involved in "establishing some sort of order in intellectual work" (Focillon 1937:13). This involved (among other things) projects such as reports and missions aimed at the reformation of China's education system at the request of China's government in 1931, which it made formally to the League of Nations (Focillon 1937:15). The IIC had been "[f]ounded in Paris in 1925 as the executive body of the International Commission for Intellectual Co-operation of the League of Nations" (Lacoste 1994:22), upon the presupposition that there could be "world-wide agreement on moral conceptions and a community of intellects in the quest for peace through a better organization of international
relations" (Munch 1937:48). These goals are echoes of the mandates outlined by UNESCO, and the IIIC dismantled itself after the Second World War in favour of the UN's version of itself.

The Importance of Education

- Education is both an expression and an instrument of society (Freire 1976:196).

As discussed earlier, the importance assigned to education did not begin with UNESCO; concern with mass education existed long before the organization did. However the belief in a universal need for education, especially where education is defined along specific lines, can be construed as a construction furthered by the UN, and put in place to bolster global development plans. In 1960 "[a] resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations recognized education, hitherto considered exclusively in a humanist perspective, as a factor in economic development" (Lacoste 1994:96). Education could be a prime means by which development could not only occur, but had the potential to become an emancipatory event from the local limitations of "ignorance and dependency" (Nyerere 1976:vii).

As noted earlier, the UN's concept of human rights was conceived of as an indivisible package. While specific rights could be measured, found lacking, and then targeted for improvement, it was understood that each Article of the UDHR worked in conjunction with the others. In this way, a picture of a minimum standard of a universal life emerges in which (among other things) people have the right to work (Article 23), enjoy leisure time (Article 24), and be guaranteed food and shelter to ensure survival (Article 25; United Nations [1978]1983a). The construction of each human right as a single part of a greater package extends from the conception of the UDHR to its implementation. The introduction of a plan to bolster or introduce one of the human rights into a locality assumes the existence and fulfillment of each other right, as they have been
conceived of by the UN. In terms of education, UNESCO's packages of learning become not only methods by which the Right of education is introduced or bolstered within a locality, but they are also vehicles for the maintenance of other Rights. For instance, people can be educated as to the best ways to grow crops to alleviate hunger, or in matters of participating in healthy lifestyles so that they might live longer. People can be educated as to the contents of the Rights which are due them, and how the UN and UNESCO can aid them in the fulfillment of those Rights. Education becomes a part of development (i.e., with the introduction of educational programmes and plans) and a process to facilitate other development objectives, such as in areas of agriculture and health. This is an important point to understand because not only are educational spaces constructed through development plans, education can reciprocate by shaping the imagination required to participate in development. Changes in overall local life through education programmes is remarked upon with pride by UNESCO, such as in the case of its 'education for development' in the Philippines in the late 1970s. At this time, development became the central focus of the educational programmes there so that, "[d]ifferent aspects of development, such as population planning, food production and environmental beautification are taken up successfully to enable pupils to learn about development at the personal, community, national and world levels" (UNESCO 1978:10). Education becomes

---

8The fact that an educational programme can be introduced into a locality for its own sake, or that it can be a method for facilitating another developmental objective, is reflected within Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Section one of this Article states that everyone is entitled to education, and that education "shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages" (United Nations [1978]1983:8). The second section reads (in its entirety):

Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace (United Nations [1978]1983:8).

Education under UNESCO auspices is therefore not only a Right but an instrument to further development and the maintenance of peace, which makes it integral to the development process.
a tool not only to develop a locality (in this case, the Philippines), but to instruct each person within that space on how their personal and local activities and growth fit into a global image.

Since the UN's universally applicable policies — whether in matters of Rights, education or world peace — do not include universally understood definitions, these global concepts must therefore be taught. In this way, UNESCO creates spaces in localities not only for educational programmes, but for other development plans to which UNESCO education has attached itself (Buchert 1998). UNESCO has tied education to the idea of progress, and so has "continuously supported the renewal of educational structures, contents, methods and techniques at all levels" (Power 1998:5). UNESCO justifies its interference in local educational organization by maintaining that the world is constantly changing, and so UNESCO must aid localities in keeping up with this pace of alteration and renewal if their people wish to "participate effectively in the development of their communities and nations" in order to effectively exist within the modern world (Power 1993:8; see also, Matsuura 2000:5; Caillods 1997:29; Sack and Saiidi 1997:18; Munro 1991:1; Special Committee 1947:220). In fact according to Caillods (1997:30), if one does not give aid for the development of global educational goals one is actually impeding the cause of peace and prosperity, because "[n]ot allowing able pupils to be educated or trained is a waste of human resources; not educating and training disadvantaged youth has a cost and can lead to violence and crime". Education becomes a part of an overall social life, so that its proper inclusion can mean personal and communal happiness, while the failure to implement educational programmes properly or universally may lead to general social failure. It is this point of view that "[e]ducation is the sine qua non for effective participation in modern society" (Mayor 1993:5), that legitimates the imposition of education programmes.

Introducing education and development as necessary aspects of survival — especially if it becomes tied to notions of the ability to enjoy any sort of quality of life —
begs the question, how did people manage to get along before the UN and UNESCO? Galtung describes education and development as a means to include localities into a larger discursive framework:

There is a basic structural similarity ("isomorphism" to use the technical term) between being made literate on the one hand, and being fed, sheltered, clad and protected on the other. In all cases one is a receiver, a client, being taken care of by nutritionists and food-makers, by town-planners and architects, by manufacturers of clothing, by sanitation engineers and physicians. There is a whole army with tertiary education to take care of you -- once you are willing and able to read their instructions (Galtung 1976:102)!

However UNESCO does not differentiate between its discursive practice of reframing local spaces and the universal quest for a fulfilled, peaceful life. The organization asserts that education must belong to each individual, because it is only through this common bond of learned values that "lasting peace, rooted in 'the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind'" (UNESCO 1995:16) can be attained. But what does this education consist of? What does universal education look like? It is by answering the former question that a critique of UNESCO's answer to the latter question can be put forth.

As a part of UNESCO development, education is a package that comes sub-divided into sections of 'basic', 'higher' and 'life-long' learning. Compulsory schooling "originated with recognition of the social need for education, which is why the three characteristics of compulsory, universal and basic were combined into a single policy package" (Tedesco [1995]1997:80). The focus of this thesis is Basic Education which is also composed of smaller categories: global literacy, elementary or primary education, education for community development, and life-long learning. This package of education
has set parameters that includes buildings that are divided into classrooms, and social spaces which are set aside for the purpose of specific types of learning. These parameters are aligned closely with the idea of a progression towards a peaceful, developed world that the UN idealizes within the *Universal Declaration* and its seemingly never-ending quest for further and better development. UNESCO's education is not a package of ideas that can be shared with local peoples and then altered to fit their needs. Instead Basic Education requires changes on the part of localities and so must be rationally designed in advance taking into account the identified deficiencies of the population targeted. UNESCO's education needs to be implemented by means of a plan that identifies (through charts and statistics) what type of education is needed, and where. But how did education come to be conceived of as a specified community space whose existence and productivity can only be understood through a quantified, statistical language?

The structure of education — whether in the form of a physical schoolhouse or a chart enabling one to see educational deficiencies and attainments — that is assumed by UNESCO to be a universal design, can actually be located in non-universal geographical and historical moments. Tedesco ([1995]1997:19) gives a reason for the particular shape of education: "[t]he contents of school textbooks and of teaching practices, as well as the general architecture of the education system, were ... responding to the need to guarantee the social order through the acceptance of dominant standards". The standards of UNESCO's Basic Education package has its roots in the first schools of Western Europe. These schools were designed with the purpose of creating a moral, disciplined, self-regulating and industrious citizenry (Hunter 1994; Amin 1976). This need was combined with the ready-made, well-established, socialization method of the Christian Church (Rose 1999; Hunter 1996; Tedesco [1995]1997). The schools that the Christian Church had established were more than institutions of biblical and moral instruction. In fact, they were places where people became good Christians through a pedagogy that included techniques of "surveillance and self-examination, obedience and self-regulation" (Hunter 1994:xxi).
The Christian instructors did not simply teach ideas and facts, but ideas about the self that became learned and internalized by those being taught, a method that was later kept in government schools while the religious doctrine was dropped.

Hunter (1994) notes that the first appearance of the modern elementary school was in early eighteenth century Prussia, formed in response "to the challenges to social governance presented by a protracted period of religious civil war and by the associated exigencies of social discipline and economic development" (p. xvii). This school was a success in Prussia, and was visited by foreign officials to see if the same institution could work in their own country.

[T]he German innovations provided a model for others to follow, as we can see when, in the early nineteenth century, leading educational officials and reformers from Britain and America made an almost obligatory pilgrimage to the Prussian Volksschule. The relative uniformity of the modern school was, however, more importantly determined by a different if related fact: namely, that the administrative and spiritual technologies with which European societies could develop the school as an instrument of government were quite 'rare' and therefore fairly invariant (Hunter 1994:xvii).

This single design provided the blueprint for European and North American schools, as well as their colonies.

How were methods of discipline, governance and self-governance meshed in the design of this school? Complex methods used by authorial figures (for example, government heads, school heads, teachers) to locate students and their performance within schools were designed through the shapes of the buildings and the monitoring records kept. Tedesco links the form of the school to concepts of sequence and hierarchy.
Sequence is linked to the development capacity of individuals, but also to the hierarchy of social positions. The education system was organized in a succession of grades related to particular ages. The ascent up the various grades and levels implied access to increasingly complex stages of understanding reality and to increasingly prestigious and powerful social positions (Tedesco [1995]1997:17; see also Galtung 1976:93-94).

Sequence and hierarchy were combined with bureaucratic governance to map and display those working within, as well as attending, the school (Morris 1994). Through the use of statistical techniques, governments were able to 'discover' a need for mass education (in the same way that the UN 'discovered' the need for Third World development) by mapping and problematizing populations within nineteenth century Europe as being unemployed, criminal, etc. (Hunter 1994). Discipline and morality became important concepts within the school, since it was hoped that elementary schooling would curb the tendencies of the so-called "dangerous and endangered populations" of the poor and disenfranchised (Hunter 1996; Hunter 1994; Markus 1993). The spatial structures of the schools as well as the written assessments of the students created an atmosphere of perpetual surveillance. Students were supervised in the playground and constantly watched within the classroom (Markus 1993), which encouraged them to monitor and censor their own behavior. For instance, early British educational proponents insisted that schools include galleries.

The gallery — a raised stepped platform on which students were seated in rows of desks — is one of those remarkable improvisations that remain unnoticed in histories of educational ideas and that fall beneath the dignity of the dialectic. Yet, in permitting for the first time constant eye contact between an entire class and the teacher who stood before it, the gallery was
the prototype of the single most important mechanism of the modern school system: the teacher-centred classroom (Hunter 1994:72).

Playgrounds were also monitored and used as devices for children to interact with one another -- the understanding that they were being monitored would keep the children involved in 'moral' play. This transformation of self was meant to carry from the spaces of learning into other social spaces (i.e., of employment) as a regulated and self-censoring population was built. This in turn developed new types of expertise to create this population; there were experts working within schools (i.e., teachers, principals, administrators) and those planning educational endeavours (such as statisticians and technical advisors).

Concern with morality and self-discipline is akin to UNESCO's belief that development and Basic Education will allow for a fuller, more independent life for its participants. That is, if development is going to change the shape of a locality's social life, then the people living there have to be taught to function within it. Indeed, the history of the school did not go unnoticed by those involved in UNESCO's policies in the early years of the organization's existence. In fact, a UNESCO Special Committee (1947:2) remarked that basic or 'foundational' education was the result of "an historic background in the development of the social theory of education; nor is it unconnected with the evolution of the social sciences or the long effort of mankind to achieve an ever larger measure of freedom and of self-control". Rose (1999:123) describes mass schooling as "the mechanism sought to promote social citizenship and compulsory education would be construed not merely in terms of pedagogy of habits of conduct and thought, but as the means to produce social civility and social peace". The mechanism by which UNESCO

---

9 Basic Education has a long history within UNESCO, although initially it was described as 'fundamental education'. Fundamental education was considered the minimum education that people needed to participate in daily life, and Basic Education maintains this approach with an additional move towards the concept of lifelong learning (UNESCO 2000:28).
seeks to build a foundation of peace and development in all localities is their Basic
Education programme. Now that this programme has been given an historical context, the
following section will particularize and expand upon its definition.

Basic Education

Officially, Basic Education is a programme "encompassing early childhood and
primary education, literacy and life skills training for youth and adults" (UNESCO
1993:10; see also Chinapah 1997; Inter-Agency Commission 1990b). While this may
seem to be a vague and harmless enough proposition, elsewhere in UNESCO's literature
Basic Education "refers to education intended to develop basic learning skills (i.e. the
"3Rs" as well as some basic life skills necessary for the children to survive, to improve the
quality of their lives and to continue learning)" (Chinapah 1997:3). This definition was
elaborated upon in the Monitoring Project that UNESCO participated in which had,

a specific and deliberate focus on minimum basic learning competencies
(BLCs) in the domains of literacy, numeracy and life skills. BLCs
represent the levels of learning in a particular subject comprising basic
knowledge, understanding, skills, abilities, interests, attitudes and values
which are considered minimum but essential for all pupils to acquire at the
end of a particular standard or stage. They can be regarded as attainment
targets below which learning competencies are not sustainable (Chinapah
1997:3).

Each of these domains, literacy, life-skills and numeracy, all come with justifications for
the reasons behind their teaching. Literacy is seen as a path to human dignity, life-skills
allows one to function and survive within one's environment, and numeracy develops
logical capacities (Chinapah 1997). It is not enough however, for UNESCO to see people
functioning and participating within their environment. Concepts like 'life-skills' have very specific structures and prescriptions within the Basic Education programme, and unless one achieves these skills via a particular method, UNESCO's statistics will reflect a lack of knowledge on the part of the individual. It is this ability to name, identify and group, that gives UNESCO a power over localities, since this is the power to *reorganize*. Local spaces that are identified and understood within UNESCO's discursive definitions reflect those definitions back to the people inhabiting the locality.

The structure of Basic Education can be difficult to define precisely. Most official UNESCO texts fall short of giving specific details as to what Basic Education consists of. Basic Education tends to be construed as a fluid concept, its meaning and implementation always slightly changing through time and space in order to keep pace with global social changes, demands and needs. Changes to the definition of basic, and its predecessor fundamental education have been made at various times in UNESCO's existence (Lacoste 1994). There are consistencies however (such as the presumed natural and unwavering need for Basic Education), and there are moments such as the one in 1990 when, at the UNESCO-sanctioned Jomtien, Thailand conference on Education for All, Basic Education became a plan solidified within two texts: the *World Declaration on Education for All* and the *Framework of Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs*. In these two documents that came out of the consultations at this conference, are attempts to renew the international community's commitment to the goal of universal Basic Education, and to ensure that "the basic learning needs of all children, youth and adults are met effectively in all countries" (Munro 1991:1). In these texts Basic Education is given a shape with borders that enclose a specific definition of education. The *content* of this education is left mostly undescribed (although there are hints as to what should be included), implying that there is room for difference of interpretation and implementation regarding the content of Basic Education's curriculum. There is less room to maneuver regarding the *structure* of Basic Education however, as the blueprint of a plan of education is given that outlines education as both a
programme and a process. This educational structure is put forth unproblematically by UNESCO as a universal method for achieving global Basic Education for All, and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. It is the claim of universality attached to UNESCO's Basic Educational structure, as opposed to the educational content, that requires further scrutiny.
CHAPTER IV
Spaces of Education: Planning and Becoming Educated

In the previous chapter I introduced UNESCO, its Basic Education programme, and the importance played by education within an over-all development plan. The Right of education is not one that works in isolation from the other rights articulated within the UDHR. Instead it must be seen as an integral part of a larger 'rights discourse' that assumes a way of life supported in part by UNESCO’s rearrangement of educational and social spaces. In this chapter UNESCO's Basic Education programme and its use of cartographical techniques are examined in more detail. Specifically, how do these techniques aid UNESCO’s ability to see the populations with which the organization involves itself? As well a further exploration of the physical rearranging of local space encouraged by the Basic Education programme will be discussed in light of the historical meanings of the schoolhouse that was elaborated upon in Chapter III. To demonstrate UNESCO’s application of physical spatial reorganizations and cartographical techniques, examples of UNESCO’s involvement in these areas are put forth and commented upon. These illustrations are reviewed in light of the ongoing discussion that problematizes the application of universalized spatial constructions into heterogeneous localities.

Introducing a Plan of Education

Part of the purpose of UNESCO’s existence is its claim that Basic Education is a universal right that is a necessary component to human existence. In recognizing a universal need for Basic Education, UNESCO then takes steps to determine where education is needed, and in what capacity. The organization recognizes that each locality fulfills its potential for installing education programmes with varying degrees of success, and that they are not necessarily blank states void of any educational processes. Therefore, while UNESCO’s idea of Basic Education may be conceived of as a single universal
definition, the programme's implementation may be already partially realized within a locality, so UNESCO's aid is only required in certain areas of education. To determine the educational needs of a locality or specified target population, UNESCO must be able to account for what education is currently available and then compare that reality with the organization's Basic Education standard requirements. To construct plans of programme implementation that will result in universal educational outcomes, UNESCO must spend time understanding the requirements of each locality in which it intervenes. The planning techniques that UNESCO employs to understand the Basic Educational needs within localities can fall into two types: the initial planning stages and the post-programme education monitoring. What these techniques are and how they are employed by UNESCO is discussed in this chapter, beginning first with Basic Education's initial planning stages.

UNESCO has universal structural standards for Basic Education, but it doesn't simply hand out carbon-copy educational packages to any locality that asks for it. Instead, before Basic Education aid can be offered UNESCO's experts must first assess the local educational situation. These experts may ask: does the locality in question fall short of UNESCO's standards in every area of Basic Education? Does a plan of Basic Education need to start from the beginning, or are there some already existing resources? Is this plan to be targeted towards all people within the locality, or only certain populations? To answer these questions, UNESCO collects data regarding the locality in question, and then assesses the information in relation to a standardized set of universal Basic Education criteria. Action is then taken based upon these results. (For examples on variants of these questions being posed and answered, see for example Caillods 1997; Chinapah 1997; Sack and Saïdi 1997.)

Basic Education is a programme that attempts to offer a well-rounded and complete educational package. Therefore "UNESCO's efforts to improve the quality of basic education are multifaceted, dealing, for example, with the training of teachers, the management of schools, the provision of learning materials and the measurement of
learning outcomes" (Power 1993:9). To be effective in all of these areas, UNESCO relies on methods of educational planning or, as it has been referred to by Jacques Hallak (1977), educational mapping. The ability to plan plays an important role within UNESCO's programme of education dissemination, and the organization prides itself on being recognized as a leader in this area (UNESCO 1993). This penchant for planning began in 1968 when UNESCO organized an International Conference on Educational Planning in Paris. That conference was attended by representatives of "95 countries, 8 international organizations, 8 intergovernmental organizations and 13 NGOs" (Lacoste 1994:129). The Conference was largely in response to a perceived international growing awareness of the need for scientific planning in the implementation of educational programmes. There was some concern that in a survey of 75 countries only some 40 percent had governments that had made a provision for the organized general planning of education (Gambert 1962:v-vi). The other 60 percent dealt with each educational need as it came up due to a lack of availability of planning experts. From then on educational planning became a big part of UNESCO's programmes since by mapping and quantifiably assessing populations around the globe, UNESCO could establish identities for people which would enable the organization to better provide an educational package for them.

Some of these identities mapped by UNESCO can assume regional affiliation\(^\text{10}\), or other forms of grouping populations such as by gender, income, or educational level attained (see for example, Mayor 1995:5). UNESCO further strengthens this conception of population groupings by building institutions based around such identities as in for example, the Regional Centres of education. In 1951 the first Regional Centre was

\(^\text{10}\)For instance, identifying a Latin American region presumes an identity shared by certain peoples to the exclusion of others — see for example UNESCO 1995:18; Special Committee 1947:147. By assuming that there was such a concept as 'Latin American cultural values' UNESCO created a population of Latin Americans that not only was composed of people with some sort of similar identity (the above cited UNESCO documents only assume its existence as self-evident, they do not explain what it is), but that that identity excluded non-Latin Americans. The work of identifying populations not only creates what is named, but what is not-named.
established in Mexico in order to target fundamental education in Latin America (Lacoste 1994). At that time the universal standard of fundamental education was to be developed through presumed similar Latin American cultural values, and then disseminated to the appropriate target populations. However today as in 1951, these "target populations' rarely have any say in these agreements" (Rahnema 1997a:387). But while these targeted people may not be consulted about Basic Education planning, they may be forced to become involved in other ways. Caillods (1997:20) notes that, "[m]ost countries have diversified their sources of funding: at basic education level [sic], parents and communities have been asked to contribute in diverse ways, for example, through the construction of schools". The responsibility of the target population in terms of their education does not just involve participating in the learning through the classroom setting. Physical room must be made for education within the community in the form of the school house, time must be found to partake within this education, and each community member must fund or build schools and programmes even if the educational programme in question is not meant to directly benefit them. Basic Education does not confine itself to the schoolhouse, instead it permeates all of local life and forces a change in the spaces and rhythms of the people to whom it is introduced.

The imposition of education and development programmes become legitimised because the experts linked to these programmes have identified a problem within a locality (illiteracy, poverty, non-industrialization) that needs to be rectified. This problem has been quantitatively measured — for instance, as a percentage of the population that cannot read or write — and can be construed as problematic when compared to a mean standard of illiteracy. While any illiteracy that exists within a population is problematic to UNESCO, by targeting populations of especially low levels of literacy the organization creates an illusion of realistic universal targets and goals that are imposed in one locality because these targets have been successfully reached elsewhere. Populations are not expected to completely overcome their problems all at once but can work towards their goals in stages
that don't aim for 100 percent literacy, therefore keeping localities within a development process that is never fully concluded.

Developers or Northern industry experts who understand the successes of one place, try to plan ways of duplicating that success within an 'underdeveloped' locality. Experts of this sort are involved in the planning of UNESCO's Basic Education programmes and, by problematizing a situation in one locality based upon their expert knowledge, help to reify that knowledge as a universal phenomenon since it can now be applied outside of its original context. The educational attainment of experts is part of the legitimization of their knowledge and ability, "as much as lack of schooling justifies the misery and powerlessness of the [local citizen]" (Galtung 1976:94). This expert legitimation is what Escobar describes as bringing the process of professionalism to the Third World:

This is accomplished through a set of techniques, strategies, and disciplinary practices that organize the generation, validation, and diffusion of development knowledge, including the academic disciplines, methods of research and training, criteria of expertise, and manifold professional practices; in other words, those mechanisms through which a politics of truth is created and maintained, through which certain forms of knowledge are given the status of truth (Escobar 1995:45).

By changing the context of the concept of education within a locality, UNESCO effectively restructures the imaginative possibilities of education based upon the understanding of schooling by its staff of experts.

Educational planning is a part of UNESCO and is developed through the experts on the organization's staff. These plans all revolve around new ways to bring the universal concept of education to a locality that lacks it according to UNESCO's standardized
measurements of educational achievement. Chinapah (1997:15) lists the general steps needed to implement UNESCO's education programmes: identify the problems; create a task force; prepare project documents; train workers in "survey methodology and data analysis"; and finally establish a monitoring system to assess the performance of Basic Education. Lists of this sort standardize not only the structure of an educational programme, but also its implementation. Caillods (1997) portrays educational planning as being part of a larger development agenda, so that educational goals become planned to take into account the need to encourage local demand for education as well as to tie the concept of education together with the structures of development and employment. There is a recognition that while UNESCO may advertise the universality of its educational programme, the belief in that universality is not itself widespread. For UNESCO the first step towards acquiring a world-wide consciousness in the universal necessity of Basic Education, is to teach those ignorant of it of its existence.

After initial planning measures are taken, the details of the educational plan can follow:

- teachers have to be appointed and posted in regions and localities where they are most needed, replacement teachers have to be made available when needed, salaries have to be paid on time, textbooks and other didactic materials or equipment have to be delivered to schools and put at the disposal of pupils, in-service training of teachers and systems' support have to be organized and provided in time for curriculum reform, buildings have to be ready on time and properly maintained etc. The quality of the educational process largely depends on the way these functions are performed — unfortunately, in an inadequate manner in many countries (Hallak 1997:7).
The author of the above quotation is Jacques Hallak, who in 1997 was the Assistant Director-General of UNESCO. This is how he sees the universal structure of education; that it is housed within an educational building, that that building is furnished with certain instruments of teaching, and that there are salaried professionals to run the institution and to disseminate knowledge to those who use it. However UNESCO is very careful to keep its beliefs limited to what it considers uncontroversial universal goals. While Hallak is a high-ranking official within the organization, some distance may still be maintained between his personal experiences and theories regarding education and the institutional mandate. In the following section however, I discuss a Basic Education plan that was put forth in text as a result of a conference in Jomtien, Thailand. These texts are attributed solely to UNESCO as opposed to a single author writing a report of the conference proceedings. Without a single personal name attached to them, these written pieces become UNESCO-sanctioned documents which I take to reflect beliefs given official status by the organization. The Jomtien Conference Plan is only one part of a series of educational plans elaborated on and subsequently published by UNESCO in order to support "the renewal of educational structures, contents, methods and techniques at all levels" (Power 1998:5).

**Jomtien: The Ultimate Plan**

The 1990 Conference on Basic Education held in Jomtien, Thailand was a chance for the 1500 participants\(^1\) not only to reaffirm their commitment to universal Basic Education, but to lay out a standardized plan of action to assist in turning this goal into a reality. One of the two texts produced from this conference, *Framework for Action*, was constructed to be a guide for those localities wishing to implement their own plans of action.

---

\(^{1}\)At Jomtien, there were "[d]eleges from 155 governments, including policy-makers and specialists in education and other major sectors, together with officials and specialists representing some 20 inter-governmental bodies and 150 nongovernmental organizations" (Haddad 1990:Preface).
relating to Basic Education (Inter-Agency Commission 1990b:1). How are assumptions about education reflected within this specific text?

First, it is revealing to outline the purpose of the text: "The ultimate goal affirmed by the World Declaration on Education for All is to meet the basic learning needs of all children, youth and adults" (Inter-Agency Commission 1990b:2; emphasis in original). To achieve this outcome, the Framework suggests that educational goals should be formulated in terms of the (numerical) attainments sought, the populations to be targeted, and the methods used to track progress (p. 2; 6-7). Existing educational resources are evaluated to see if they can fit within the Basic Education framework and steps are taken to involve all members of the community within the development of the programme (p. 4-7). By taking all of these considerations into account a local plan of action may be drawn up and implemented.

According to Framework of Action, a plan of action must operationalize the goal of universal Basic Education by determining a sequence of quantified targets that are drawn up based upon the initial local data. For instance, those implementing an educational plan must determine what percentage of the population (based upon their current figures) should become literate or be enrolled in school, and within what time frame. There is no questioning whether a literacy programme is right for a locality since UNESCO has already defined the Right to education as including literacy. Questions are not solicited from the population to be educated; they are not consulted about whether they want to become literate, or to attend schools. Instead low school attendance (as shown on the statistical charts) is considered a problem that needs to be rectified. Planning means targeting below-normal achievements as identified by UNESCO through their statistical mapping of a population. Planning starts from the problematization of a UNESCO-identified, local educational reality without any consideration as to whether or not the locality in question

---

12Unless otherwise specified, the information about the Jomtien Conference discussed in this section is taken from Inter-Agency Commission 1990b.
may construct the educational situation differently. From there the populations and situations identified by the maps are acted upon in ways that are suggested by UNESCO experts who have construed the situation as a problem, and are therefore unable to conceive of it in any other way. A plan of Basic Education implementation becomes a means by which a locality may be brought within the discursive spheres of UNESCO's support of peace through a developed, educated world.

So what happened after the Jomtien meeting? Caillods comments on the understood need for change in educational planning among the participants of the Conference:

Primary and, in some countries, secondary education cannot be generalized over such a short period of time without preparing enrolment projections, forecasting the number of teachers to be trained, analyzing the cost implications, preparing budgets, and carefully planning the location of schools. Plans have become rolling plans being periodically updated to take into account the latest developments. More and more planning activities are also taking place at lower administrative levels. Much remains to be done, however, in terms of policy implementation, raising attendance, promoting demand, motivating teachers to teach better and to innovate, administrators to manage education more effectively, etc. (Caillods 1997:32-33; see also Sack and Saïdi 1997).

Caillods' statement regarding what we might call 'the planning of planning' reaffirms the perceived need by UNESCO and its supporters for a continued emphasis on developing beliefs in localities about the imperative nature of education. There is an understanding that this programme should not deviate from the charts and figures that have mapped its structure, unless new charts and figures can be found (see also Munro 1991). As
Caillods's quote above implies, UNESCO's education programmes don't just serve to legitimate education and the development to which it is tied, but a further and perpetual move towards increased development and educational change reflected within the "rolling plans being periodically updated to take into account the latest developments". Basic Education and the historical assumptions associated with it, therefore become the basis for the ways that future educational endeavours can be conceived of, built upon, and understood.

The Shape of Basic Education

A programme of education means making education tangible and conceivable, and includes the introduction of schoolhouses, textbooks, teachers, principals, and administrators. It means that any society that was formally lacking in any of these educational items (and others) must now make a space to accommodate them in their community, home, and vocabulary. As well the education of peoples about Human Rights, including the Right of education, means the displacing of one understanding with the introduction of another. In this way UNESCO's educational programme has the potential to reorganize not only the physical spaces of people's lives but their spaces of knowledge as well (Sachs 1992b). Specific definitions of knowledge, education and learning become naturalized within the global sphere of universal Rights that has been constructed through UN policy, and with this naturalization it becomes harder to conceive of and articulate other knowledges or different forms and spaces of the transmission of those knowledges.

Hetherington (1997:186) reminds us that "places are not what lies on either side of the boundary, they are constituted through boundary work". What does Basic Education look like as it is constructed through its boundaries? The plan laid out for the installation of a Basic Education package calls for community involvement, the building of schools, the hiring of teachers, the promotion of literacy, and a foundation of education that includes
both formal schooling and life skills training. A development plan for a locality re-shapes the purposes and methods of many of its spaces, and these new ideas must be learned from qualified UNESCO personnel or their affiliates.

Let's begin the discussion with the example of the schoolhouse and the objects which fill and define that structure, since it seems one of the most obvious examples of the shape and form of Basic Education. Illich ([1971]1997) has recognized the Northern penchant for identifying education with attendance at school thereby automatically limiting conceptions of spaces of education. In fact, part of UNESCO's concern with establishing local Basic Education programmes is determining whether or not there are school facilities available that include chalkboards, student classroom seating, and a desk and chair for the teacher (Chinapah 1997:50). But why should these concerns matter?

Buildings are important to understand as systems of classification since "they organize people, things and ideas in space so as to make conceptual systems concrete" (Markus 1993:19; see also Miller 1992). The schoolhouse was a means for organizing its students, producing statistical information by which students could be seen by an administration, as well as physically organizing them into classrooms presided over by a teacher. Hunter (1994) ties the power of a teacher to the historical pedagogical techniques of the Christian schools, which emphasized the teacher/student relationship as resembling that of the shepherd with its flock. This was a case of the shepherd/teacher having access to knowledge which is then imparted to the students/flock, the latter owing the former obedience in exchange. This relationship is reflected within the structure of the classroom which is built so that the students are constantly surveyed. "The traditional classroom situation calls for a podium to elevate the professor over his charges, and seating arrangements to ensure a minimum of movement on the part of students" (Scriven and Associates 1975:3). In other words, schoolhouses are formed for an education that is based upon specific ideas related to the purposes of learning. "The division of children into classes according to age, gender, level of attainment or subject of study, and their location
in 'classrooms' according to pedagogic rules, is an overt statement of educational philosophy" (Markus 1993:20). This is reflected not only within schoolhouses (Hunter 1994), and classrooms (Markus 1993), but can be found in the purpose of the design of schoolroom furniture (Scriven and Associates 1975). Projects have been carried out by UNESCO in this latter instance, so that 'Western-style' furniture would allow students to sit at desks rather than on the floor (Scriven and Associates 1975).

The physical spaces of education are reflected within the structure of the schoolhouse, but they also permeate local social life. By correlating the concept of education with that of schoolhouse learning, education becomes compartmentalized to take place only within certain spaces (Galtung 1976). This compartmentalizing process effects not only concepts of education, but "[i]t influences the timing of household schedules, routines and plans, from the time to get up in the morning, to the use of leisure time and holidays" (Allatt 1996:172). Education is something in which one participates in outside of the home and which demands that home and social life make time for it. Boundaries are constructed around what education is and how it is experienced through physical constructions of the school, and the social separations of home and learning. UNESCO's Basic Education does attempt to reach beyond the schoolhouse with its conceptions of 'life-skills' learning as something different than, and complementary to, the formalized schoolhouse education. But that attempt only further compartmentalizes notions of education into smaller spaces of life-skills, literacy or numeracy, and reinforces the notion of the necessity of an education that must be spelled-out by a global organization.

Education at this material level also becomes revisited by more experts. The experts who planned the education within the previous section now have locally manifested counterparts -- teachers -- who disseminate knowledge to their students. Experts also aid in the standardization of educational spaces in ways other than establishing themselves and schoolhouses as necessary components of a Basic Education programme. For instance, textbooks are described by UNESCO as an indispensable part of education. The
organization not only establishes them as a necessary component, but also discusses the proper method for textbook production and distribution (UNESCO 1993). UNESCO considers textbooks as a necessary component in improving overall classroom achievement as opposed to students without them for whom "there is no alternative but to learn things by heart or recite passages written out on the blackboard" (p. 39). To ensure that classroom learning benefits from textbook use, UNESCO compiles and produces information on the technical aspects of their production, thereby constructing textbook standards. UNESCO maintains universal standards of textbook production just as it does for educational planning and school construction. The form in which knowledge may be read becomes as structured as the teacher disseminating information while standing at the head of the classroom, or the compartmentalization of knowledge into hierarchical grades, so that information is divulged in pieces based on successful completion of previous levels. UNESCO maintains a method of educational implementation that is embedded with specific historical assumptions, and that fails to recognize and therefore illegitimates, alternative methods of organization (and by extension different assumptions regarding teaching and knowledge). As the following example will demonstrate, UNESCO maintains these standards unfailingly even in the face of poverty and conflict.

A School for All Contexts: the Case of Afghanistan

Elements of the physical structuring of education, as well as the communication of the necessity of Basic Education, are furthered by UNESCO even in the midst of war. The recent turmoil in Afghanistan¹³ has meant that refugee camps have been constructed for those fleeing that country. UNESCO tackled the problem of providing Basic Education for these people by constructing partitioned tents to serve as temporary schoolhouses. These tents are called VBECs, which is short for the name of the area of their production: the

¹³The turmoil made reference to here was the internal Afghani disputes surrounding Taliban rule, pre-September 11, 2001.
workshops of the Village Basic Education for All Centres. These tents are equipped "with a room-divider (containing blackboard, pin-up board, bookshelves and storage space), squatting desks and educational material, both for teachers and students" (UNESCO 1993:45). In the midst of Afghanistinian turmoil and displacement a schoolhouse is maintained, as is the practice of mapping people into the categories that accompanies such a structure:

[a] typical VBEC includes three classrooms for children, a multi-purpose reading room where literacy can be taught to adults and young people, two or three workshops for skills training for both girls and women and men, one room used as a day-care centre to allow mothers to attend literacy/basic skills classes, a teacher's house, a well and toilets, areas for poultry raising and vegetable growing, and space for leisure activities (UNESCO 1993:45).

People in a VBEC are seen within grouped categories of 'men', 'women', and 'girls', and thus the populations described in such organizing tomes as UNESCO's Statistical Yearbooks are reinforced. This categorization of populations is also a means of reasserting UNESCO's belief system within this local context. Under Afghanistan's Taliban regime girls and women were also population groups that were identified and differentiated in order to exclude them from (among other things) educational programmes. UNESCO retains the same gender categories but for different reasons; girls and women need to be measured in terms of their participation, not their exclusion.

Space is also demarcated to separate the teacher from those to be instructed, and to distinguish education from other areas of social life, such as personal hygiene (the toilet), family (children are sequestered in a daycare), and nourishment (poultry and vegetables have separate spaces). The notion of leisure is separated from the perceived work of
school, and there is a demarcation between types of learning — the quote above describes literacy and skills training as two distinct concepts.

This example of the temporary schools in Afghanistan really does reflect UNESCO's idea of a school for all contexts, as the title of this section suggests. In an information pamphlet published by UNESCO in 1985, the organization describes the research it has undertaken to determine the environment most favourable to learning (p. 62). Under the title 'Norms and Standards' (p. 64) are a series of diagrams that illustrate the position of the teacher relative to the students within a school's classroom. The students are seated in rows of desks facing the teacher, the latter being positioned in front of the blackboard. The distance separating the teacher from the first row of students is two metres, and the classroom as a whole is stipulated as being no more than seven metres by seven metres, to allow the teacher an angle of vision that captures each student. This specified classroom spacing carries the historical assumptions of surveillance and class discipline that were discussed in Chapter III, and UNESCO published these specifications as a model to be copied in educational settings around the globe. This apparently includes even the war-torn refugee camps of Afghanistan.

The situation in Afghanistan that led to the creation of refugee camps is considered an abnormal occurrence, a hopefully temporary situation that will eventually be corrected. The camps are housing people hoping to return to their normal life, and while there may be a lack of material resources what is available is constructed to reflect UNESCO's standardized reality as closely as possible. UNESCO assists in this respect by furnishing an educational curriculum to the refugees and in reestablishing a particular schoolhouse structure, thereby reinforcing the notion that the two are somehow inseparable. It is not enough in this case to teach lessons to displaced students, the teaching must be done in spaces specifically set aside for such a purpose. By establishing this connection between education and educational spaces UNESCO effectively rearranges local spaces to
correspond to an ideal of universal organization, the groundwork of which is laid down in the UDHR.

**Monitoring the Educated**

For UNESCO to implement a plan of Basic Education into a locality, it must first comprehend that locality through quantifiable or mapped means (for example statistics, charts, or projections). After its experts assess the meaning of these data, UNESCO puts measures in place to rectify any local lack of educational indicators: schoolhouses are built, teachers are trained, or textbooks are improved. But are the goals of the implemented Basic Education programmes reached? Does the population targeted awaken to find itself basically educated? A second mapping of the locality takes place after the completion of the initial programme, and at this stage those being mapped are encouraged to adopt the cartographical techniques used so that they may monitor themselves. The static population groupings arranged on paper thus become perpetuated through self-monitoring. Numbers and percentages are evaluated for progression towards the target that, when reached, will signal the success of the programme.

To achieve this state of local self-monitoring UNESCO promotes a Monitoring Project which is meant to help countries develop sustainable, educational administrative systems. This allows localities to identify their own educational needs and then implement plans of actions to address any deficient situations. The post-programme monitoring collects information which can then be analyzed in one of two ways:

*[In the one hand, information in absolute terms -- scores in basic learning skills -- that indicates what has been learned, can be acquired. On the other hand, the findings must be analyzed and interpreted so that trends can be identified. It is even more important to understand why these trends are]*
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happening in order to recognize their implications for policy-making (Chinapah 1997:73).

Sack and Saïdi (1997:43; see also Caillods 1997) endorse the reasoning behind Chinapah's belief in the necessity of monitoring. In fact they stress the importance of continually assessing and improving an educational system. By measuring the outcomes of education programmes -- and hopefully obtaining an increased amount of education obtained by each student -- UNESCO qualifies the quantitative measurements of 'number of students enrolled', and 'drop-out rates'. In this way self-monitoring helps to reproduce the spaces of education that have been constructed within a locality based upon a blue-print that has been promoted by UNESCO as universal. Monitoring a locality's ability to operate a Basic Education programme within the framework constructed by UNESCO helps to reify, naturalize and legitimize as universal, that framework at the expense of any alternatives (Rose 1999; Law and Benschop 1997). The apparent neutrality of the statistics used masks the cultural meanings with which the numbers are endowed (Rose 1999; Escobar 1995; Barnes and Duncan 1992b; Miller 1992). As quoted above, Chinapah combines the forecasting of trends with the interpretation of the data collected. This helps to ensure that the educational structure will continue to be reproduced by projecting the necessity of these techniques into the future (Munro 1997).

Self-monitoring plays an important part in UNESCO's education programmes, but the organization does not let its own assessments of the global education situation lapse in favour of local reporting. UNESCO publishes series of texts that track educational attainment against standardized norms for specified populations, and the organization uses these texts for both the pre-education planning stages as well as post-programme monitoring. For instance beginning in 1952, UNESCO published the first set of statistics about women's education around the globe; its series 'World Survey in Education' began in 1955, and in 1963 the organization produced the first edition of its *Statistical Yearbook*
(Lacoste 1994). As well "World Education Report 1991, compiled and published by UNESCO, was the first of a series of biannual reports providing an analysis of the main trends and policy issues in education worldwide (149 pages, graphs and statistics, and a summary table of the main educational indicators in more than 160 countries)" (Lacoste 1994:349). UNESCO seeks to combine these statistical publications with national self-monitoring practices (Chinapah 1997), as it relies on nationally gathered data to compile texts such as the World Education Report. To this end UNESCO is (and has been) actively pushing for the international standardization of educational statistics, a practice that includes publishing studies relating to the necessity and legitimation of such statistical information.

UNESCO also involves itself with the "revision and updating of the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED)" (UNESCO 1995:113; see also UNESCO 2000:122-123; Werdelin 1967)14. Why are these statistics so important? They legitimate the need for an organization such as UNESCO by problematizing the existence of the world as it stands unaided by global interference. Before these statistics — and UNESCO's educational aid — the problems of illiteracy, lack of primary education, and life skills in the developing world, remained undetected.

The scope of the challenge to provide free and compulsory elementary education for all children in the world was not fully appreciated internationally until a decade or so after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was proclaimed. By that time, UNESCO had managed to assemble the first statistical estimates of the numbers of children in the world who were in and out of school, and national educational policy-makers in the less

---

14 Combined with the gathering of information, UNESCO is also asking for national governments to be able to present and interpret these statistics in a standardized fashion. For an example of this that includes instructions for countries on how to present data using SPSS, see Chinapah 1997, Chapter 4.
developed regions of the world had begun to implement initial strategies for expansion of their primary school systems (UNESCO 2000:40).

It was through the use of statistics that UNESCO was able to map and consequently problematize the state of educational achievement around the world, and then to use this knowledge as a means to legitimate interference based upon the notion of Universal Rights. Localities may then be unproblematically reorganized until they conform with and meet, the standards set through the UN and UNESCO’s interpretation of the UDHR.

Post-programme monitoring is not just about the maintenance of the re-spatialization of education within a locality however, it also reshapes the knowledges that are considered important and necessary. While I have maintained in this study that UNESCO has allowed for some local cultural autonomy within the uniform Basic Education structure, there are certain curricular inputs given by the organization. As the UN organization in charge of Science, Culture and Education, UNESCO defines and emphasizes all three of these themes within its structures, so that Basic Education programmes must include the involvement of science and technology. UNESCO wants to ensure “that every individual acquires an understanding of those aspects of science and technology which are essential for a full life in any particular social, economic, political, cultural and natural environment” (UNESCO 1993:40). UNESCO partitions and separates education into its own spaces and it also connects those spaces to other development plans initiated through the organization or the UN (see for example, Caillods 1997:24). Methods of educational evaluation for instance, include auditing procedures that may be used to evaluate the success or failure of any aspect of life outside of the educational realm. In fact auditing procedures are meant to encourage local-level self-evaluation as part of a normal routine rather than as an event done to fulfill outside stipulations. UNESCO’s final element in the implementation of educational plans is to teach the value of local programme analysis and review, that can be done automatically and independently of the organization’s
assistance. Local self-monitoring assures local compliance with the educational assumptions that UNESCO imparts, as well as a method of incorporating those assumptions into a bureaucratic framework that is intended to endure indefinitely. Examples of UNESCO's encouragement of such self-monitoring programs are outlined in the following section with illustrations taken from Cambodia and Portugal.

*Internalizing the Monitoring of Education*

After decades of war, Cambodia was involved in a campaign involving UNESCO and UNICEF to reconstruct its educational system (Prasertsri 1996). According to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Cambodia is ranked as one of the poorest countries in the world and so any new educational programme must take cost-effectiveness into account. As a first step in the educational plan, a survey of the problem was carried out and it was determined that Cambodia lacked an adequate number of schools, teachers, and textbooks (Prasertsri 1996:4). Coupled with this was a high drop-out rate and it was believed that "[u]nder such conditions, children in Cambodia, and especially the most vulnerable, are not learning even the most basic skills in literacy and numeracy, nor the skills, knowledge and values to face up to the urgent problems of the present and the uncertainties of the future" (Prasertsri 1996:4). The implementation of a solution to this problem found its shape in the idea of cluster schools:

The cluster is a group of between four or five and eight primary schools in the same neighbourhood or district which work together as a single unit. One school is chosen as the "core", and functions as the administrative heart of the cluster. All the schools in the cluster share their facilities, teaching materials, and even teaching staff. Local teacher training takes place at the core school (Prasertsri 1996:7).
A pilot project consisting of building seven of these cluster schools was initiated, completed, and eventually evaluated. This post-implementation evaluation reveals that on the one hand these schools are good sources of self-monitoring, and on the other, that they are a success.

Firstly, the cluster model is considered advantageous to use because it facilitates "the monitoring of the quality of teaching and teacher training at the local level" (Prasertsri 1996:9). It is also to be used as a resource to produce and disseminate educational data to the community. "The resource centre at the core of the cluster is expected to compile information which will assist local education planners — such as data on enrollment, repetition, drop-out, completion and access rates" (Prasertsri 1996:10). The school is set up not only as a device for housing teaching activities but to monitor those activities according to specific criteria. It is those criteria that have illustrated these teaching/monitoring cluster schools as successful: "Enrolment rates were higher, while repetition and drop-out rates were down. Learning achievement and the quality of teaching had both improved" (Prasertsri 1996:11). The cluster school program doesn't just raise learning achievement however, it has also left the localities into which it has been introduced with a shape and definition of what education is. This includes the ability of people within the localities to see themselves as educated or not, and the means to compare that image through quantified data to other localities' educational achievements. This act of comparison not only enables educational scores to be meaningful in a comparative way, but can be used as a method of surveillance of the educational system, as in the case of Portugal.

Portugal's bid to enter the European Union was contingent upon (among other things) its ability to modernize its educational system described as "behind the times and inert" (UNESCO 1991:21). Portugal's plan for educational modernization was based on UNESCO's programme practices, and once implemented the organization held up the country as a positive and progressive example for educational change (UNESCO 1991).
The crux of Portugal's educational update was a computerized internal-auditing system meant to pinpoint problems in the country's current educational practices and to be a source of perpetual self-monitoring after these initial problems were located. Portugal's educational system would move from 'inert and behind the times' to efficient and regulated, thanks to the implementation of a computerized, automated education surveillance system.

Computerization has revealed previously concealed malpractices; for instance, in some districts the number of pupils enrolled was over-estimated, and in some schools the rate of absenteeism among teachers was very high. But above all, the regular circulation of statistics has proved to be a powerful instrument in making institutions responsible and autonomous. Comparison with other results has encouraged institutions and individuals to correct their actions themselves, without the intervention of the hierarchy or directives from above (UNESCO 1991:23, emphasis added).

Self-monitoring has become a tool of educational management not only for the Portuguese Ministry of Education, but for each institution as well. This type of surveillance has the power to close half-full schools and move those students to other under-enrolled institutions, as well as to discipline teachers into full work attendance. And as in the case of Cambodia, statistical information allows people involved in these schools (students, administrators, teachers, etc.) to see themselves in a quantifiable form and to compare themselves with other institutions and individuals. By introducing monitoring as a part of educational practice, UNESCO's Basic Education standards become a part of the process of learning as opposed to something separate from it. Education is not just a programme whereby people partake and learn, it is a process that shapes people and reforms the spaces in which they live.
Part of the duties that UNESCO has imposed upon itself is the publication of statistics that reflect the global situation of Basic Education. These statistics display parts of a world educational picture that includes levels of literacy and student drop-out rates. Ideas about what education is or could be that are missing from this picture, become localized idiosyncracies that are not meant to reflect education elsewhere in the world. What UNESCO displays then are standards of education that the organization believes are globally applicable. For UNESCO, these standards reflect not only a definitive minimum conception of Basic Education, but can also be used as a means for localities to compare their own educational achievements to others', using common tools of measurement. UNESCO's educational standards are not only a way for localities to see themselves, they also become a reason to ask for the organization's aid in boosting low statistical scores. UNESCO's aid may then take the form of a reallocation of local physical spaces along lines that they have established as necessary for education (i.e., the schoolhouse), or an administrative system designed to maintain and evaluate the new spaces. Spaces are maintained, the people within them become charted, and UNESCO regulates the process by publishing its statistical yearbooks relativising localities' successes or setbacks. Failure on the part of a locality to achieve significant success may result in further involvement in local life by global institutions bent on further development in the name of (in this case) human rights.
CHAPTER V

Conclusion

I began this thesis by discussing the process of globalization in light of global institutions, specifically one of the specialized organizations of the UN, UNESCO. What does it mean to be global? One answer to that question in this work is that the global organization UNESCO self-identifies with this term for two reasons. Firstly it works within a mandate that aims to affect all localities in some way, whether city, state, or country, and secondly, it declares itself to be free of any localized allegiance. By aligning itself with a global concern rather than a local agenda UNESCO seeks to speak only to the interests that it represents, and thus portrays itself as an impartial authority that serves a greater humanity. From its inception the United Nations was conceived of as an organization that would facilitate world communication and peace, and was to operate without showing favouritism towards any particular locale. However the UN was created at a particular time and in a specific context at the behest of national governments and elite groups. The UN was created not only for a specific reason (world peace) arising out of a particular context (the Second World War), but its purpose was framed within certain discursive spaces. In other words, the organization is the result of a global agreement made only among some people and some locales. Despite this fact, the UN maintains that it is a universally relevant organization, and it legitimates that assertion through its twin mandates of two laudable goals: world peace and the promotion of universal human rights.

What are human rights? They are a construction of principles which were articulated and committed to record by a UN Committee, and later ratified by the UN's General Assembly. These rights were conceived of as universally applicable, minimum standards of life that are guaranteed to each person on the globe by virtue of their humanness. While many people have applauded the concept of human rights and worked
with the UN to promote these rights around the globe, others have questioned their universal nature and suggested instead that they are the product of a particular geographical and historical context (see for example, Esteva and Prakash [1996]1997:282). This claim must be investigated since the UN’s interpretations of the rights it has constructed forms the basis of its localized development work. If these rights and their interpretations are particular rather than universal constructions, what effect could their implementation have on those localities that receive them? In this work I explored some of the implications of this question by focusing the discussion on UNESCO, and how it interprets the universal right to education.

As an organization of the United Nations, UNESCO considers itself to be a global institution that fulfills its educational mandate on behalf of all of the peoples of the world, regardless of their national affiliation. Because UNESCO’s General Conference is composed of representatives of a multitude of member states belonging to the organization, and since it is mandated to uphold the conventions established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the organization also considers its programmes to be of universal necessity. But by looking more carefully at the UNESCO programme of Basic Education and noting the structure of the programme, some non-universal assumptions come to light. The self-evident way in which UNESCO discusses the importance of educational planning, institutions, and monitoring techniques establishes as globally-applicable some assumptions that can be traced to specific geographical and historical localities. Educational buildings built on historical plans of self-discipline and moral instruction are combined with cartographical tools such as statistical charts and graphs to construct localities and the people within them as subjects in a UNESCO-backed discursive framework. This framework has its roots in a specific form of thought relating to governance in Western Europe (Hindess 1996; Dean 1994) and as such can hardly be described as universal.

Both the UN and UNESCO have maintained that human rights should be conceived of as a whole package rather than as each right being a separate entity unto itself.
Education plays a unique role within this human rights package, functioning both as a right and a vehicle for the propagation of other rights. Basic Education incorporates particular assumptions about what local life should consist of outside of the confines of an educational sphere. For instance, UNESCO's schoolhouses designate separate, disciplined spaces of learning, and its planning techniques construct statistical maps of local educational achievements which UNESCO's educational experts encourage local peoples to internalize. But beyond this, UNESCO's education is based upon assumptions that health, science and cultural matters (to name just a few) require a classroom setting to be taught, and that the economy requires its participants to have some sort of scholastic degree. These assumptions place UNESCO's Basic Education within a discursive framework borrowed from the North and offered to the developing South. While the assumptions within the framework are not directly stated, they are hidden within the spaces of UNESCO's programme implementation and reveal themselves in Basic Education's physical spaces as well as in the cartographical techniques employed for expert analysis.

When I assert in this thesis that UNESCO's Basic Education programme embodies non-universal assumptions regarding not only the need for education but its purpose and place within a larger development context, I am echoing sentiments that have been variously discussed within development literature. Although they may not necessarily have been specifically discussing education, theorists such as Escobar (1995), Sachs (1992a), and Shanin (1997), have criticized the industry of development that Sachs (1992a:1) described as "a perception which models reality". Developers construe their work as being a necessary component in establishing a minimum quality of life in a locality that has been problematized as existing below or at that minimum. Development is necessary to rectify a situation that is lacking — whether in education, health, or economy — and to bring it in line with the standards of a reality that has been predetermined. But 'seeing' that a locality lacks aspects of development, fails to take into account alternate conceptions of reality that may use different standards and assumptions to construe as a success what others may read
as failure. This thesis explores UNESCO's Basic Education programme in order to identify specific instances where the organization has imposed one standard upon the world -- in this case spatial assumptions regarding educational organization -- without critically questioning the historical reasons for those spaces.

Space is an important component in this work because an analysis of space probes the reasons behind methods of organization and placement. The theories that organize spaces may be unarticulated to all but those who actively seek them out, so that spaces become reified into 'natural occurrences' as a consequence. By examining how UNESCO uses and conceives of space and combining this focus with critical development theories, I am contributing to a growing literature that discusses the United Nations and its development programmes as a means of furthering one local agenda on a world scale (see for examples, de Senarclens [1988]1997; Ilcan and Phillips 2000). However, how UNESCO's reorganization of local spaces affects the people who inhabit them is a discussion that is beyond the scope of this work; the potentially thousands of differing reactions of people to Basic Education across space and time demands an equal number of descriptions and analyses. Instead this work has sought to demonstrate that UNESCO is drawing on particular, rather than universal constructions of education. These constructions are then introduced into localities with the purpose of affecting social change in line with UNESCO's assumptions, that extend beyond the sphere of education.

The purpose of exposing the non-universality of UNESCO's Basic Education structures is not to insist that the homogeneity of the programme has transformed the localities into which it has been introduced into mirror-images of that programme. The consistent failure of Basic Education to transform whole populations\(^5\) (Illich [1971]1997) into literate, highly-skilled citizens despite national support, seems to tell a tale of

\(^{15}\)For instance, in UNESCO's literature one of the most difficult populations to 'improve', is Sub-Saharan Africa which has had decreasing statistical achievements at certain historical points.
resistance, reluctance or paradigm incompatibilities. UNESCO's failure is a reminder that while space may be reformed by one agent there will still be vestiges of the previous spatial shape, as well as the multitude of other actors who are making an impact upon a structure simply through interaction with it (see for example, Foucault [1978]1990:100).

Whatever the case for the failure of Basic Education here, it seems obvious to me that the solution is not to be found in more funds, better planning and new theories. Rather it might be more prudent to let real, structural difference exist. Taken to a logical conclusion however, this idea poses more dilemmas than this current work can address. For instance, could the representation of educational difference be made at the smallest level of locality, that of the individual? How would this alter UNESCO's current voting membership which consists of national representatives? Further, how would UNESCO assist (if it would be called upon to do so) these localities? What would the consequences of educational self-determination be, especially for those localities that have a vested interest in the universalization of those cultural assumptions that have been associated with Basic Education's structures? After all, some Basic Education for those countries that are still developing could inculcate a belief in the current order of things, without allowing any but the upper layers of society as well as the developed countries to move on to a form of 'higher' education (Tedesco [1995]1997:68). This means economic profit and knowledge-power is remitted to the control of the few that are in possession of it today. In this way education can be seen as a tool of domination for some, although it has also existed as a means for emancipation for others. But teaching and learning are aspects of all human societies -- people exist through the lessons of their own experience as well as by the examples of others. It is the structure of learning that can differ greatly, and the attempt at its homogenization stifles imaginative alternatives.
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