UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley

Glenda Sluga

UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley[*]

GLENDA SLUGA
University of Sydney

I N that curiously utopian moment bracketed by the end of World War II and the onset of the Cold War, cosmopolitanism made its debut on the new international stage of the United Nations in its literal translation as "World Citizenship" (from the Greek *cosmos* or world, and *polites,* or citizen). In the first few years of the UN's operation, delegates and functionaries portrayed world citizenship as the path to permanent world peace, and as a necessary step in the evolution of mankind from tribes to nations, from national consciousness to "One World."[1] At the UN special agency, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization or UNESCO, world citizenship was celebrated as the adjunct of an antichauvinist *raison d'être* and as a cultural manifestation of the Enlightenment premise that humanity was evolving socially, politically, technologically, and even psychologically toward a "World Community." Even as UNESCO's mission statement located the organization's role in the more generalized objec-

¹ "World Government" was rarely used in the context of the UN's operations, even though it was a common concept in discussions of the future of internationalism. See, for example, Hans Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations* (1948; New York: Knopf, 1951), section 9 passim.

tives of "international peace" and the "common welfare of mankind," [2] UNESCO proselytized world citizenship and One World through their programs and publicity on the understanding that these terms inflected familiar organizational precedents and political ambitions.[3] Although the international legitimacy of the language of world citizenship, like the idealism invested in the United Nations itself, was short-lived, from at least 1945 to 1950 a cosmopolitan view of the future of internationalism dominated intellectual and political visions of an anticipated new world order circulating around the creation of UNESCO.

In the globalized world of the twenty-first century, the history of the UN and UNESCO are attracting belated historical interest as significant transnational sites.[4] While political scientists have long shown interest in UNESCO as the axis of what was, in the post–World War II period, a newly constituted and self-consciously international public sphere, my intention in this article is to look more closely at the almost forgotten and historically specific features of the cosmopolitan language of internationalism spoken from the organization. If broached at all, the association of UNESCO with cosmopolitanism in the immediate postwar period is usually viewed from the perspective of the Cold War that followed, and its significance overwhelmed by the claims of national sovereignty and the anticipation of decolonization.[5] Yet, for all UNESCO's weakness as an international institution, its short-lived venture with the language of cosmopolitanism offers an important entrée into the intellectual history of that idea and its changing political and social significance. From a historical perspective, the UNESCO experience of

---

² See the preamble to the UNESCO Charter, and Basil Karp, "The Development of the Philosophy of UNESCO" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1951), p. 41.

³ Jo-Ann Pemberton provides a useful genealogy of the twentieth-century usage and variety of meanings of world citizenship and One Worldism in *Global Metaphors* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), see in particular p. 121ff. She describes the use of the notion of a "world mind" "discussed as though it were a viscous fluid penetrating and fusing together individual minds," p. 111.

⁴ See for example *Journal of World History* 19, no. 3 (2008), an issue dedicated to new histories of the UN, and the introduction by Sunil Amrith and myself, "New Histories of the United Nations"; and G. Sluga, "The Transformation of International Institutions: Global Shock as Cultural Shock," in *The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective,* ed. Niall Ferguson, Charles Maier, Daniel Sargent, and Erez Manela (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009).

⁵ This historiography really only exists as a footnote to studies of UNESCO, or biographies of its mainstays, such as Huxley. One excellent exception is Pemberton's *Global Metaphors.* See also Derek Heater, *World Citizenship and Government* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996). For evidence of the intellectual impact of world community see the chapter in Hans Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations.*

cosmopolitan internationalism suggests the political relevance for the twentieth century of the *longue durée* history of cosmopolitanism, that is, as both a form of cultural identification and as a utopian world-scale political ideal.[6] As important, it is indicative of the ways in which late nineteenth-century conceptions of race and empire remained uneasily at the heart of cosmopolitanism and internationalism.

The mid twentieth-century international romance with cosmopolitanism took many political and cultural forms among a number of constituencies. During the war, the term "One World" was popularized in the English-speaking world through the efforts of Americans such as the maverick political figure Wendell Wilkie, author of *One World* (1943), as well as the philosopher Ralph Barton Perry, who followed with *One World in the Making* (1945). The message of these texts was less radical than some of the interwar arguments for "world government" put by long-lived pacifists, including the Hungarian feminist Rosika Schwimmer from her American base.[7] Wilkie, for example, emphasized that the world was growing materially more interdependent, a point he illustrated by flying around the whole world in *only* 160 hours. He claimed that this existential shift required a new "One World" consciousness of kinship, shared problems, and shared politics. But Wilkie was most interested in making an economic case against a return to the American isolationism of the interwar period.[8] Sunil Amrith has eloquently described an Asian internationalism that "drew on a language of global citizenship and rights, rights which locked into a common struggle the 'wretched of the earth,' the recent and current victims of racism and colonialism."[9] In this article my aim is to begin

---

[6] See Jeremy Waldron, "What Is Cosmopolitan?" *Journal of Political Philosophy* 8, no. 2 (2000): 227–243; pp. 227, 228.

[7] See for example, Derek Heater, *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and Its Opponents* (New York: Continuum, 2005); and Joseph Preston Baratta, *The Politics of World Federation: From World Federalism to Global Governance* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 2004).

[8] Wendell Wilkie, *One World* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1943). See also Manu Bhagavan's discussion of India at the UN in "A New Hope: India, the United Nations and the Making of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights," *Modern Asian Studies* 44 (2010): 311–347.

[9] S. Amrith, "Asian Internationalism: Bandung's Echo in a Colonial Metropolis," *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 6, no. 4 (2005): 557. Amrith also describes as notable the internationalist—or more literally supra-nationalist—ambitions for a new world order that would see to fruition the nation-focused internationalism on offer in 1919, with its emphasis on the principle of nationality and its renewed relevance for colonized populations eager to throw off the yoke of imperial rule. See also G. Sluga, *The Nation, Psychology, and International Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), passim.

to unravel this multiskeined history of the relationship between conceptions of cosmopolitanism and internationalism, and the creation of UNESCO, through a study of Julian Huxley, UNESCO's first director-general and a man often described as the consummate world citizen.

When Julian Huxley was born, in 1887, his grandfather, Thomas Huxley, an imposing scientific figure and a great proponent of Darwin's theory of evolution, was still active in the Royal Society, and the Victorian empire was at its apex. This scientific intellectual inheritance and imperial setting provided the framework for most of Julian Huxley's career as an erstwhile biologist and zoologist and popularizer of science. It inevitably seeped into his post–World War II conception of a new world-oriented society, of which he was so often figured a citizen, coloring his sense of a "world mind" and "world consciousness" as inevitable developments in human evolution. None of this language was of course exclusively Huxley's. Before the war he shared it most prominently with his collaborator H. G. Wells, who propounded the passage to, varyingly, a "world state," "world machine," and "world brain," by means of scientific advance.[10] In the history of UNESCO's early years, Huxley is often depicted as its hero, charting "the broad course to which the organization became committed," and granted the natural sciences, and scientists, a central place in the shaping of UNESCO's internationally targeted cultural and educational programs—and literally putting the "S" in UNESCO.[11] I want to argue that his perspective on this scientific one-worldism reveals the more intriguing paradox that informed UNESCO's early explicit cosmopolitanism. From the outset, the UN and UNESCO's world work—for those such as Huxley who helped design it and those who observed it—was generated by a worldwide popular revolt against the master race theories of Nazism and "the scourge of war," and driven by a sense of the extraordinary revolution in ideas and attitudes.[12] Yet, in practice, UNESCO's allegedly radical cosmopolitan purpose was beholden to the persistence of not only an

---

[10] See John S. Partington, "H. G. Wells and the World State: A Liberal Cosmopolitan in a Totalitarian Age," *International Relations* 17, no. 2 (2003): 233–246.

[11] Walter Laves and Charles Thomson, *UNESCO: Purpose, Progress, Prospects* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957), p. 295. Laves and Thomson (formerly Huxley's deputies) argued that even though UNESCO derived its authority from the member states, it was the director-general who steered the organization's direction, through his initiation of proposals and through his responsibility for the execution of its programs.

[12] This definition of One World is offered in Fondren Library Woodson Research Center, Rice University, *Julian Sorell Huxley—Papers*, 1899–1980, MS 50, Box 66, folder 7. "Verbatim Report of Talk by Dr Huxley at the Sorbonne University, Paris, on Thursday, 26 February, 1948, at 9:00 pm. Paris, 5 April, 1948," p. 24.

Enlightenment-coddled trust in the universal power of knowledge and education, but also late nineteenth-century conceptions of evolution and empire.

EVOLUTION

The Huxley who ran UNESCO was in his late fifties, six feet tall, slightly stoop-shouldered, lean, energetic, and elfinlike. His appointment to the charge of UNESCO—first as executive secretary of the Preparatory Commission for UNESCO, based in London, in 1945, and then as director-general in Paris for the relatively short term of only two years—was, like the creation of UNESCO as a UN cultural organ, ad hoc, but his reputation as a cosmopolitan made him, for some contemporaries, a perfect fit for the organization—a portrait also enhanced by his marriage to a multilingual Swiss woman.[13] The press reporting on his appointment singled out Huxley's fluency in French, German, and Italian, so that "the cosmopolitan world in which he lives contains no embarrassments," coded language for being socially at ease at diplomatic dinner parties.[14] His public status as a cultural cosmopolitan seemed to suit the import attached in the immediate postwar period to UNESCO's global mission of tackling chauvinism and fostering international understanding.[15] The more programmatic side of this cosmopolitanism, Huxley's "One World enthusiasm," also mirrored UNESCO's early ambitions for "the orchestration of cultural diversity within an advancing world civilization."[16] These were motives concentrated in the oft-repeated UNESCO-associated aphorism "wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."[17] As spelled out in the preamble to

---

[13] For more on the circumstances surrounding his appointment, see James Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 105–107.

[14] *Julian Sorell Huxley—Papers, 1899–1980* MS 50, Box 137 folder 1: "Profile: Julian Huxley," *The Observer*, Sunday, 15 December 1946, p. 22.

[15] The linguistic fluency of wives seems to have been important for contemporary definitions of the cosmopolitan (masculine) individual. James Sewell remarks that Alfred Zimmern, the anticipated first director-general of UNESCO, was more cosmopolitan than Huxley, by virtue of being Jewish, speaking numerous languages, and having a multilingual wife. See Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics*, p. 84.

[16] Spender, cited in Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics*, p. 114.

[17] See the preamble to the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, adopted in London on 16 November 1945.

UNESCO's constitution (much of it written by the American poet Archibald MacLeish), the doctrine of the inequality of men and races, the suspicion and mistrust between peoples had fed on "ignorance of each other's ways and lives."

Although the extent of popular and political support for the UN in its early manifestations was new, UNESCO's language and methods reflected well-rehearsed views of the role of education, popular texts of the time, and institutional precedents, including Huxley's own limited experience of international organizations such as the Council for Education in World Citizenship. The message of world citizenship that came to be so closely identified with the early UNESCO was indebted to the aims and methods of class- and race-conscious internationalist organizations across the Atlantic, including the League of Nations Committee for Intellectual Cooperation, and the London-based Council for Education in World Citizenship established at the height of World War II, in the absence of a functional League and with Huxley on its board of trustees.[18] The classicist Gilbert Murray, as famous for his role in the progress of a British liberal imperialism in the earlier twentieth century, was a prime mover in both organizations as chair of the League body and creator of the Council for Education in World Citizenship. Under him, these institutions set out to train individuals to a consciousness of their place in a variegated world, through education in geography, languages, and broad-minded history teaching. The aim was not world government, but rather world citizenship—that is, the constitution of new forms of individual subjectivity within the existing forms of political organization. A subsequent new sense of world community would exist through and across national borders and empires, not as their replacement. The League Committee for International Intellectual Cooperation emphasized the role of intellectuals moving themselves and ideas across national borders to aid the development of a "League of Minds" and a "universal conscience."[19] Following in its footsteps, the Council for Education in World Citizenship aimed to end provincialism in thought and encouraged practical methods of

---

[18] See Derek Heater, *Peace through Education: The Contribution of the Council for Education in World Citizenship* (London: Falmer Press, 1984).

[19] See Geneva, *League of Nations Archives*, Registry Files, 1934–1937, Sections 5 B and 5 C (Intellectual Cooperation); the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation, *An International Series of Open Letters* (Paris, IIIC, 1933); *The League of Nations and Intellectual Cooperation* (Geneva, 1927). Similar ideas informed the creation of the International Federation of University Women, see Virginia Gildersleeve, *Many a Good Crusade* (New York: Macmillan, 1954), part 4 in particular.

inculcating international understanding, including "international" ser-
vice for students in order to create a "habit of the mind and the will."[20]
In the latter stages of the war, the Council of Allied Ministers of Edu-
cation (also known as CAME and based in London), responsible for
mapping out a new international educational and cultural organization
to be launched at the end of the war, invited the Council for Education
in World Citizenship to report on just how it might be done. Huxley,
who was a trustee to the Council for Education in World Citizenship,
was also a founding member of the "War Aims" group set up to advise
the British government and a fascinated informal participant in the
CAME discussions. It was these circumstances that brought him to the
attention of the British bureaucrat John Maud, who, as education sec-
retary, was administratively responsible for putting the plans for a new
international cultural and educational agency into motion.[21]

The emphasis placed in interwar programs on world citizenship as
an attitude expressed by nationally identified individuals toward indi-
viduals from other national cultures resonated in the programs dreamed
of by Huxley's UNESCO, from its planned World Citizenship Clubs
for schools to the plethora of exchange programs promoting "under-
standing between nations and peoples." The anticipated end result of
this dissemination of knowledge about peoples across national borders
remained conceptually similar to that of the League: "One World in
the things of the mind and spirit."[22]

The continuities between the interwar and postwar international
efforts were as indicative of a general ideological momentum as Hux-
ley's singular influence. However, Huxley did add to the mix some
elements that were peculiarly his own, including a biological interpre-
tation of the evolutionary significance of this One World project. From
his perspective, the prospects for an evolving world consciousness, or
world community, and the place of diversity in that process, were tied

---

[20] Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, the CEWC's first chair, cited in Heater, *Peace through Edu-
cation*, p. 49.

[21] Those bureaucrats were acting on behalf of the Council of Allied Ministers of Educa-
tion, whose wartime discussions led to UNESCO's creation. For more on this institutional
history see Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics*; Karp, "Development of the Philosophy of
UNESCO"; or most recently the essays collected in *60 ans d'histoire de l'UNESCO* (Paris:
UNESCO, 2007).

[22] For more on these similarities, see Karp, "Development of the Philosophy of
UNESCO," pp. 13ff. The programs were similar in their conventional emphasis on the
constitutive role of nations. UNESCO, like the UN, and like its predecessor the League
of Nations, was based on the supremacy of national sovereignty in international law. Its
system relied on representation through national delegations, in the interest of maintaining
national diversity.

to "the established facts of biological adaptation and advance brought about by means of Darwinian selection."[23] Darwin's theory of evolution provided the template for UNESCO's contribution to the inevitable march of human progress, and the language of biology was made to speak for that organization's holistic cultural ends, as Huxley described to a visiting journalist in 1946: "Man must find a new belief in himself, and the only basis for such a belief lies in his vision of world society as an organic whole, in which rights and duties of men are balanced deliberately, as they are among the cells of the body. . . . By working together, we must lay a conscious basis for a new world order, the next step in our human evolution."[24] Even this scientific conception owed more to the prewar period than the postwar. According to the historian of biology John Greene, "Huxley's ambition from youth onward [was] to define a world view based on evolutionary biology that would unite mankind under the banner of evolutionary humanism and displace forever the creeds and dogmas that had retarded the progress of civilization in past ages."[25] Huxley's most succinct statement of this biologically determined new world order was laid out in his 1936 Galton Lecture (republished in *The Uniqueness of Man* in 1941). There he argued that "man's role is to do the best he can to manage the evolutionary process on this planet and to guide its future course in a desirable direction."[26] Greene concludes that Huxley's worldview "profoundly . . . shaped his interests and his conclusions as a biologist."[27] We can also argue that his knowledge of the natural sciences shaped his thinking about what in the world was required and politically possible at the end of World War II and at UNESCO for progress toward One World.[28]

As a discipline, biology had been at the heart of modern cultural and political debates about the nature of human diversity and its significance since the mid nineteenth century. By the 1930s, as fascist European political parties brutally exploited the scientific legitimacy

---

[23] Julian Huxley, *Memories II* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1973), p. 15.

[24] Laura Vitray, "UNESCO: Adventure in Understanding," *Free World*, November 1946, pp. 23–28, p. 24.

[25] John C. Greene, "The Interaction of Science and World View in Sir Julian Huxley's Evolutionary Biology," *Journal of the History of Biology* 23, no. 1 (1990): 39–55, p. 40.

[26] J. S. Huxley, "Galton Lecture: *Eugenics and Society* (1936)," published in *The Uniqueness of Man* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1941).

[27] Greene, "Interaction of Science and World View," p. 47.

[28] When historians have discussed the introduction of the natural sciences to UNESCO's mission, they have in most cases interpreted science as a value-neutral, unsocialized discipline. See for example, the entries in *Sixty Years of Science at UNESCO 1945–2005* (Paris: UNESCO, 2006).

of biological determinism, progressive natural scientists such as Huxley identified with a "new school." They emphasized the environmental causes of difference in human development and capacity, and the biological significance of variation (only ambiguously cultural) to the evolutionary process. Like other antiracists of the period, Huxley had little difficulty reconciling a continuing interest in variation and in the capacity of humans to adapt to and be affected by their social environment, on the one hand, with claims about the biologically intrinsic inferiority of the "less developed races" and lower classes, on the other hand. Huxley's *We Europeans: A Survey of "Racial" Problems* (1935), coauthored with the Cambridge ethnologist A. C. Haddon, was typically ambivalent in its attitude toward the social and political relevance of biology.

   We Europeans made the argument that because it was "impossible to disentangle the genetic from the environmental factors in determining 'racial traits,' 'national character,' and the like," it was also impossible to use race as the foundation of political or social organization.[29] The authors further explained that race should not be used as a foundation for politics because just as science could offer no absolute proof that race was an incontrovertible determinant of individual capabilities, neither could it establish that racial mixing was bad. Indeed, in *We Europeans* scientific ambiguity in regard to race worked both ways, so that race mixing was just as likely to produce "some exceptionally well-endowed types" as negative, and thus "miscegenation" could be politically and socially useful.[30] Huxley and Haddon also retained "minor sub-species" classifications—including Nordic, Euro Asiatic, and Mediterranean—identities manifest, they alleged, in physical characteristics such as hair, nose, head shape, and stature. These classifications were now presented as ethnicities, that is, quasi-biological by-products of race mixing.[31]

   Despite harboring an ambivalent view of race, *We Europeans* (a telling title) became an iconic mid twentieth-century antiracist text.[32]

----

   [29] Julian Huxley and A. C. Haddon, *We Europeans: A Survey of "Racial" Problems* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1935), pp. 20–21, 91.
   [30] On this same argument, it was acceptable for states to practice exclusionary immigration policies, as long as those policies were not legitimated on race grounds but for social reasons.
   [31] Huxley and Haddon, *We Europeans*, pp. 216, 277.
   [32] See, for example, Ralph Bunche's *A World View of Race* (Negro Folk-History Association, 1936), which cites Huxley's findings in order to debunk the scientific credentials of racial classifications.

Even as its authors preferred the term "ethnicity" to "race" because of its cultural connotations, they concluded that "science and the scientific spirit" still had a role in pointing out "the biological realities of the ethnic situation."[33] More specifically, as Elazar Barkan has pointed out, Huxley's overriding faith in biological facts, as he understood them, left a margin for the view that while "white and black overlap largely in regard to intelligence, energy, ability and character," this overlap was not complete. The radical conservative edge of these views was as obvious in Huxley's abiding perspective on "morons" and his "personal aversion to aliens."[34] It was also immanent in a book published a year before *We Europeans,* in which Huxley enthusiastically took up the literary challenge of imagining himself a dictator. In the context of what he described as the genetic decline of Britain, he prescribed as its antidote the eradication of social welfare, a system that, he claimed, provided unnatural support for individuals who would otherwise succumb to the rigorous processes of natural selection. Rehearsing the ideas of other early twentieth-century liberal eugenicists, Huxley proposed promoting the biological reproduction of gifted individuals and discouraging the reproduction of so-called degenerates. He advocated putting to this hypothetical task new technological advances in techniques of artificial insemination, contraception, abortion, and sterilization.[35] His vision of the political relevance of this biological reform was global, to be realized through an internationally enforced "world population policy."[36]

In 1945, on his appointment to the fledgling international organization for education, science, and culture, Huxley famously penned *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Philosophy,* a pamphlet of some sixty pages. He anticipated that it would provide the institution with a unique philosophical grounding in "world scientific humanism," a philosophy built on an understanding of evolution as "all the historical processes of change and development at work in the universe."[37] While the end

---

[33] Huxley and Haddon, *We Europeans,* p. 287. Huxley became definitively identified with this text and chose to own it much more than Haddon.

[34] Kenneth Walters, "Introduction: Revising our Picture of Julian Huxley," in *Julian Huxley: Biologist and Statesman of Science,* ed. C. K. Waters and A. Van Helden (Houston: Rice University Press, 1987), p. 20.

[35] See Julian Huxley, *If I Were a Dictator* (London: Methuen, 1934).

[36] See also Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, Harvard, 2008), 126ff.

[37] Julian Huxley, *UNESCO: Its Purpose and Philosophy* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1947), p. 8.

result was eventually intellectually quarantined from any direct asso-
ciation with UNESCO, and Huxley himself would come to regret his
foundationalist efforts, the pamphlet is a useful indicator of the extent
to which Huxley felt he had found in UNESCO the institutional
means of applying the views he had developed in the interwar period
to planning on a world scale for changes in governance within Britain
and within its colonies. [38]

Huxley now argued that it was no longer necessary to wait for evo-
lutionary developments. Instead, those developments could be brought
about through the conscious choice of specific values. The most impor-
tant of these was internationalism because it was itself evidence of evo-
lutionary progress toward the simultaneous complexity and unity of
social and political organization. This accelerated political evolution
would have an inevitable biological dimension, "securing the fullest
contribution to the common pool from racial groups that, owing to
their remoteness or their backwardness, have so far had little share in
it." The international organization UNESCO would act as a vehicle
to propel this process through the promotion of the "unity-in-variety
of the world's art and culture," and through a policy of purposeful mis-
cegenation. As Huxley put it: "While the social difficulties caused by
wide racial crossing may be too great to permit the deliberate large-
scale use of it as a means of still further increasing the extent of human
genetic variability, we must assuredly make the best use of the vari-
ability which already exists." [39] Unlike Murray's earlier League version
of world citizenship, Huxley's version was driven by its evolutionary
logic to contemplate the possibility of altered political and even bio-
logical foundations and structures. Even if actual world political unity
and world planning were far-off ideals, UNESCO would facilitate the
collection of scientific knowledge and midwife "the emergence of a
single world culture" "unifying the world mind." [40]

Even as he emphasized cultural unification, Huxley saw in "the fact
of human difference" (that is the existence of primitive cultures as well
as different national cultures) a range of implications for UNESCO's
program. There was the imperative of conserving evidence of diversity
through museums and publications. There was also the management
of individual differences through applied psychology, so that "every

---

[38] See Huxley, *If I Were a Dictator*, and Julian Huxley, *TVA Adventure in Planning* (Sur-
rey: Architectural Press, 1948 [1943]).

[39] Huxley, *UNESCO*, p. 17.

[40] Ibid., pp. 14, 61.

encouragement should be given to the study of distinct psycho-physical types." Governments armed with these typologies could take "a more selective approach . . . to job selection, picking training for people and work, and for keeping certain types of men out of certain positions." In some cases, the more structural causes of unequal differences had to be dealt with programmatically, through "fundamental education." This was the UNESCO prototype of the UN-based developmentalism that formed deep institutional roots only after Huxley left UNESCO. Huxley's colonially influenced version aimed at leveling up educational, scientific, and cultural facilities in the world's "dark areas," that is, places populated by the "darker races" or by the less privileged classes.[41] Class inequality, from Huxley's intellectually aristocratic purview, was also in specific cases, traceable to "biological facts," such as the problem of "low-grade mental defectives" who could never benefit from educational opportunities. In these cases, as with the poverty that he diagnosed as rooted in overpopulation, Huxley returned to the idea that scientific classification could be applied to planning on a world scale through the provision of birth control facilities, among other eugenic strategies.

There are obvious ways in which Huxley's postwar views seem peculiar to his scientific perspective and unsynchronized with the more idealistic trends of postwar internationalism—including the condemnation of Nazi policies propounding the biological facts of unequal collective difference and eugenicism. By 1946, too, many of the "darker races" of Huxley's biological and political philosophy were afforded more opportunities to speak for themselves through the offices and forums of the UN, and through the prism of the destruction wrought at the hands of European notions of civilizational superiority. At the other end of the international spectrum, there sat a more conservative and powerful generation outraged by the atheism of Huxley's scientific humanism, for its privileging of scientific values over Judeo-Christian morality. To Huxley it might have seemed that history was repeating itself. Faced with the task of overseeing a "world organization," Huxley sought neutrality, universality, and guidance in the allegedly value-free tenets of evolutionary theory. Despite the objections of his critics from all sides, his general faith in evolutionary progress pulsed through the early years of UNESCO. It oriented the practical as much as ideologi-

---

[41] This was not unique to him; the British prime minister, Clement Atlee, welcomed an audience of Allied ministers in April 1945 by referring to an "obvious difficulty that we all have to face—the education of backward races," cited in Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics*, p. 81.

cal dimensions of UNESCO's One World not toward the future, but to the past, to the liberal progressive values of the long nineteenth century.[42]

EMPIRE

Imagining, let alone creating, a new world order of universal human rights and cosmopolitan internationalism in the mid twentieth century was no simple matter. Most fundamentally, there was the overwhelming legacy of empire. At the end of World War II, despite accumulating evidence of the antidemocratic and racist practices of colonizers throughout the world, and despite the moral force being placed behind the claims of universal rights and equality, the idea of empire had as anomalous a place as race in cosmopolitan conceptions of internationalism. Huxley's vision of the evolution of a world mind was profoundly influenced by his view of the biological as well as political and social mission of empires in this process. Huxley, and almost all the representatives of the European powers, continued to emphasize the international prerogatives and responsibilities of "the white race." To add to the confusion, empires appealed to their subscribers as models of cultural cosmopolitanism, as multicultural political entities that defeated dangerous national chauvinisms. On this view, the idea of empire, perhaps all too conveniently, was the antithesis of a fragmenting world of decolonized nation-states.[43]

In 1942, Hans Kohn, an expatriate of the Austro-Hungarian empire, and the proclaimed "father" of nationalism studies, advocated the return of an ancient concept of empire affording to all peoples the equal protection of a common citizenship and of a rational law. "This Empire," he argued, "would mean the end of all imperialism, it would be the consummation and the justification of the best tendencies inherent, though not realized, in the liberal imperialisms of the nineteenth century."[44] In this same period, René Cassin, the French jurist and framer of the UN's Declaration of Human Rights, could not disen-

---

[42] See my discussion of Louis Snyder's celebration of UNESCO's contribution to postwar science in Glenda Sluga, *Nation, Psychology and International Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), Conclusion passim.

[43] See, for example, the case made in Keith Hancock, *Argument of Empire* (London: Penguin, 1944).

[44] Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), pp. 141–142.

gage his vision of the implementation of human rights from his regard for France as a cosmopolitan empire in which Jews, such as himself, and Muslims, white and black, found politico-cultural convergence as French citizens and patriots. This true France, and French empire, was the cultural fount of the human rights Cassin promoted as both universal and respectful of cultural diversity.[45]

H. G. Wells, Huxley's interwar collaborator, who was the icon of political cosmopolitans, deliberated a narrower vision of cosmopolitan imperialism in the final years of World War II. He described himself as "a Cosmopolitan patriot" because of the "profound satisfaction and inspiration" he found in Milton's phrase "God's Englishman," "as the resilient, competent and obdurate servant of mankind. Consider the men who have sprung from this little island to fertilise the world."[46] Like Wells, Huxley simultaneously supported an international cosmopolitanism and enthused over the social and economic benefits of an English/British civilizing mission.[47] When in 1929 the British Colonial Office sent Huxley to British East Africa to report on the possibilities for improving colonial education in biology, he was ebullient, exclaiming that "without indulging either the false sentimentality of jingo imperialism or the false shame of doctrinaire little-Englandism" one could "simply feel proud of belonging to a nation which does a difficult job, demanding such unselfish devotion, honesty and hard work, and does it on the whole so well . . . If contact with a bit of the British Colonial Empire has not yet made me a full-blooded devotee of kiplingismus it has certainly shown me the way to a spirit of Liberal Imperialism."[48] As Huxley prepared for a second mission in 1944, this time to West Africa, he fleshed out the fundamentally practical character of that progressive imperial spirit in terms of "the white man" providing "tutelage" to colonial territories that manifested different capacities for self-government.[49] These territories were colonies *because* of their "backwardness"; the "white man" could bring them civilization,

---

[45] See G. Sluga, "René Cassin: *Les Droits de l'homme* and the History of Human Rights," in *The Twentieth Century History of Human Rights*, ed. Stefan Ludwig-Hoffman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[46] H. G. Wells, *'42 to '44: A Contemporary Memoir upon Human Behaviour during the Crisis of the World Revolution* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1944), p. 30.

[47] For both men, the political lessons they took from biology affected how they understood the role of the British Empire in implementing these broadly cosmopolitan objectives.

[48] Cited in Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics*, p. 111.

[49] Huxley, "Colonies in a Changing World," p. 121ff. See Sluga, *Nation, Psychology and International Politics*, pp. 16–20.

modernization, and education, and transform them into more useful markets, render their "backward peoples" participants in worldwide progress, and raise them "to a position where they can take their international place on a footing of actual equality."[50] In sum, Huxley shared the view of the enduring role of imperial "trusteeship" that had shaped the liberal idealism of the League of Nation's mandate system, and that, in 1945, continued to influence British progressivism and worked to delimit the UN charter's version of trusteeship.[51]

Historians such as Frederick Cooper and William Rogers Louis have written at length of the nuance and shading that colored political thinking in this immediate postwar period when it came to the future of the world's colonies.[52] As Cooper shows, in the context of metropolitan efforts to stem labor revolt and address the economic dysfunctionality in the colonies, "development" emerged as a new anchor of imperial legitimacy. In the British case, and as manifest in the British Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940, the extension of social welfarism became the catchcry of progressive colonialist thinking.[53] During the war, at a time of profound challenges from native anticolonialists, Huxley was among those who agitated for strengthening Britain's hold on its dependencies through an emphasis on imperially directed economic and political modernization, enabling "the region to achieve general prosperity and to play its role as an active member of the modern world."[54] In Huxley's conception of the capacity of humans to control evolution and accelerate its processes through sci-

---

[50] Julian Huxley (with P. Deane), *Future of the Colonies* (London: Pilot Press, 1944), p. 13.

[51] While international accountability was in principle lauded in discussions of trusteeship, in practice the UN ended up overseeing a system in which all colonies could be classified as strategic (which meant no oversight), or non-self-governing (limited oversight).

[52] See Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard, *International Development and the Social Sciences* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Frederick Cooper, "Modernizing Colonialism and the Limits of Empire," in *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, ed. Craig Calhoun, Frederick Cooper, and Kevin W. Moore (New York: New Press, 2006); W. Roger Louis, *Imperialism at Bay: The United States and the Decolonization of the British Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 104.

[53] Cooper, "Modernizing Colonialism and the Limits of Empire," p. 68.

[54] See also Huxley, *Future of the Colonies*, p. 8: "We the separate colonial powers and the white race as a whole, can and should still export brains and skill to the colonies, can and should help their people to acquire such of our ideas and inventions as will help their advance, can and should fertilize their countries with our accumulated wealth and our accumulated experience, and with the machines and techniques to which they have given rise. That will help the colonial peoples; but it will also help the economic prosperity of the world as a whole, including that of the colonial powers."

entific management, places such as West Africa were "to pass through its Renaissance, its Industrial revolution, and its transition to the Age of Air Transport and the Social Service State, all simultaneously."[55] The British Empire that Huxley imagined as a vehicle of evolution toward ever-enlarged political communities comprised a "partnership" in which the "white race," in its "next and final phase of white expansion" assisted this "development of the world's backward and undeveloped regions, of which the colonies are an important section."[56] In the postwar period, such expectations, together with Huxley's personal links to the Colonial Office, connected UNESCO's One Worldism to the example and aspirations of enlightened British colonial policies. From Huxley's point of view, these were specifically its 1940 Colonial Development and Welfare Act and its mass education program "in which literacy is linked with some social objective, such as health or better agriculture, tsetse clearance of improved nutrition."[57]

As a self-appointed stakeholder in postwar planning for a new international organization,[58] Huxley had emphasized the internationalist aspect of this imperially driven evolutionary process. When, in early 1945, world representatives met at San Francisco to draft a charter for the new UNO, Huxley—still with no official role—argued for an international colonial convention, a colonial charter, and an International Colonial Office that would oversee bringing backward colonies to the same educational level as the more modern states and that would set standards "for dealing with the colonial peoples in their advance towards self-government and a higher level of life, for the abolition of discriminatory practices between the nations in colonial affairs, and ensuring accountability of all colonial Powers to some interna-

---

[55] *Julian Sorell Huxley—Papers*, 1899–1980 MS 50, Box 99 Folder 2: Julian Huxley, "West African Possibilities," *Yale Review*, Winter 1945, p. 263.
[56] Huxley had close links to the British Colonial Office through his consulting work, his cousin Elspeth, and his relationship with Arthur Creech-Jones, who was eventually the postwar Labor government's secretary of state for the colonies. In 1944, Jones was on the Elliot Commission with Huxley and joined him in submitting a minority report that recommended limiting the number of higher education institutions planned for West Africa on practical grounds.
[57] See Julian Huxley, "Colonies and Freedom," *New Republic*, 24 January 1944, p. 108: "One of the things that I take considerable pride in as an Englishman is that in 1940, that *annus terribilis*, Parliament initiated a new phase in British colonial policy by passing the Colonial Development and Welfare Act."
[58] See the important study of these groups provided by Marika Sherwood, "'There Is No New Deal for the Blackman in San Francisco': African Attempts to Influence the Founding Conference of the United Nations, April–July, 1945," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 29, no. 1 (1996): 71–94.

tional body."[59] This was, in effect, a vision shared by the black activist W. E. B. DuBois and progressive figures in the U.S. State Department. It also became international law through the trusteeship clauses of the UN charter decided upon at San Francisco—although where Huxley wanted *all* colonial territories to be subject to international oversight and colonial subjects to be able to petition an international body, the political delegates dominant in the creation of the UN, particularly the United Kingdom and the United States, watered down these expectations by differentiating between trust territories subject to international oversight, non-self-governing territories subject to limited international oversight, and strategic territories under the special oversight of the Security Council—that is, the great powers themselves. Some other of Huxley's more inventive ideas came to naught: UNESCO would work with the colonial powers, encouraging them to employ personnel from other countries and nurturing a cohort of "International Personnel." An international staff college would be created to train these people.[60] At the end of his tenure, Huxley even urged UNESCO to adopt "the policy of relying wherever possible on these citizens of the One World of the human mind, and of helping them to find their place in some form of organization which would make it possible for them to render help more efficiently to UNESCO and to the cause in which it and they believe."[61] But this was for Huxley a question of being able to hire more British nationals and avoid the pressure being exerted by underrepresented UN members for a more geographically, or at least regionally, representative international body.

Upon his appointment as director-general of UNESCO, Huxley worked for the adaptation, rather than the abandonment, of empires in the interest of the world's cosmopolitan international future. Huxley's interwar efforts to convince the British Empire Marketing Board to use film as a propaganda tool in tropical Africa echoed in his postwar involvement in British colonial filmmaking.[62] In 1946, Huxley provided the narrative and voiceover for the British Ministry of Informa-

---

[59] *Julian Sorell Huxley—Papers*, 1899–1980 MS 50, Box 103, Folder: Julian Huxley, "International Colonial Office," *News Chronicle*, 4 May 1945. In effect, this was an argument for the Trusteeship Council.

[60] This was an idea he first tried out in "Colonies in a Changing World" (1942), reprinted in *Man in the Modern World* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1947), p. 56.

[61] *This Is Our Power, Speeches Delivered by Julian Huxley and Mr. Jaime Torres Bodet during the Third Session of the General Conference of the UNESCO, Beirut, December 10, 1948* (UNESCO, 1948).

[62] Rosaleen Smyth, "The Roots of Community Development," *Social Policy and Administration* 38, no. 4 (2004): 418–436.

tion film *Towards a Better Life*, depicting the African Gold Coast as a place brought to civilization through the efforts of the "white man," iterating his thesis of "partnership between European and African, between the white man's science and experience and the African's desire to realize a better life," one important dimension of which was agricultural modernization. He also brought to UNESCO his special interest in the use of film and "development broadcasting" in Central Africa to educate local populations.[63] During and after Huxley's departure, colonial expertise was highly valued at UNESCO, which employed in its own development projects, among other figures, the director of the British Colonial Film Unit and British colonial education experts. Such links resonated through UNESCO activity in "fundamental education," "technical assistance," and "population"— programs that Huxley helped legitimate and that by 1950 were firmly implanted in the wider workings of the UN.[64] UNESCO started out with three "Fundamental Education" pilot projects on the model of the British colonial "Mass Education" ideals that Huxley helped devise during the war. These were in East Africa, Haiti, and China. Although fundamental education was only one aspect of UNESCO's cultural and educational program, it was its ambitious flagship contribution to the creation of One World.

UNESCO's East African project had two parts: one in Nyasaland (at the time a British protectorate, later Malawi), where, as John Bowers, the head of the Fundamental Education project and an ex-British military and colonial servant, described, "[a] basic survey is now being carried out and a Danish Agricultural economist with experience in the Folk High Schools, will go to Nyasaland as UNESCO's expert consultant in February"; the other in Tanganyika (at the time a UN trust territory under British administration, later Tanzania), where UNESCO was to involve itself in the British government's extraordinary groundnut scheme.[65] Begun in 1946, the East African groundnut project was run by a newly constituted British government body, the Overseas Food Corporation. Groundnuts (or peanuts) were a basis

---

   [63] *Julian Sorell Huxley—Papers*, 1899–1980 MS 50, Box 66 folder 1: J. S. Huxley, "Towards a Better Life," Commentary on MoI Film, 3 January 1946, p. 1.

   [64] For a brief discussion of the internationalization of development, see Cooper and Packard, "Introduction," *International Development and the Social Sciences*, p. 9.

   [65] John Bowers, "Fundamental Education," *UNESCO Courier* i, I, February 1948, p. 5. Phillip Jones has traced the influence of this idea of education through Bowers; see *International Policies for Third World Education: UNESCO, Literacy and Development* (London: Routledge, 1988). Bowers was brought into UNESCO by Huxley.

of fat production, oils and margarines being sorely needed in a post-war Britain under rationing. The project aimed to clear 3.25 million acres of jungle and plant groundnuts, employing modern agricultural machinery and methods. It was also intended that the project, run in conjunction with UNESCO, would ward off the expected criticism by the UN Trusteeship Division of Britain, as trustee of the territory since the end of World War I (when it had been taken over as a mandate from the defeated Germany), that it had neglected the well-being of the trust's inhabitants. Britain would organize the economic venture in the interests of its own economy; UNESCO would bring education and modernization for the benefit of the local population into the picture. UNESCO's external relations officer, the former Portuguese colonial agronomist Armando Cortesao, presented the project to the UN Trusteeship Council, which had ultimate oversight for the territory, as "an interesting experiment in building up an ab initio of a complete new African society in the East African Groundnuts Scheme." UNESCO would recruit thirty thousand selected Africans from several tribes "to receive the benefits of Fundamental Education, and so one élite will be organised."[66] Cortesao wanted to see the model extended to Belgian and French territories in Africa. "The more I study today's delicate colonial problem," he argued, "the more convinced I am that no other international agency can exercise a more important and decisive influence than UNESCO in the development of non-self-governing territories [the new UN language for colonies not covered by trusteeship arrangements], in accordance with 'the new spirit indicated in the Charter of the United Nations.'" But the scheme ended with barely a quarter of the anticipated land cleared and most rendered a "dust-bowl," at the cost (to the UK) of £36 million, an untallied amount for UNESCO, and the disruption of locally based cultural practices and social uses of the same land.[67] At the same time, this ill-fated agricultural collaboration offers a spectacular measure of how for UNESCO

---

[66] *UNESCO Archive*, Paris, Social Questions, Economic and Social Council, Commission on Human Rights, Correspondence: "To: Director-General, Deputy Director-General, Assistant Director-General, From: A. Cortesao 'PROVISIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE ON TRUST TERRITORIES,'" 11 August 1947.

[67] While there are numerous assessments of this project in national histories of the British empire, and Tanganyika, there is no scholarly study of UNESCO's role or its failure's impact on UNESCO. See Cyril Ehrlih, "Some Antecedents of Development Planning in Tanganyika," *Journal of Development Studies* 2, no. 3 (1966): 254–267. Among the follies of this "model failure" were its lack of local consultation—not even the Tanganyikan administration—and a focus on development as physical capital expenditure. This was quite a different view of development than UNESCO's.

the seeds of the most practical, and even idealistic, aspects of postwar internationalism, including the creation of modernizing cosmopolitan bureaucracies, took root in an imperial setting.[68]

Huxley's vision was undauntingly influenced by the overlapping strands of a genuine commitment to "the advance of world civilization," empire, and evolutionism. In the late 1960s, a time of considerable political shift in race relations (owing at least partly to the platform provided to anticolonialists by the UN's General Assembly and UNESCO), the elderly Huxley, writing his *Memoirs*, unabashedly recalled the pressure he had felt—and resented—to appoint "a coloured man on the staff" at UNESCO in order to stress the organization's "universal character."[69] Huxley describes how "after some searching, we enlisted a Haitian Creole schoolmaster . . . he proved not to be of much use—except in inducing UNESCO to send a mission to his native island to help over its educational system."[70] The inclusion of the nameless Haitian was in the end, Huxley acknowledged, fortuitous since it led to the other of UNESCO's defining (although ultimately failed) educational initiatives, the Haiti Pilot Project, but he never got over the sense of imposition.[71]

The man Huxley resented was Emmanuel Gabriel, a program specialist for Fundamental Education at UNESCO. What little can be gleaned about him tells us that in his relatively short life Gabriel was committed to tackling the problem of illiteracy in his country, and he had developed numerous educational programs amid the endlessly fluctuating Haitian political scene. His philosophy that Haitians needed to be taught Creole literacy on the path to literacy in more international

---

[68] See for example, "Verbatim Report of Talk by Dr Huxley," p. 12: Huxley defined "fundamental education" as to do with illiteracy, hand in hand with "something designed to give a higher standard of living both economically and in other ways. Improved health, better methods of agriculture, better techniques, better methods of making money, and so on, and finally not forgetting the expressing of the aesthetic side of the personality through arts and crafts." See also Chloé Maurel's survey of developmentalism and UNESCO in "L'UNESCO de 1945 à 1974." Univ. Paris I. Sous la direction de Pascal Ory (2005). Maurel dates UNESCO's interest in Africa and the influence of the British Colonial Office to a later phase of UNESCO's policy making, in the 1950s and 1960s. There was an obvious convergence of interests among Europeans in this postwar colonial developmentalism. For more on the significance of developmentalism in Africa in this period among scientific "progressives" and their links to Huxley, see Peder Anker, "The Politics of Ecology in South Africa on the Radical Left," *Journal of the History of Biology* 37 (2004): 303–331.

[69] Huxley, *Memories II*, p. 23.

[70] In his own footnote, Huxley qualified this assessment: "with the newly won independence of so many colonies, coloured staff are now a numerous and valuable element in UNESCO," ibid.

[71] For more discussion of the significance of this project see Amrith and Sluga, "New Histories of the UN"; and G. Sluga, *The Great Age of Internationalism*, forthcoming.

languages such as the endemic French was a product of his substantial local experience and his American and English higher educational training. Fluent in French, English, and the local patois, Gabriel had studied as an undergraduate at New York's Columbia Teacher's College and later at the University of London's Education Institute. It was during that period in London that Gabriel attended the first session of UNESCO, in much the same auditing capacity that Huxley had attended earlier international meetings on the formation of that body. As the serendipitous result of their informal attendance, both men, each in their own way culturally cosmopolitan, had ended up as employees in the secretariat, Gabriel for slightly longer than Huxley and as a program specialist in Fundamental Education employed three grades lower than the norm.[72] The Fundamental Education pilot project seeded in Haiti's Marbial Valley, which included plans for "a rural training centre for young Haitians" and aspiring teachers, "comprising a small clinic, a demonstration farm, a community centre, library and museum" was ultimately deemed another failure.[73] Around the same time as the British-run groundnut scheme failed, the Haiti scheme became mired in the complexities, inequities, and incompetencies of the UNESCO's emerging development program. C. J. Opper, a British colonial education officer stationed in Mauritius, was brought in to terminate a project that had aroused extensive local expectations, enthusiasm, and practical support.[74]

The history of postwar development offers extensive evidence of the support for development initiatives among the "undeveloped" parts of the world. Indeed, UNESCO required invitations from the relevant governments and matching funding in order to establish its fundamental education projects. UNESCO's anticipated role in these schemes also underlines the quite distinctive ways in which individuals from the "darker" continents were seen to be part of this new cosmopolitan internationalism. Both the East African and Haitian fundamental

---

[72] Gabriel was a Grade 11, his European equivalents were Grade 14.

[73] Bowers, "Fundamental Education," p. 5.

[74] Opper had an Oxford degree in language and literature, and a diploma in education from London University. His special field of interest was "social welfare" among youth, and he had visited the United States in 1937 on a Rockefeller grant "to study social and educational problems in the Southern States of the USA," see Curriculum Vitae, Annex II, "Nyasaland Protectorate Mass Education Pilot Project," Edc./61—31 March 1948, "Fundamental Education: Pilot Project in Nyasaland (Malawi) 1948," *UNESDOC, UNESCO*. For a useful assessment of the fate of the project, see Chantalle Francesca Verna, "Haiti's 'Second Independence' and the Promise of Pan-American Cooperation, 1934–1956," (PhD diss., Michigan State University, 2005), chap. 4; and Craig N. Murphy, *The United Nations Development Programme: A Better Way?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 86.

education schemes imagined a constituency of darker world citizens in a manner quite distinctive to the cosmopolitan credentials of an intellectual such as Huxley himself—their place in the modern world was designated as efficient modern workers, educated to the manipulation of machines and management of the mass agriculture and industry that was their future. The status of their consequently lost cultures, and their salvation, was also left to UNESCO, as part of its commitment to cultural diversity through the deployment of anthropologists and the creation of museums.

Cosmopolitanism

In a recent critique of the historiography of cosmopolitanism, Anthony Pagden has described cosmopolitanism as "historically specific and as culturally contingent a notion as 'rights' or 'democracy' or . . . the conception of 'the human' itself." Pagden adds that it was "in some sense an attempt to transform the values formally associated with the European empires and their theoreticians." It preserved "the idea of a single human destiny, a *telos* for all mankind and the conception of the future—and ineluctable—emergence of a single human culture."[75] Pagden has in mind the example of the Napoleonic empire, but we might as easily see this paradox as crucial to the more dominant of the cosmopolitan rationales underscoring the creation of UNESCO. Certainly, even in the late 1940s, unsympathetic observers who were themselves British citizens witnessed in the organization's emergent shape a worrying imitation of imperialist cultural and economic priorities. UNESCO, they claimed, was staffed with its own empire builders "blowing in from excitingly remote corners of the globe with a bagful of souvenirs and a proud 'mission completed.'"[76] The English poet Stephen Spender, Huxley's friend, personally recruited to UNESCO, thought of Huxley as stuck in the nineteenth century and its progressive scientific-minded rationalism, barely adapting himself to the conditions of the twentieth century. He portrayed the director-general in Paris in his gloomy Hotel Majestic office as having "amongst his distraught secretaries and flying papers, rather the air of the hero of a play which takes place in a house situated in the tropics—the white man in the midst of nature struggling to put in order a world of jungles to be

---

[75] Anthony Pagden, "Stoicism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Legacy of European Imperialism," *Constellations* 7, no. 1 (2000): 3–21, p. 19.
[76] Ibid., p. 76.

cleared."[77] What Gabriel thought of Huxley's vision, or of the Marbial project's failings, we do not know. There is, however, some oral evidence that he did think it one of the better outcomes of UNESCO's commitment to Fundamental Education that his appointment allowed him to draw the world's attention to the high rate of illiteracy in Haiti, to the general "pitiful" conditions of villagers and city slum dwellers, and to attempt a solution.[78]

For some critics, it was the lack of national and regional representativeness of UNESCO that gave it an imperial rather than cosmopolitan flavor. The appointment of Emmanuel Gabriel was, as Huxley's tone suggests, somewhat of an anomaly. Those who commented on UNESCO's lack of diversity or representativeness estimated in 1947 that of the 557 posts in the secretariat, 514 were held by French or English nationals (they did not bother to count the insignificant number of women).[79] Significantly, despite UNESCO's limitations as a "world" body and Huxley's blinkered views, accounts by early visitors to the Paris headquarters—even those determined to be critical—suggest that this organization stood for something more international and "world"-like than had ever been attempted, from the Babel-like babble of languages to the representation of "as many races, complexions, and national backgrounds as you can imagine" and the "air of constructive international geniality."[80] Huxley himself was never thrown by what the English writer J. B. Priestley (a contractual UNESCO employee

[77] Stephen Spender, "Julian Huxley: A Profile," *Vogue*, January 1949, pp. 63, 80, 96.

[78] Ernest O. Hauser, "Doctor Huxley's Wonderful Zoo," *Saturday Evening Post*, 2 October 1948, p. 76. Hauser recalls meeting Gabriel: "I discussed the existing pilot projects with UNESCO's Program Specialist for Fundamental Education, Emmanuel Gabriel, a genial, dark-skinned native of Haiti. 'Of my country's four million inhabitants, some three million are illiterate,' he told me. 'UNESCO has pitched its tents in one of the most forgotten valleys of the island—three hundred voluntary native workers are now building a road to make the place accessible by jeep.' 'How many students are there?' 'None, so far. But when the center opens, it will have thirty, and they'll learn something about sanitation and community life as well as how to read and write . . . I assure you, the people of Haiti expect great things from UNESCO.'" For a discussion of the appeal of developmentalism from the perspective of the "under-developed," see Cooper and Packard, "Introduction," *International Development and the Social Sciences*.

[79] UN Archives, New York, S-0544-004, UN Education Science and Culture Section, Ivan Borisoc, to Henri Laugier, Ass. Sec. Gen. Dept. of Social Affairs. Comments on the second session of the general conference of UNESCO, 3 December 1947. The 1948 list of staff shows that there were only two Haitians, Gabriel and an accountant. "Asia" was represented by six Chinese staff, many of them highly placed; the Middle East by four Egyptians, two Lebanese, and one Palestinian named "Luckerman"; and there were six Indians spread through the institution, mainly at lower administrative levels. The majority of women were employed as secretarial and administrative assistants.

[80] Vitray, "UNESCO," p. 23.

like the equally skeptical Stephen Spender) described as the "multi-lingual chatter" of UNESCO House.[81] For enthusiasts, including those working within the organization, the path to One World and world citizenship lay precisely in the detail of UNESCO's cultural ambitions and the mindset of many of its workers.[82] Even harder-edged "realist" political scientists writing in the 1940s and 1950s—including David Mitrany and Hans Morgenthau—argued that UNESCO's institutional existence and its internationalizing practices (although not its culturally oriented education and exchange programs) constituted a significant strand in the "spreading web of international activities and agencies, in which and through which the interests and life of all the nations would be gradually integrated."[83]

Ironically, such estimations were reinforced in the criticisms expressed by communist and liberal democratic critics of UNESCO. Soviet bloc delegates may have been more interested in accusing UNESCO of anticommunism, but its preferred evidence for such accusations was the organization's "cosmopolitanism." While its Russian political antagonists derided Huxley's "philosophical Esperanto,"[84] American columnists, such as Ernest Hauser from the *Saturday Evening Post*, reported with sarcastic delight on "Doctor Huxley's Wonderful Zoo." The latter noted in general the cold former bedrooms and parlors of the Hotel Majestic that housed the infant organization, just off the sunlight-flooded Champs Élysées, populated by earnest men and women of goodwill, their foreheads furrowed from much thinking. Hauser sketched the surrealist symposium of an in-house cafeteria "where men and women of white, brown, black, and yellow skin talk shop in terms of terms."[85]

---

[81] *Julian Sorell Huxley—Papers*, MS50, Folder 5: 16.12.46 European Service General News Talk, J. B. Priestley.

[82] See UNESCO oral histories collected in *UNESCO Racontée par ses Anciens* (Paris: UNESCO, 2006). Even as they shared Huxley's cosmopolitan language or its universalist ambitions, not all of them took up that rhetoric in alignment with his imperial or biological framing of it. At the first session of the first UNESCO general conference in Paris in 1946, the British-appointed Indian ambassador, the philosopher and statesman Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, referred to Huxley's blueprints "for the development of what one may call a world brain, a world mind, or a world culture, which alone can be the basis of a world authority or a world government," and "a Commonwealth of free nations." UNESCO General Conference First Session, First Plenary meeting, Wed 20 November 1946.

[83] David Mitrany, *A Working Peace System* (1944), cited by Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations*, p. 413.

[84] Laves and Thomson, *UNESCO*, p. 330.

[85] Hauser, "Doctor Huxley's Wonderful Zoo," p. 16. Huxley and his office were so annoyed by the article they prepared a series of "counterblasts." *Julian Sorell Huxley—Papers*,

It was the image of UNESCO as a world forum or emergent international public sphere, rather than the realities of its bureaucracy, that provoked fears among the more powerful governments of an international revolution in political practices and inspired the demands that UNESCO censor its more cosmopolitan rationales and objectives. The United States, led first by Truman and then Eisenhower, urged the UN "to make clear that promotion of international understanding did not mean support of world government."[86] In 1952, at the height of McCarthyism, American delegates also made UNESCO the object of explicit investigations of its "alleged" world-government sympathies. The delegation, perhaps practicing a form of self-censorship, concluded that UNESCO definitely had no One World intentions, firmly supported national sovereignty, and was not at all interested in world citizenship.[87] That same year even Jaime Torres Bodet, Huxley's highly motivated Mexican successor, found it necessary to denounce the aspirations of world citizenship. Opening a seminar titled "Active Methods of Education for Living in a World Community," Bodet clarified to his audience that "[i]t has never been the purpose of UNESCO to turn citizens from their national loyalties. We are trying to do something quite different: to train citizens—since we are concerned with education—who will be faithful in their duty to their own country, and who, for that very reason, will also be loyal to their international obligations which their country has assumed."[88]

1899–1980 MS 50, Box 17 Folder 10: "CM Berkeley, Office of the Director-General, to The Director-General, Subject: Hauser" 25 October 1948.

[86] Laves and Thomson, *UNESCO*, p. 221.

[87] This kind of disavowal was an obvious consequence of the infiltration of the Cold War into UNESCO—whereby the weeding out of communists was accompanied by the denigration of ideals which inspired UN "world citizenship" and the notion of internationalism itself became akin to a dirty word, in its threat to nation—nationalism having resumed its dominant political status. However, there were still remnants of the world citizen ideal around in the early 1950s. In an address delivered to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in April 1950, Walter Laves argued that the world's task was "the building of a world community which will ensure the consideration of a world point of view of those problems which can no longer be adequately handled from a less broad point of view." Cited in Karp, "The development of the philosophy of UNESCO," p. 147. See also a work by UNESCO employee Stuart Chase, *The Proper Study of Mankind: An Inquiry into the Science of Human Relations* (London: Phoenix House, 1950). Interestingly, Bhagavan notes that Nehru continued to refer to the idea of "One World" well into the 1950s; see "A New Hope," p. 29.

[88] UNESCO, he argued, had moved away from the concept of "education in world citizenship," to the more precise "education for living in the world community." *UNESDOC* e-archive: UNESCO/ED/124, Paris, 24 January 1953, Bodet in "*Teaching about Human Rights:* A Report on the UNESCO Seminar on Active Methods of Education for Living in a World Community, 1952."

This history of the demise of world citizenship is an important reminder of the place of the reprisal of the nation-state and of empire in postwar cosmopolitan internationalism. Like the UN as a whole, UNESCO was carefully established as a body representing the interests of national or "domestic" sovereignty; by the middle of the twentieth century even imperial governments presented their states interests in terms of nationhood. At the helm of UNESCO, however, Huxley emphasized that "nationalist self-determination" led "in this closed world, to competition and war,"[89] and maintained that in order to promote peace and security his organization had to prevent "the separateness of nations from increasing"; a position easily reconciled with his preference for "self-government, and aversion to independence as the future of Britain's colonies."[90]

Looked at from the perspectives of the persistence of both imperialism and nationalism, the shifting status of ideas about world citizenship and One World—like the influence of men such as Huxley, who felt during World War II that they were "living in a revolution" but derived their definitions of political, social, and cultural change from the late nineteenth-century imperial past—points to the complexity of cosmopolitanism as an idea, even at any one historical moment. While the language of cosmopolitanism as One World, or world citizenship, or world community, remained vital to postwar visions of internationalism, it was as strategically significant to the antagonists of the democratic imperatives that fed a renewed international idealism. Huxley himself represented the world out of which the United Nations was formed, rather than the future it was meant to represent. This is not to argue that Huxley decided or determined the fate of what was a large and complex institution, especially given his relatively short term in office. But in the postwar struggle to give meaning to UNESCO's aims and methods, Huxley set the institution's anchor and its message of world citizenship as profoundly in the language and ideals of the liberal imperialist past and its cultural particularism as in the promise of a new scientific, modern, postnational future. As Huxley directed UNESCO's fascination with cultural diversity and scientific modernity in enduring institutional ways, UNESCO came to exemplify the potential and limits of mid twentieth-century cosmopolitanism and of One World.

---

[89] Huxley, "On Living in a Revolution," *Harper's Magazine*, September 1942, p. 13.
[90] Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics*, p. 109.