

UNESCO, the Faure Report, the Delors Report, and the Political Utopia of Lifelong Learning

Maren Elfert

Introduction

In accordance with its educational mandate and role as an intellectual think tank, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) mandated two independent commissions, one chaired by Edgar Faure, the other by Jacques Delors, to prepare two reports on the future of education. The commissions produced the reports *Learning to be* (Faure *et al.*, 1972), otherwise known as the *Faure report*, and *Learning: The treasure within* (Delors *et al.*, 1996), otherwise known as the *Delors report*. Despite the 24 years that lie between them and the different socio-political contexts from which they emerged, these reports have many similarities. They are situated in UNESCO's enlightenment tradition in that they are indebted to rationalism and progress, universal values, individual freedom, emancipation, and a humanist concept of human beings as masters of their own destiny. They call for a utopia in the sense of an ideal vision of a just society, 'a better world to live in' (Delors *et al.*, 1996, p. 19). Significantly, Jacques Delors called his own first chapter of the *Delors report* 'Education: The necessary utopia'. Both reports reflect on the future of education by questioning the validity of the existing systems not only of education, but of society as a whole. In this article, I argue that the concept of lifelong learning, as put forward by the reports, had a political dimension in terms of the emancipatory claim for justice and equality, which have been driving forces of the enlightenment and modernity.

In this article, which draws on archival research and interviews, I will explore how these two reports have contributed to debates on the purpose of education and learning. I will begin by shedding light on the origins of these initiatives, the context in which they came about and the driving forces behind them. I will then present their key features, in particular lifelong education as the global educational 'master concept' (Faure report, p. 182). I will go on to discuss how they have been received by UNESCO member states and partners and how they have been discussed in the scholarly literature. In the last section I will reflect on whether the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* are still relevant for our debates about learning today. I will argue that the concept of lifelong learning, as put forward by these reports, was a political utopia which is at odds with today's utilitarian view of education, driven primarily by economic considerations.

The Faure Report

Learning to be, otherwise known as the *Faure report*, was the outcome of the International Commission on the Development of Education, chaired by the French politician and former Minister of Education Edgar Faure. At its 84th session, held from 4 May to 19 June 1970, UNESCO's Executive Board authorised the Director-General, René Maheu, to establish the Commission mandated to produce a report on the future of education. The report, which was supposed to help member states 'formulate strategies for the development of education', was

considered to be a contribution to the Second Development Decade and the International Year of Education (UNESCO, 1970, April 8). It was a strategic move on the part of René Maheu to provide a UNESCO response to the ‘world educational crisis’ (Coombs, 1968), caused by the exploding enrolment rates and educational needs both in developing and developed countries. In the years preceding the report, students in Western and Eastern European countries had expressed their demands in uprisings in many capitals worldwide, particularly in Paris, where UNESCO’s headquarters are located. These protests left a lasting impression on the two driving figures of the report, René Maheu and Edgar Faure¹. The *Faure report* was also meant to position UNESCO as an intellectual driver of education, following the example of the World Bank’s *Pearson Report* and the UNDP’s *Jackson Report* on development, which were very much debated at the time. UNESCO’s Executive Board had a long discussion about these two reports during its 84th session, prior to deciding on the establishment of the Commission that was mandated to produce an education report (UNESCO, 1970, pp. 103–186). According to Jones (1988, pp. 124–125), the rivalry between UNESCO and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) at the time about the decrease of the funds that UNESCO received from the technical assistance sector of the UNDP was another reason why Maheu initiated the report, as a demonstration of UNESCO’s autonomy and moral and intellectual authority in education.

The *Faure report*, published by UNESCO in 1972, permeates the spirit of the late 1960s and early 1970s, which were the years when a cosmopolitan vision of global justice emerged as a call for a new social contract that not only involved states but ‘everyone everywhere’ (Moyn, 2013), and in which ‘persons [and not states] are the ultimate subjects of international morality’ (Moyn, 2013, citing Charles Beitz). Lifelong education was at the heart of ‘learning societies’, in which the focus was no longer on schooling, educational institutions and provision, but on the lifelong learning process of every individual that would enable the formation of the ‘complete man’ who is an ‘agent of development and change’, ‘promoter of democracy’, ‘citizen of the world’ and ‘author of his own fulfillment’ (Faure *et al.*, 1972, p. 158). The report calls upon education to contribute to ‘free reflection’ (p. 150) and ‘political consciousness’ (p. 151), so that human beings ‘understand the structures of the world they have to live in’ (p. 151) and ‘where necessary [show] a personal commitment in the struggle to reform them’ (p. 151).

The *Faure report* had a political-philosophical character, in that it tied educational ideas to the overall development of society, to equality and to democracy as a social and political system and to what the report called ‘international co-operation’ or ‘solidarity’ with developing countries. It responded to the general frustration about the inadequacies of educational policies by criticising the ‘linear expansion’ of education systems and recommended a ‘move from the quantitative to the qualitative, from imitation and reproduction to a search for innovations, from a uniform procedure to diverse alternatives’ (Faure *et al.*, 1972, pp. 173–174).

Knoll (1996, p. 26) situated the *Faure report* in a second pedagogical reform movement (after the first at the turn of century). Field (2001, p. 6) saw it as a ‘turning point’, as it marked a shift from the emphasis on schooling to a broader perspective that included less traditional pillars of education such as non-formal and informal education. Boshier (2004) observed the ‘challenge to formal

education [that is] nested in the architecture for lifelong education' (p. 55). In their paper on the ideological influences of the *Faure* and *Delors reports*, Lee and Friedrich (2011) demonstrated that the major underpinnings of the *Faure report* were a blend of classical liberalism, social democratic liberalism, and radical democratic liberalism, and that the report was also influenced by Paulo Freire's approaches to education for social change and Ivan Illich's deschooling ideas, which questioned the traditional approaches to education. These influences were brought into the Commission by one of its members, the former Iranian Minister of Science and Higher Education Majid Rahnema (Interview with Henri Lopes, 5 August 2014; Boshier, 1987).

The report also reflects the strong interest of its time in psychology. It is underpinned by theories of human nature and human beings' relationship to society and technology, drawing on a blend of Enlightenment humanism, existentialism (Wain, 1987, pp. 118–134) and Marxist thought, in particular Erich Fromm's philosophical psychology. As revealed by the title 'Learning to be', lifelong education in the *Faure report* is 'closely connected to the experience of life' (Suchodolski, 1976, pp. 62/63) and draws on a phenomenology of being, an aspect which has been explored by Friedrich and Lee (2011) and Su (2011).

The Delors Report

The *Delors report* was released 24 years after the *Faure report*, in a very different political and socio-economic context. After the end of the Cold War, it seemed that capitalism had won a complete victory. Neoliberalism was on the rise, but at the same time there was hope for a revitalisation of international cooperation and a renewed interest in human rights. The US had withdrawn from UNESCO in 1986, and although the absence of the largest financial contributor was a big challenge, in some ways the Organisation was freed from the burden of the perennial East-West conflict that had characterised the Cold War, as well as the South-North clashes that followed the admission of a large number of newly-independent countries of the South. In this rather hopeful climate, UNESCO made an effort to raise its intellectual profile by advocating for human rights against the spread of a market-driven view of education and by affirming its role as a global standard-setter in education.

The *Delors report* was the product of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, chaired by the French politician and long-term President of the European Commission Jacques Delors.² As part of a major programme on 'Education for the Twenty-First Century', the Commission was mandated to come up with responses to the question 'What kind of education is needed for what kind of society in the future?' (UNESCO, 1994, p. 39). The preface states that the report was the idea of the Director-General Federico Mayor. According to Power (2015, chapter 6), it was initiated as a response to the educational needs and demands of the countries that emerged from the collapse of the Soviet Union. The opening up of China was another reason why UNESCO deemed it important to produce another education report and its origins go back to an Education Symposium held in Beijing in 1989 (chapter 6). The decision to establish the Commission was taken at the 26thth session of UNESCO's General Conference, held in October/November 1991. The first session of the Commission was held in March 1993. Mundy (1999, p. 46) argues that the *Delors report* was a response to the utilitarian view of education put forward in the World Bank's 1995

Priorities and Strategies for Education. Another report that had a deep impact at the time was OECD's 1989 report *Education and the Economy in a Changing Society*, which reflects the OECD's engagement with the 'second generation of human capital theory' (Rubenson, in press).

The *Delors report* followed the *Faure report* in confirming the role of UNESCO as the advocate of a humanist and utopian vision of education. Like its predecessor, it promoted learning throughout life as the key concept for education and advocated for a learning society. Roberto Carneiro (2011), one of the commissioners of the *Delors report*, emphasises the novelty of these ideas. He defines the learning society as a counter-model to the neoliberal approach to education, 'a powerful appeal to the realm of human will and consciousness to reach beyond simple knowledge as a panacea and a new consumption commodity to be managed in our daily portfolio of convenience' (p. 8). Significantly, the term 'learning society' is a translation of 'cit   educative' which was used in the original French version of the *Faure report*, a reference to the Greek 'polis', the ideal society of citizens aimed at the common good.

The report reflected on the role of education in the face of the tensions which characterised the world on the eve of the new millennium, exacerbated by globalisation, such as the tension between the universal and the individual, tradition and modernity and the spiritual and the material (Delors *et al.*, 1996, pp. 16–18). It also paid a great deal of attention to the role of the new technologies in education and the need for continuous training for job-related purposes. While it stressed the possibilities of these new technologies for the democratisation of knowledge, it also cautioned against their potential to further aggravate social inequalities. Like the *Faure report*, the *Delors report* was permeated by a desire for a more just society, 'guided by the Utopian aim of steering the world towards greater sense of responsibility and greater solidarity' (p. 51).

The report introduced four pillars around which education and learning should be organised: learning to know; learning to do; learning to live together; and learning to be. 'Learning to live together' was, according to Delors, the most important pillar in the eyes of the Commission (p. 22; see also Carneiro & Draxler, 2008). The section on the 'learning to be' pillar reiterates the concern expressed in the preamble of the *Faure report*, 'that the world would be dehumanized as a result of technical change' (Faure *et al.*, 1972, p. 94). The report cautions against 'a certain standardization of individual behavior' (p. 95) and emphasises the importance of 'the qualities of imagination and creativity' as 'the clearest manifestations of human freedom' (p. 95). Below the surface, the *Delors report* expresses a subtle spirit of disenchantment, propagating education as a necessary condition for the ability of humans to defend themselves against an 'alienating', even 'hostile' system (Delors *et al.*, p. 95).

The Purpose of Education and Learning in the Reports

Both reports draw on ideas such as the equality of human beings as global citizens (the *Delors report* speaks of the 'global village'), the Enlightenment belief in progress, the full development of the human potential, and the ability of human beings to change their world. Like those who drafted UNESCO's Constitution, the members of the Commissions believed in the unifying force of humanism. Zeev Sternhell's (2010) definition of the Enlightenment's 'universal intellectual' could be applied to them:

They wrote with the immediate application of their ideas in mind, but at the same time posed fundamental questions about human nature and the role of man in society. They have an idea of what they thought a 'good' society should be. They all tried to transcend the immediate context in which they lived and felt that they were stating 'eternal principles' and essential truths (p. 39).

This universalist position is addressed in the *Delors report*, when Delors — in his own chapter — writes about 'the tension between the spiritual and the material':

It is . . . education's noble task to encourage each and every one, acting in accordance with their traditions and convictions and paying full respect to pluralism, to lift their minds and spirits to the plane of the universal and, in some measure, to transcend themselves. It is no exaggeration on the Commission's part to say that the survival of humanity depends thereon (Delors *et al.*, p. 18).

Significant in this regard is a quote from a book by Henri Lopes (2003), the Congolese politician, diplomat and writer who was a member of the Faure Commission, in which he takes a strong stand against particularism and identity politics: 'The distinctive cult of cultural, original, national or religious identity brings about obscurantism, fundamentalism and the politics of exclusion' (author's translation from the French original). (p. 13). In accordance with this universalist spirit, lifelong education is presented by the *Faure report* as the 'new educational master concept for both developed and developing countries' (Faure report, p. 182). But it was not a new concept — it had emerged in UNESCO in the 1960s, mainly in the context of adult education (Lengrand, 1970). According to Kidd (1974, p. 20), lifelong education was already discussed at the 2nd International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA II) in Montreal in 1960.

In the *Faure report* it is stated that the 'major argument in favour of lifelong education' is the condition of human beings as coming into this world 'unfinished' and in constant need to learn in order to survive' (Faure *et al.*, p. 157–158). While the *Faure report* uses the term 'lifelong education', the *Delors report* is associated with the use of the term 'lifelong learning'. It escapes many readers that this is not entirely accurate — the report actually uses the term 'learning throughout life'. According to Roberto Carneiro, one of the commissioners of the report, this 'subtle, but fundamental' difference was very well chosen. Beyond the temporal — some would say the vertical — dimension of 'lifelong', it includes the horizontal notion of 'lifewide', considering the learning that occurs in all spheres of life. 'Life is your basic material of learning, your basic reflection, it is experiential' (Interview with Roberto Carneiro, 27 June 2014). Learning is no longer limited to specific life periods and age groups, but needs to be seen as a 'continuum' (Delors *et al.*, p. 100). Learning throughout life encompasses the necessity to adapt to learning requirements as a 'response to an economic demand', as well as the ability of human beings 'to retain mastery of their own destinies' (p. 101). Learning throughout life needs to be guaranteed through 'flexible types of education' that provide for the equality of opportunity of all learners — a point which is stressed as a necessary premise of democracy. Carneiro (2011) refers to 'learning throughout life' as 'both a way of organizing education and a philosophy of education' (p. 5). Both 'lifelong education' and 'learning throughout life' are meant to be more than organising

principles of education — rather, they depict a worldview of a democratic society in which all citizens have equal learning opportunities which enable them to unleash their full potential and participate in building the societies in which they live.

The main difference between the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* lies in their historical contexts. In the 1970s, in the aftermath of the student revolution, the existing order was being called into question. Erich Fromm (1969), writing about Ivan Illich, called that approach ‘humanist radicalism’ — ‘characterized by the motto: *de omnibus dubitandum*; everything must be doubted, particularly the ideological concepts which are virtually shared by everybody and have consequently assumed the role of indubitable commonsensical axioms’ (pp. 7–8). In the words of Henri Lopes, ‘All taboos were broken, there were no certainties’ (Interview with Henri Lopes, 5 August 2014; author’s translation from French). It was in this spirit that Paul Lengrand wrote an article entitled ‘L’homme de la réponse et l’homme de la question’ (1975/1994). He referred to lifelong learning as the ‘first time [when] an element of freedom has been introduced into the educational universe’ (1986, p. 9), in that it signified for him the end of what Paulo Freire called the ‘banking’ model of education. The *Faure report* challenged the traditional education system, in particular the school system — ‘the old idea that schooling is the only valid education and that the time for learning is limited to traditional school age . . . is fundamentally unjust’ (Faure *et al.*, p. 44). Although the school is accepted as the foundation of the education system, the report calls for a critical reconsideration of the school, which needs to become less elitist, promote intellectual and practical skills and be more relevant to people’s lives. Not only does the school system exclude the ‘hundreds of millions of illiterate people’ (p. 44) and young people who have never been to school or have dropped out of school. It also ‘acts as a sieve . . . with an eye to selecting the future élite’ (p. 59). Alongside the claim for more equal participation in education goes the demand for ‘equitable redistribution’ (p. 49) of other material and immaterial resources, such as scientific knowledge and technologies between developed and developing countries.

In the 1990s, the path that societies would take seemed determined, the Communist societies had collapsed, neoliberalism was on the rise, and the Education for All initiative was launched, which led to a considerable expansion of primary schooling in developing countries. The *Delors report* fully embraces the school as the fundamental pillar of the education system. However, it also makes a series of critical remarks about it and argues, for example, that it is in pre-primary and primary schooling that ‘the spark of creativity may either spring into life or be extinguished’ (Delors *et al.*, p. 115).

The ‘complete man’, one of the key concepts of the *Faure report*, is an essential component of the report’s emphasis on ‘learning to be’. The ‘complete man’ has learned to be creative and to ‘think freely and critically’ (Faure *et al.*, p. 69) and ‘will consciously seek individual and collective emancipation’ (p. 56). The *Delors report* does not take up this gender-biased term, but it embraces the *Faure report*’s emphasis on the realisation of the individual’s potential and sees the ‘central aim of education [as] the fulfillment of the individual as a social being’ (Delors *et al.*, p. 53). This capacity of thinking critically and participating in society as an active citizen is directly linked to democracy, another key concept of the reports:

Strong support must be given to democracy, as the only way for man to avoid becoming enslaved to machines, and the only condition compatible with the dignity which the intellectual achievements of the human race require; . . . there cannot . . . be a democratic and egalitarian relationship between classes divided by excessive inequality in education; and the aim and content of education must be re-created, to allow both for the new features of society and the new features of democracy. For these reasons, the commission stressed the fact that education must be regarded as a domain where political action is of especially decisive importance (Faure *et al.*, p. xxvi).

This quote illustrates that the commissioners of the *Faure report* believed they were witnessing the birth of a new society and a new political system. The tone of the *Delors report* is more pessimistic. Here also, democracy is portrayed as the only possible political system that allows for a balance between individual freedom and social cohesion. But the *Delors report* observes a crisis of democracy and a loss of interest in its values (Delors *et al.*, p. 55). The democratic and participatory society based on freedom, creativity and solidarity imagined in the *Faure report* did not come about.

Influence of the Reports

Research into the impact of the reports on educational policies is insufficient. Tawil and Cougeureux (2013) observe that there has been ‘no systematic follow-up on the influence and impact of the Delors report’ (Delors *et al.*, p. 5). The Executive Secretary of the Faure Commission, Asher Deleon, lists Canada, Japan, Sweden, Norway and Argentina among the countries that took up the *Faure report*, but ‘most experiments have been fragmentary and sporadic, with limited resources’ (Deleon, 1996, p. 14). Ryan (1999) traces the influence of the *Faure report*’s concept of lifelong education on training and further education (TAFE) policies in Australia. The report was certainly more of a high-flown intellectual exercise and, with its strong humanist ideology and innovative ideas, did not speak to the mainstream. The reactions of the Executive Board were echoed in many member states. After a series of friendly remarks, the Board went on to deplore that the report did not propose a ‘typology of education’ and a ‘methodology of the reform of education’, which could have given it ‘a more realistic and practical character’ (UNESCO, 1972, December 21, p. 10).

While the *Faure report* was discussed at length by the Executive Board (UNESCO, 19 January 1973, pp. 4–33), no such debate occurred in the case of the *Delors report*. But away from headquarters, many UNESCO Commissions and regional offices organised seminars and panel discussions in countries all around the world to discuss the report, often in cooperation with national Ministries of Education (Power, 2015, chapter 6). Both reports were translated into about 30 languages. According to Carneiro and Draxler (2008), the *Delors report* generated initiatives in 50 countries. It sparked the development of indicators for lifelong learning (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2010; Canadian Council on Learning, 2010), reflections on educational reform (see, for example, Canadian Commission for UNESCO, 1997, for Canada; De Lisle, 1998, for Latin America; Dohmen, 1996, for Germany) and pilot projects, such as a lifelong learning model experiment in the German Laender (BLK, 2001). The *Delors report*’s four pillars of learning became a catchphrase and are still being cited frequently in policy reports and the

scholarly literature. A quick search for the terms ‘four pillars of learning’ and ‘Delors’ in an academic database produced 52 articles in academic journals, not counting books, chapters and other literature. But apart from the rhetorics and intellectual exercises, there is little evidence as to how far the report actually influenced policies worldwide.

Given that lifelong education had emerged in the context of adult education, it is no surprise that both reports, despite addressing education in its totality, have been received mainly in adult education circles. It was UNESCO’s adult education institute — the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE)³ — that not only provided background papers to both reports⁴, but also played an important role in their follow up. Following the publication of the *Faure report*, UIE took up lifelong education as its main area of work and developed its conceptualisation from an interdisciplinary perspective (see, for example, Dave, 1976; Cropley, 1979).⁵ Although the *Delors report* was criticised for its lack of attention to adult education (Bhola, 1997), it strongly influenced the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA V) and is referred to in many of the conference documents (see, for example, UIE, 1997).⁶ Lee (2007, pp. 18–19) argues that, as a consequence of the *Delors report*, the discourse in EC policy documents shifted between 1995 and 1997 from a focus on the economic purposes of education to a more balanced discourse, showing equal concern for the role of education for social purposes. The EC’s *Memorandum on Lifelong Learning* of 2000 refers to ‘learning throughout life’, which is an important concept in the *Delors report*.

The *Faure report* was meant to be a contribution to the Second Development Decade, but it was not successful in reaching the developing world, as ‘the Third World countries regarded lifelong education as a luxury of the Developed World’ (Rubenson, 2006, p. 71). There is no doubt that since the early 1990s the Education for All (EFA) initiative, driven by the World Bank’s conviction at the time that primary schooling produced the highest economic rates of return, had a far greater impact on the educational systems in developing countries and became the development agenda for the South (Mundy, 2006; Torres, 2002). The EFA initiative has been criticised because the reliance on goals entailed increased linking of development aid to the achievement of numerical targets (Goldstein, 2004). As for the ‘developed world’, it was the OECD’s lifelong learning discourse that won the day (Rubenson, 2009). Although OECD’s version of lifelong learning also includes aspects of social cohesion and citizenship, the dominant purpose of lifelong learning is presented by the OECD as the acquisition of skills and competencies to meet labour market needs in the broader context of a competitive knowledge society. In his study of the competing views of lifelong learning between UNESCO and OECD, Rubenson (2006) invoked the image of the Janus face, showing us its economic side more often than its humanistic side. Going even further, Bagnall (2000), in his analysis of the contemporary lifelong learning discourse, came to the conclusion that it was strongly driven by economic determinism, a finding confirmed by Elfert and Rubenson’s (2013) research on adult education and lifelong learning policies in Canada. Hence, despite the appeal of its message, the *Delors report* was overshadowed by the pragmatic approach to EFA on the one hand and by the hegemony of a neoliberal lifelong learning discourse on the other.

With their call for social change and their reflections on political and societal issues, the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* remind us of the political message of lifelong learning. In the *Faure report* the ultimate purpose of lifelong education is a

new society. Delors' 'necessary utopia' is a 'more just world' (Delors *et al.*, p. 19). In this respect, the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* represent what has been called the 'maximalist position' of lifelong learning, which, according to Cropley (1979) involves 'a fundamental transformation of society' (p. 105).

As Nesbit (2013, p. 93) points out, we do not see any such reflections in the country reports that were submitted to UNESCO prior to the last International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA VI) in 2009 or to the *Global Report on Adult Education and Learning* (GRALE). Similarly, with regard to EFA, Torres (2001, p. 7) observes that the dramatic changes the world had undergone between the EFA conferences in Jomtien, held in 1990, and Dakar, held in 2000, are not reflected in the Dakar documents. Klees and Qargha (2014), in their study of UNICEF's approach to equity in education, argue that the political debate is being eschewed. Girls' education is being kept 'apolitical' in favour of cost-benefit approaches that do not challenge the underlying causes (p. 327). Today's instrumental approach prevents one from placing education in the context of wider debates about society or offers technocratic solutions to complex social problems.

Conclusion

The reports remind us that lifelong learning, as imagined by its pioneers in UNESCO and by the Faure and Delors Commissions, was meant to be a political utopia in that the concept challenged traditional orders and aimed at changing society for the better on the basis of the principles of justice and equality. In this respect, they represent the old dream of modernity, which is also reflected in the UNESCO Constitution. UNESCO has recently launched a 'Rethinking Education' initiative, which draws on the *Faure report* and the *Delors report*, with the purpose of formulating UNESCO's humanistic and universal vision of the future of education in the context of the current post-2015 EFA debates (UNESCO Education Research and Foresight, 2013). At this time of exacerbating conflicts and widening gaps of inequality worldwide, there could be much to learn from revisiting the reports' claim for a more just society and their concepts of 'learning to be' and 'learning to live together'. However, in the contemporary political climate characterised by particularism and the hegemony of the economic, it seems unlikely that UNESCO's message will be noticed. But the reports remind us that political and ideological climates change and that it is worth imagining alternatives.

Maren Elfert, Department of Educational Studies, University of British Columbia, Ponderosa Annex G, 2044 Lower Mall, Vancouver, B. C., V6T 1Z2, Canada, elfertm@shaw.ca

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank André Mazawi, Kjell Rubenson and the reviewers for their helpful comments on this article.

NOTES

1. Faure was nominated Minister of Education shortly after the French May uprising. He refers to the events in France in May 1968 in his preamble to the report (Faure *et al.*, p. xx).
2. Whereas the Faure Commission consisted of seven men, originating from France (Faure himself), Chile, Republic of Congo, Iran, Syria, the US and the

USSR, the Delors Commission consisted of 15 members, five of whom were women, from all world regions. Members were appointed by UNESCO's Director-General Federico Mayor after broad consultation, including with Jacques Delors (Interview with Alexandra Draxler, 22 July 2014). While the *Faure report* contains many footnotes added by individual members, the *Delors report* includes short individual chapters by each commissioner at the end of the report. The first chapter was written by Jacques Delors himself.

3. In 2007, the Institute changed its name to UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.
4. A selection of the background papers that informed the reports, written by eminent scholars from diverse disciplines, have been published in UNESCO, 1975 and UNESCO, 1998.
5. For a longer discussion of UIE's role in shaping the concept of lifelong learning, see Elfert, 2013, and Tuijnman & Boström, 2002.
6. Upon invitation by the Institute, Jacques Delors provided a video message on lifelong learning to CONFINTEA VI, held in 2009. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYDTIRzzRss>

REFERENCES

- BAGNALL, R. G. (2000) Lifelong learning and the limitations of economic determinism. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 19, pp 20–35.
- BERTELSMANN STIFTUNG (2010) *Making Lifelong Learning Tangible. The European ELLI-Index 2010*. (Guetersloh, Bertelsmann Stiftung). http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/bst/en/media/xcms_bst_dms_32077_32078_2.pdf
- BHOLA, H. S. (1997) Adult education policy projections in the Delors report. *Prospects*, XXVII (2), pp. 207–222.
- BOSHIER, R. W. (1987) *Learning to be — an interview with Majid Rahnema, former Minister of Education and Sciences in Iran about building an architecture for lifelong education*. Vancouver: UBC Access Television.
- BOSHIER, R. (2004) Meanings and manifestations of anarchist-utopian ethos in adult education. *45th Annual Adult Education Research Conference (AERC)*, Victoria, B.C. (pp. 53–58). <http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/2004/papers/Boshier.PDF>
- BUND-LÄNDER-KOMMISSION FÜR BILDUNGSPLANUNG UND FORSCHUNGSFÖRDERUNG (BLK). (2001) *Lebenslanges Lernen. Programmbeschreibung und Darstellung der Länderprojekte*. Deutsches Institut für Erwachsenenbildung (DIE). *Materialien zur Bildungsplanung und zur Forschungsförderung. Heft 88*. (Bonn, BLK). <http://www.blk-bonn.de/papers/heft88.pdf>
- CANADIAN COMMISSION FOR UNESCO (1997) *Learning together throughout our lives. Discussion kit on the report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the 21st Century* (Ottawa, Canadian Commission for UNESCO). <http://www.unesco.ca/en/home-accueil/resources-ressources/~media/PDF/UNESCO/LearningTogether.ashx>
- CANADIAN COUNCIL ON LEARNING (CCL). (2010) *The 2010 Composite Learning Index (CLI). Five years of measuring Canada's progress in lifelong learning* (Ottawa, Canadian Council on Learning).

- CARNEIRO, R. (2011) Discovering the treasure of learning, in: J. YANG & R. VALDES-COTERA (Eds). *Making Lifelong Learning a Reality for all: conceptual evolutions and policy developments* (pp. 3–23) (Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning).
- CARNEIRO, R. & DRAXLER, A. (2008) Education for the 21st century: lessons and challenges. *European Journal of Education*, 43, pp.149–160.
- COOMBS, P. H. (1968) *The World Educational Crisis: a systems analysis* (Oxford, Oxford Press).
- CROPLEY, A. J. (Ed) (1979) *Lifelong Education: a stocktaking* (Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education).
- DAVE, R. H. (Ed) (1976) *Foundations of Lifelong Education* (Hamburg/Oxford, UNESCO Institute for Education/Pergamon Press).
- DELEON, A. (1996) Learning to be in retrospect. *The UNESCO Courier*, April 1996, pp.12–16.
- DE LISLE, J. (1998) The Delors report within the American context. The major project of education in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Bulletin*, 45 (April 1998) (pp. 32–46). Santiago, Chile: Regional Office for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001131/113160e.pdf>
- DELORS, J. *et al.* (1996) *Learning: the treasure within. Report to UNESCO of the international commission on education for the twenty-first century* (Paris, UNESCO).
- DOHMEN, G. (1996) *Lifelong Learning. Guidelines for a Modern Education Policy* (Bonn, Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Technology).
- ELFERT, M. (2013) Six decades of educational multilateralism in a globalising world: the history of the UNESCO Institute in Hamburg, *International Review of Education*, 59, pp. 263–287. doi: 10.1007/s11159-013-9361-5
- ELFERT, M. & RUBENSON, K. (2013) Adult education policies in Canada: skills without humanity, in; T. NESBIT, N. TABER, S. BRIGHAM & T. GIBB (Eds) *Building on Critical Traditions: adult education and learning in Canada* (Toronto, Thompson Educational Publishing).
- FAURE, E. *et al.* (1972) *Learning to Be. The World of Education Today and Tomorrow* (Paris, UNESCO/Harrap).
- FIELD, J. (2001) Lifelong education, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20, pp. 3–15.
- FRIEDRICH, T. & LEE, M. (2011) Technocratic and aesthetic-democratic being in UNESCO's lifelong learning policy discourse: an ideological analysis, *Journal for the Philosophical Study of Education*, I, pp. 153–173.
- FROMM, E. (1969) Introduction, in: I. ILLICH. *Celebration of Awareness. A Call for Institutional Revolution* (pp. 7–11) (Garden City, New York, Doubleday & Company).
- GOLDSTEIN, H. (2004) Education for All: the globalization of learning targets, *Comparative Education*, 40, pp. 7–14.
- JONES, P. W. (1988) *International Policies for Third World Education: UNESCO, literacy and development* (London & New York, Routledge).
- KIDD, J. R. (1974) *A Tale of Three Cities: Elsinore-Montreal-Tokyo. The Influence of three UNESCO World Conferences upon the Development of Adult Education* (Syracuse, NY, Syracuse University).

- KLEES, S. J. & QARGHA, O. (2014) Equity in education: the case of UNICEF and the need for participative debate, *Prospects*, 44, pp. 321–333.
- KNOLL, J. (1996) Vom *Faure-Bericht* zum Bericht der Internationalen Kommission *Bildung fuer das 21. Jahrhundert*, in: K. HUEFNER & W. REUTHER (Eds) *UNESCO-Handbuch* (Neuwied, Kritisel, Berlin, Luchterhand).
- LEE, M. (2007) Opening up the ideologies in ‘Learning: The treasure within’, *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 4, pp. 17–36.
- LEE, M. & FRIEDRICH, T. (2011) Continuously reaffirmed, subtly accommodated, obviously missing and fallaciously critiqued: ideologies in UNESCO’s lifelong learning policy, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 30, pp. 151–169.
- LENGRAND, P. (1970) *An Introduction to Lifelong Education* (Paris, UNESCO).
- LENGRAND, P. (1975/1994) L’homme de la réponse et l’homme de la question, *International Review of Education*, 40 (Special issue on lifelong education), pp. 339–342.
- LOPES, H. (2003) *Ma grand-mère bantoue et mes ancêtres les Gaulois. Simples discours* (Paris, Éditions Gallimard) (Continents noirs).
- MOYN, S. (2013) *The political origins of global justice*. Lecture at the Center for the Humanities, Wesleyan University. 16 September, 2013. <https://itunes.apple.com/us/institution/wesleyan-university/id427785946>
- MUNDY, K. (1999) Educational multilateralism in a changing world order: Unesco and the limits of the possible, *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19, pp. 27–52.
- MUNDY, K. (2006) *Education for all and the new development compact*, *International Review of Education*, 52, pp. 23–48.
- NESBIT, T. (2013). Whiter utopia?, in: T. NESBIT & M. WELTON (Eds) *Adult Education and Learning in a Precarious Age: the Hamburg Declaration revisited* (pp. 91–101) (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass).
- POWER, C. N. (2015) The power of education. (Series: *Education in the Asia-Pacific region: Issues, concerns and prospects*, vol. 27) (Dordrecht, Springer).
- RUBENSON, K. (2006) Constructing the lifelong learning paradigm: competing visions from the OECD and UNESCO, in: S. ELLERS (Ed) *Milestones in Adult Education* (pp. 63–78) (Copenhagen, Danish University Press).
- RUBENSON, K. (2009) Lifelong learning. Between humanism and global capitalism, in: P. JARVIS (Ed) *International Handbook on Lifelong Learning* (pp. 411–422). (London & New York, Routledge).
- RUBENSON, K. (in press) Framing the adult learning and education policy discourse: the role of the OECD, in: M. MILANA & T. NESBIT (Eds) *Adult Education and Learning Policy: a worldwide review* (London, Palgrave Macmillan).
- RYAN, R. J. (1999) From recurrent education to lifelong learning. *International Seminar on the Delors report: Learning — The Treasure Within*. Elinders University Institute of International Education. Elinders University, Adelaide.
- STERNHELL, Z. (2010) *The Anti-Enlightenment Tradition* (Yale University Press).
- SU, Y.-H. (2011) Lifelong learning as being: the Heideggerian perspective, *Adult Education Quarterly*, 61, pp. 57–72.
- SUCHODOLSKI, B. (1976) Lifelong education — some philosophical aspects, in: R. DAVE (Ed) *Foundations of Lifelong Education* (pp. 57–96) (Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education and Oxford, Pergamon Press).

- TAWIL, S. & COUGOUREUX, M. (2013, January 4) Revisiting *Learning: The Treasure within*. Assessing the influence of the 1996 Delors report. UNESCO Education Research and Foresight. *Occasional papers* (Paris, UNESCO). <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002200/220050E.pdf>
- TORRES, R. M. (2001) What happened at the World Education Forum? *Adult Education and Development*, 56.
- TORRES, R. M. (2002) Lifelong learning in the north, Education for All in the south, in: C. MEDEL-ANOÑUEVO (Ed) *Integrating Lifelong Learning Perspectives* (pp. 3–12) (Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education).
- TUIJNMAN, A. & BOSTRÖM, A.-K. (2002) Changing notions of lifelong education and lifelong learning, *International Review of Education*, 48, pp. 93–110.
- UIE (UNESCO INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION) (1997) *The Hamburg Declaration on adult learning and the agenda for the future*. Fifth international conference on adult education, 14–18 July 1997 (Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education). www.unesco.org/education/uiie/confintea/pdf/con5eng.pdf.
- UNESCO (1970, April 8) International Commission of experts on strategies for the Development of education throughout the world. 84th session of the Executive Board. 84 EX/7 (UNESCO Archives).
- UNESCO (1970) Twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh meeting of the 84th session of the Executive Board, May– June 1970. 84 EX/SR. 1-33 (SR. 26) (pp. 294–308). In *Executive Board. 1969–1970. Comptes rendus. Vol. VIII, 82–86 sessions* (UNESCO Archives).
- UNESCO (1972, December 21) Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Executive Board at its 90th session (Paris, 25 September — 21 November 1972). 90 EX/Decisions (Paris, UNESCO). <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000022/002233e.pdf>
- UNESCO (1973, 19 January). Summary records. 90th session of the Executive Board. 25 September — 20 November, 1972. 90 EX/SR.1-19 (Paris, UNESCO Archives).
- UNESCO (1975) *Education on the Move. Extracts from background papers prepared for the report of the International Commission on the Development of Education* (Toronto, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education & Paris, UNESCO Press).
- UNESCO (1994) Approved programme and budget for 1994–1995. 27 C/5 (Paris, UNESCO). <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0009/000956/095663eo.pdf>
- UNESCO (1998) Education for the twenty-first century: Issues and prospects. Contributions to the work of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, chaired by Jacques Delors. *Education on the Move* (Paris, UNESCO Publishing).
- UNESCO EDUCATION RESEARCH AND FORESIGHT (2013) *Rethinking education in a changing world*. Meeting of the Senior Experts' Group, Paris, 12–14 February, 2013. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002247/224743e.pdf>
- WAIN, K. (1987) *Philosophy of Lifelong Education* (Wolfboro, New Hampshire, Croom Helm).

Copyright of European Journal of Education is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.