

University of Groningen

UNESCO's Tensions Project (1947-1957) on India and Israel:

Six, Clemens

Published in:
Peace & Change

DOI:
[10.1111/pech.12619](https://doi.org/10.1111/pech.12619)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2023

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Six, C. (2023). UNESCO's Tensions Project (1947-1957) on India and Israel: Peace research in an era of decolonization. *Peace & Change*, 48(3), 183-204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pech.12619>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

UNESCO's Tensions Project (1947–1957) on India and Israel: Peace research in an era of decolonization

Clemens Six

Department of History, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

Correspondence

Clemens Six, Department of History, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.

Email: c.six@rug.nl

Abstract

In the light of the Second World War, the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and decolonization in Asia, the newly established UN organization for education, science and culture (UNESCO) initiated a global research project in 1947. Its main task was to find out how tensions within and between societies can be explained and tackled to secure peace and social justice. Combining peace history with the global history of social sciences and global intellectual history, this article assesses the design and conduct of the Tensions Project in India and Israel at the crossroads of post-fascism and post-colonialism. It finds the reasons for the Project's limited impact in the contradictions between universal knowledge claims and local specificities, its overconfidence in scientific solutions for social problems, interfering nation-building in early postcolonial states, the limited comparability of research, and its neglect of political activism.

INTRODUCTION

In late 1947, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) held its second General Conference in Mexico City. The organization had been founded only two years earlier with some important preparatory steps already undertaken in the last months of the Second World War. An initiative mainly of the United Kingdom and the United States,

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2023 The Author. Peace & Change published by Peace History Society and Wiley Periodicals LLC.

UNESCO's mission to promote global peace through intellectual cooperation, education, or cultural means built upon the institutional and intellectual legacies of the League of Nations. Its objective is to help prevent future devastations comparable to the Great Depression and the war. In that light, the imperial continuities Mark Mazower observed in the set-up of the United Nations also existed at UNESCO.¹

At the same time, UNESCO was created in a historical context determined by a combination of several grave conditions including the destructions of the Second World War, the far-reaching transformations of Asian decolonization, and the nuclearization of the Cold War. Its function required new approaches and creative strategies in order to develop some perceptible impact.² Since its foundation in November 1945, UNESCO had been in a process of self-discovery both at the level of mission and programming as well as in terms of the development of concrete partnerships and projects in the Parisian headquarters and the member states. This first phase of the organization's history was thus characterized by a high degree of improvisation and a lack of coherence between its numerous initiatives and projects.³ There existed a strong and widely shared notion, though, that scientific exchange across borders had been crucial in the defeat of fascism and should thus play a central role in the post-1945 world order.⁴

During its second session in Mexico 1947, the General Conference instructed the Director-General to initiate a large-scale project to address "Tensions Affecting International Understanding" (Tensions Project). In the course of the next ten years or so, in a series of research projects, (social) scientists all over the world should undertake enquiries "into the distinctive character of the various national cultures, ideals and legal systems" in order to stimulate "sympathy and respect" among nations; launch enquiries "into the conceptions" people entertained about themselves and other nations; and identify "modern techniques" developed in psychology, education, political science, and philosophy "for changing mental attitudes and for revealing the processes and forces involved when human minds are in conflict." Furthermore, the Tensions Project should find out which "influences throughout life" would predispose people either toward international understanding or "aggressive nationalism." Finally, the Project ought to develop a source book to register the activities and strategies already under way in UNESCO's member states to study and comprehend the evolution of tensions related to technological changes and various shifts of populations. The purpose of such a source book was to take stock of such activities with the goal to coordinate them in the long run and enhance mutual learning.⁵

Based on this ambitious and broad agenda, UNESCO invited Hadley Cantril, a psychologist at Princeton University, who specialized in the study of propaganda, public opinion, international communication and development psychology, to organize a kick-off event in Paris. In the course of this gathering, some of the world's leading intellectuals were asked to translate the general intentions expressed in the General Conference Resolution into a more concrete research agenda.

During two weeks in the summer of 1948, Cantril assembled eight prominent social scientists in Paris who represented some of the most visible and best-funded academic disciplines in post-1945 Anglo-American academia including sociology, social psychology, and psycho-analysis. Among the invited scholars were, for example, Gordon W. Allport, author of pioneering studies on personality psychology and at that time professor of social relations at Harvard University; Harry Stack Sullivan, a Neo-Freudian psychoanalyst with a strong interest in interpersonal relationships who had worked for the United States Office of War Information during WW2; and John Rickman, psychoanalyst and editor of the *British Journal of Medical Psychology*. In brief, from the very beginning, the Tensions Project was strongly influenced by social sciences and psychology, two academic fields that were centre stage not only in Western academia but also in Cold War policy-making after 1945.⁶ This disciplinary



pattern reflected the prevalent perception of social scientists around that time, according to which the social sciences, particularly social psychology, produced the kind of knowledge “the future of human civilization” would depend on.⁷ In the coming two decades, though, during which peace research advanced significantly in terms of institutionalization as well as multi-disciplinarity, the dominance of social psychology decreased in favor of political science, international relations, and economics.⁸

Although Cantril's club of eight did not contain a single woman and was largely white, it did include representatives who were skeptical about the ability of social sciences and psychology to engineer global peace. The most prominent among them, Max Horkheimer, had himself fled from the Nazis in the interwar period. Together with Theodor Adorno, he made plans to re-establish his Institute of Social Research in post-war Germany and thus return to Europe.⁹ His theoretical and empirical work had been critical about the kind of over-confidence in social and mental engineering displayed at UNESCO's General Conference in Mexico. Arne Naess, a philosopher at the University of Oslo, was an early environmentalist with a distanced relationship to the blessings of industrialization, technological progress, and the transformative capabilities of the social sciences. As a lecturer in Oslo, he also exerted significant influence on later generations of peace researchers, Johan Galtung being the most prominent one, who Naess met when he was only 41 years old.¹⁰ And Gilberto Freyre, an anthropologist and sociologist at Bahia University in Brazil, had gained a reputation as one of the country's leading anti-racists. Together, these scholars were meant to draft an agenda for the Tensions Project and identify the main pillars of global, peace-promoting research.

The common statement that came out of this meeting in Paris functioned as the programmatic guidelines for the diverse studies conducted over the next ten years. The authors emphasized that, against what propagandists during the Second World War had repeatedly claimed, there was no evidence that “wars are necessary and inevitable consequences of ‘human nature’ as such.”¹¹ What, in their view, people shared all over the world was the desire to be free from fear, hunger, disease, and other such threats. Consequently, the problem of peace was not a problem of human biology but “the problem of keeping groups and national tensions and aggressions within manageable proportions and of directing them to ends that are at the same time personally and socially constructive, so that man will no longer seek to exploit man.”¹² One of the core lessons the authors drew from the first half of the twentieth century was that it was not sufficient to undertake isolated and superficial efforts toward peace. Rather, the world community needed to initiate “fundamental changes in social organization and in our ways of thinking.”¹² Among other things, this meant addressing the long-term roles played by myths, stereotyping, and symbols of national pride with the goal to overcome various social and political evils, and the continuing status of inferiority of any group of people.¹³

The Tensions Project thus started with a comprehensive claim to identify, analyze, understand, and combat the most important obstacles to peace at a global scale. The overall context of re-ordering international and domestic relations located the Tensions Project at the crossroads of unresolved conflicts. After the devastations of the Second World War several those included evolving Cold War tensions, decolonization, with its first disastrous climax of India's Partition in the summer of 1947 and the predicament of humanity's sheer survival in a post-Hiroshima world.

Before analyzing a few selected elements of the Tensions Project by taking a closer look at research on India and Israel, it is necessary to briefly assess the historiographical relevance of this case study. As a comprehensive and more detailed history of this Project remains to be written,¹⁴ the Project's broader historical significance consists primarily of the following points:

First, historical research on the Tensions Project can be an original contribution to historical peace studies. The existing literature in this field has rightly illustrated that the end of the Second World War was a global threshold in the way peace was framed and fought for. The war brought the end to the idea that human societies were quasi naturally evolving toward peace.¹⁵ By contrast, the war experience, the destruction of European Jewish communities, Hiroshima, and decolonization had brought to light new patterns of conflict and violence facilitated by new interdependencies between military and scientific thinking.¹⁶ In return, these experiences opened up space for new voices and new concepts of peace reinforcing both the scientific interest in peace and the mobilization for peace.¹⁷ The history of the Tensions Project is an opportunity to write the contributions of UNESCO, and other newly founded international organizations, into the post-1945 world history of peace.¹⁸ This step should enable us to understand better how new forms of peace research connected small-scale changes in the individual psyche, especially children and the young, and among family members, with peace as a product of and achievement in international relations. In its multidisciplinary setup, with a strong focus on psychology and social sciences, the Tensions Project manifested an attempt to document and popularize this connection for more adequate policy-making at the national and global level.

Second, the Tensions Project provides some valuable lessons for the evolving field of global intellectual history. Since the publication of Claude Ake's interpretation of social sciences as a form of imperialism in 1979, there have been repeated demands to decolonize the social sciences including their core concepts and canonized standard literature. As Ake saw it, "Western social sciences" played a vital role throughout the twentieth century in the global enforcement of capitalist values and institutions, the 'development' and control of non-Western societies, the construction of a dominant understanding of the world's most important problems, and the framing of their possible solutions.¹⁹ In Ake's tradition, critical scholars from various disciplines have urged the scientific community to contribute to a larger project of "decoloniality,"²⁰ i.e., combat "intellectual imperialism,"²¹ "decolonize knowledge"²² more generally and "sociology" more specifically,²³ and address "epistemic injustice" in its various academic manifestations.²⁴ The Tensions Project is a rich illustration of how global power relations determined the design and conduct of scholarly research in an era of decolonization. In spite of the inclusion of non-Western scholars from the very beginning, Anglo-American and French academic personnel, scholarly approaches, concepts, and research strategies remained dominant throughout its progression. The hierarchies between Western social sciences and everything else also determined the personal exchange between the scholars, which at times clearly showed colonial patterns.

At the same time, though, surprisingly many contributors to the Tensions Project showed a high degree of sensitivity about the imperial legacies of scientific concepts and the shortcomings of Western academic tools to understand late colonial and early postcolonial societies in Asia and Africa. This argument has been made before about the era of Alva Myrdal in her function as the director of UNESCO's Department of Social Sciences between 1950 and 1955.²⁵ Myrdal was indeed a strong supporter of (social) scientific internationalism and more decentralized forms of global knowledge production.

However, the Asian case studies conducted under the umbrella of the Tensions Project illustrate that this was a process promoted by many more contributors to an increasingly globalizing intellectual exchange beyond Western academia. As such, this multipolar process addressed the question about the ontological differences and similarities between the West and other areas and thus also tackled the conceptual inheritance of the imperial age.²⁶ In some cases, such as research on caste in India, scholars saw a direct benefit of such non-Western concepts for a better understanding of, for example, racial relations in the United States and thus promoted more



comparative research on a global scale. In this light, a globalizing approach to intellectual history could indeed start with C.A. Bayly's argument that Western (social) sciences were clearly shaped by non-Western knowledge systems and experiences.²⁷ Scholars of such a historiography could try to dissolve the strict dichotomy between the West and the non-West, also in terms of the history of science. Jürgen Renn's and Malcolm Hyman's notion of an evolutionary process of global learning in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is a fruitful understanding of how knowledge as problem-solving potential developed in terms of globalizing patterns of transfer, shared experience, and long-distance communication.²⁸ In this reading, the history of scientific knowledge and scientific disciplines are the result of both transnationalizing intellectual networks and cross-border political spaces that evolved since the nineteenth century.²⁹

The history of the Tensions Project is, however, a strong argument to consider more centrally the role of academic and political power relations in how knowledge globalized. In this perspective, both interpretations mentioned above, that is, to interpret the history of social sciences exclusively in imperialist terms or as a field of power-free exchange, seem inadequate. The Tensions Project suggests that in the late 1940s and 1950s peace research was determined by strong residuals of the imperial age while, at the same time, some scholars increasingly recognized the need to decolonize academia as an inherent and vital element of peace research.

In brief, the Tensions Project was a cosmopolitan intellectual peace-building project pervaded by late-colonial intellectual patterns while also indicating the dawn of a new era of academic cooperation. The way the project framed peace reflected two distinct forms of power in the production of peace-related knowledge that were specific to the context of decolonization and nation-building after 1945. UNESCO's overall approach to social science research and its role in the transformation of the world remained strongly grounded in evolutionary theory and developmentalism.³⁰ As a consequence, the Tensions Project put Western and particularly US academic knowledge production in the driver's seat of social scientific innovation after the colonial era. This predominance was less a repurposing of inherited imperial power than a structural feature of the evolving modernization paradigm developed under the hegemony of US academia. In that perspective, social scientific research and the rigorous social analysis it facilitated were vital instruments to channel and control what their proponents perceived as the potentially disruptive impact of decolonization in Asia and elsewhere.³¹

Equally important, though, was the influence of new political elites in postcolonial states on scientific cooperation and knowledge production within the scope of international organizations such as UNESCO. The membership of newly independent states such as India or Israel at UNESCO and their governments' direct financial contributions to the conduct of research co-determined the objectives, scopes, and limitations of the research agendas. This influence corresponded with the role of a new generation of social scientists in postcolonial societies seeking official recognition and an active role in the design and implementation of development.³² In that light, the Tensions Project illustrates the contribution of local researchers in India and Israel to the evolution of a scientific developmentalism that was neither simply colonial or Western nor the anti-thesis to (Western) scientific universalism. Rather, these scholars worked toward a body of universal knowledge for which they considered cooperation among social scientists around the globe as essential. The project also documents how the new political elites in early postcolonial states directed scholarly attention through, for example, direct political influence or financial control. Through these means they also silenced research questions irreconcilable with their own political interests.

To develop this argument more in detail, this article discusses two regional case studies (India and Israel) that, each in its own ways, enjoyed particular significance and attention in

the context of the Tensions Project. Israel is sometimes considered an exceptional case in the history of mid-20th century decolonization due to the existence of non-colonial institutions built up by local communities during the decades preceding independence and diaspora-related dynamics.³³ Analyzed together with India, however, the history of Israel in the late 1940s and 1950s should redirect scholarly attention toward a more multipolar understanding of the history of peace studies. Both cases illustrate that in their early phase after the Second World War, peace studies evolved to an important degree in and on newly independent societies wrapped up in conflictive processes of nation- and state-building. What is more, they show how intellectuals and scholars drafted different ways to peace in these peculiar contexts of imperial decline characterized by large-scale political, socio-economic, and mental transformation. In brief, decolonization in Asia was an essential context in the formation of peace research after 1945.

THE (IM)POSSIBILITY OF DEMOCRATIC PEACE IN POOR SOCIETIES: INDIA

When the Tensions Project was approved in 1947, one of the central tasks UNESCO defined was to detect and analyze conflicts around some fundamental concepts used in the existing international order. One of these concepts was democracy. Consequently, a year later UNESCO launched a study on the meaning of democracy in different societies. The underlying assumption was that a functioning democratic order was vital for the maintenance of peace, which could only function if people within national and regional communities had a shared understanding about the nature and the operation of such an order.

Under the coordination of Arne Naess and Stein Rokkan, UNESCO conducted a “philosophical analysis” of the understandings of democracy in the form of a survey among experts mainly at Western universities. Notable exceptions were Ricardo A. Pascual, a professor of philosophy in Quezon City, the Philippines, and Humayun Kabir, a philosopher at Calcutta University and an important educational advisor of the Nehru administration in New Delhi.³⁴ The survey brought to light that virtually all scholars shared a strong notion of ambiguity about the term democracy and stressed that the contemporary usages of the concept were too contradictory to identify one single correct and coherent meaning. The authors considered the ideological differences as too significant to be overcome any time soon, which was seen as bad news for international peace.³⁵ What this project demonstrated, though, was an ambition to initiate a (in principle) global exchange on political concepts and an awareness about the potentially devastating consequences of conceptual disagreement for global peace.

UNESCO's interest in democracy as a global concept was more concrete and also more exigent in the case of India. India had been an early and, in some respects, a pioneering member state of UNESCO from the growing group of newly independent countries in Asia. In terms of world peace, India was a particularly relevant case. Born in the midst of the large-scale violence and humanitarian disaster of Partition, the Indian Republic was the biggest democratic experiment in history. Many contemporary observers in Western academia were skeptical about the prospects of democracy in an impoverished, postcolonial society.³⁶ What was considered an advantage, though, was that the Indian elites, largely educated in Great Britain and the US, were very open to science and scientific research as the foundation for political and socioeconomic planning, which made the country a preferred candidate for various forms of social engineering and technology-based development initiatives. The existing cleavages and inequalities related

to caste, religion, ethnicity, and wealth provided an almost ideal testing ground for Western and Indian development science.³⁷

In 1949, the Indian government approached UNESCO with a request to conduct a large-scale survey on social tensions in India under the umbrella of the Tensions Project. The idea was that a national investigation into social tensions would facilitate comparative perspectives and a deeper understanding of peace in postcolonial societies. Between 1951 and 1953, the Indian authorities provided grants to conduct a series of field missions, coordinated by Gardner Murphy, a prominent US psychologist who had earned a reputation in social psychology and the study of the development of human personality. Still, the Project was not simply a US endeavor as the studies inside India were designed and conducted by local university personnel. B.S. Guha, the director of the Indian Museum in Calcutta, was the most prominent among them. As the first South Asian to earn a PhD in anthropology in the mid-1920s, Guha was a strong believer in racial biology and anthropometry. Among other things, he propagated the physical distinctiveness of upper castes from the rest of Indian society.³⁸ Irrespective of this, UNESCO's coordinators of the Tensions Project were enthusiastic about the Indian field studies and the support from the Indian government as both would indicate "that the social policy of legislators and administrators will be increasingly based on the results of work in the scientific field."³⁹

Ironically, the field studies struggled repeatedly with delays due to mounting inter-religious tensions in India. The letters exchanged between R.C. Angell, the Director of UNESCO's Department of Science, and the Indian researchers document the harsh conditions in post-Partition India, the frequent security threats the researchers were exposed to and their logistic challenges.⁴⁰ Studying the way to peace in India was not exactly a peaceful and calm endeavor.

The final study, which Gardner Murphy submitted in 1953, was a collection of case studies on Indian society and its condition barely six years after political independence. Although this monograph covered a wide range of different aspects of social relations and inequalities, it contained some general features that illustrate the author's superficial knowledge of contemporary Indian social life and a strikingly selective perception of India's most burning issues of social marginalization and political hostility.

First, the study is characterized by a positive outlook on the survival of Indian democracy and its chances to overcome its most important obstacles. The authors were optimistic due to what they considered the traditional Indian craving for science and technology. Similar to the West, the study speculated that India has always been open for "the selection and development of clues from all over the world."⁴¹ Although this curiosity was similar to a child that looks with big eyes onto the world – a colonial metaphor for the immaturity of the colonized – it would ultimately help India to learn from Western (social) science and overcome the daunting challenges such as the caste system that plagued its domestic social relations.

Second, the study made several comparisons between the Indian caste "system" and the situation of African-Americans in the United States. When the Tensions Project came to India, several sub-projects dedicated particular attention to the issue of caste. This approach corresponded with the larger political process and constitution-making in India, which recognized caste as one of the most relevant and thus also most conflictual subjects of social and democratic change.⁴² The main message of UNESCO's local research was that caste was not a rigid "system" but rather a very flexible pattern of social stratification that was undergoing rapid changes related to urbanization, industrialization, and the politicization of its lower ranks including Dalits.⁴³

A particularly thought-provoking line of argumentation was the comparison of caste in India with forms of racial discrimination in the United States. To be sure, during the early 1950s this comparison was already a well-established, although controversial, research approach evolving

since the late nineteenth century. At that time, social reformers both in British-India and from African-American communities in the United States started to articulate their political protests by comparing social discrimination based on caste and race.⁴⁴ Around the First World War, leading Indian intellectuals and anti-colonialists, who fled from tightened censorship and political prosecution in British-India to the US, reinforced this debate at American universities.⁴⁵ In the following decades, US scholars repeatedly built on this perspective and researched what they considered to be structural similarities between caste in India and race in the US.

One of the most influential but also controversial contributions to this discussion came from Gunnar Myrdal, the husband of Alva Myrdal. Gunnar Myrdal's book on the "Negro problem" in the United States, originally published in 1944, was not only a comprehensive sociological study of race-related questions in the US but of American society more generally.⁴⁶ To understand different patterns of social discrimination based on birth, Myrdal proposed to use the concept of caste rather than race in order to avoid the latter's many "erroneous connotations" resulting from established scientific traditions as well as the concept's vernacular usage. As he saw it, caste would enable the social scientific analysis to focus on the essentials of the "white man's theory of colour caste" including its obsession with (race) purity, the rejection of social equality, and segregation and discrimination in nearly all spheres of life.⁴⁷ In that sense, American sociology had a lot to learn from its Indian counterpart. Other US sociologists used the concept of caste to understand the transformation of race relations after slavery had been abolished, particularly in the American South.⁴⁸

After the Second World War, as sociology internationalized, sociologists deployed the concept of caste to facilitate comparative research on rigid forms of social stratifications in various regions and societies around the globe⁴⁹ and to facilitate the globalization of sociological knowledge production more generally.⁵⁰ Whereas some scholars in the United States and elsewhere found the concept of caste exceptionally helpful to understand the functioning and impact of race, others fiercely rejected this comparison as a misunderstanding on both sides of the equation.⁵¹ In India itself, leading sociologists were critical about what they interpreted as universalizing claims of American academia and emphasized the specificity of caste in Indian society.⁵² In spite of these controversies, after 1945 the concept of caste had become an established vocabulary in US sociology to understand racial discrimination as a form of social practice in a global perspective.⁵³

In India, Gardner Murphy found it striking that there was not much more talk about color on the subcontinent. More generally, physical appearance seemed to have no concrete consequences in social life and did not have any impact whatsoever on group action.⁵⁴ Caste appeared thus as a discriminatory social logic that functioned independently from physical features. For him, the way out of this logic was a more individualistic and science-based (i.e., Western) education for children.

Third, it is striking how trivially Gardner Murphy and his colleagues regarded the discrimination against Muslims in India. The scholars working on behalf of UNESCO interpreted feelings related to insecurity, open marginalization, and collective mistrust about their loyalty as citizens of the young republic primarily as problems of Muslim self-perception.⁵⁵ This is striking for two reasons. A major research project designed to detect and analyze the root causes of social tensions could hardly ignore the actual and very practical discrimination of Muslim communities all over India in the aftermath of Partition. This discrimination concerned not only the socio-economic marginalization of Muslim communities in Northern Indian cities, but also the damage or destruction of their religious heritage.⁵⁶ By framing these issues as questions of collective Muslim self-perception, the authors avoided taking a clear stand in this matter, probably not to offend the main financiers of the research, that is, the Indian government.

The second reason why this framing is surprising is that in these years parts of the Indian government, including Prime Minister Nehru, were aware of—and complained about—the discriminatory attitudes and practices against Muslims in state institutions such as the Indian police and in Indian society more generally.⁵⁷ Obviously, the Indian authorities and, by extension, the authors of the Tensions Project were not interested in a more detailed analysis of the severe discriminations of Muslims in order to sustain the narrative of the Indian Congress Party as the unifier of the country and to avoid a worsening of the already tensed interreligious situation.⁵⁸

BUILDING PEACEFUL DIVERSITY: ISRAEL

Another central field of the Tensions Project and its endeavor of international peace research was to contribute to the understanding of how stereotypes and prejudices evolved, which impact they had on societies at large, and what could possibly be done about them before they could unfold their fateful affect.⁵⁹ The legacies of fascism in Europe, the persistence of inter-religious and inter-ethnic conflicts in late colonial and early postcolonial societies, and the persistent problem of nationalist stereotyping constituted an urgent context to understand better how stereotypes and prejudices functioned in order to formulate concrete recommendations for policy-making. UNESCO's initiative in this field, though, was not exactly pioneering. Since the Second World War there existed a body of studies in (social) psychology on the evolution of stereotypes and prejudices.⁶⁰ Horkheimer's and Adorno's Institute of Social Research had also contributed significantly to a better understanding of how authoritarianism and stereotyping fed into each other.⁶¹ What UNESCO intended to add to this body of knowledge was a more global orientation, new comparative perspectives, and a body of methods for more in-depth studies on these issues.⁶²

In light of fascism and imperialism as major forces that triggered WW2, UNESCO put a strong empirical focus in this research field on the study of post-war Germany and Japan.⁶³ In both cases, international and local scholars working with UNESCO concentrated on children and the youth in order to understand their dominant attitudes on politics, democracy, authority, and gender relations. Furthermore, these scholars tried to find out how the younger generations related to their (grand)parents and the existing elites. Of particular relevance for all these questions was the role of education and socialization patterns within families, which the scholars saw as key contributions to either a culture of stereotyping and prejudice or mutual understanding and tolerance. Especially in the German case the findings illustrated that a person's experience inside the family, particularly with the father, was a key factor to understand young people's approaches to authority and the way youth related to cultural diversity.⁶⁴

For Japan, the studies indicated that the youth were more open to the outside world and particularly toward the West than previously assumed. The framing of the West in Japanese society appeared thoroughly positive in these surveys. On the other hand, the scholars were concerned about the persistence of strong and potentially aggressive loyalty patterns toward the monarchy and a sharpening generation conflict.⁶⁵ All in all, though, the research findings were a reason for serenity for US academics and US foreign policy makers in Asia.

The example worth examining in more detail, though, is a smaller case in terms of research endeavor and publicity. Since its foundation in May 1948, Israel underwent conflictive processes of nation-building. The situation in those years was, among other challenges, a combination of two factors: the management of inter-ethnic rivalries among Jewish communities including openly racist attitudes toward Oriental Jews⁶⁶; and the violence between Jewish and Muslim communities and Muslim expulsions to secure a Jewish majority on Israel's territory.⁶⁷

From an international peace perspective, there were a couple of reasons why the case of Israel mattered. The communications around the Tensions Project on Israel including letters between participating scholars and statements of officials in Israel and at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris indicate that many of them interpreted the foundation of Israel and its concurrent conflicts as a paradigmatic experience of 20th-century nation-building in an ethnically diverse society. In a world where migration, decolonization, and mass violence altered the ethnic composition of many societies, the example of Israel and its management of pluralism was interesting to study. UNESCO saw particularly the immigration-related aspects of research in Israel in a broader context of global transformations. It, therefore, encouraged social scientists to compare the findings on Israel with other societies confronting similar challenges such as France, Brazil, or Peru.⁶⁸

Furthermore, for a long time the dominant (but now largely refuted) framing of the state of Israel in international affairs was that it was the main reaction to the destruction of Jews before and during the Second World War.⁶⁹ Together with research on the root causes of fascism, which were a core element of the Tensions Project,⁷⁰ a better understanding of Israel's domestic developments was seen as an important contribution to the development of social sciences in a post-fascist era.

And finally, Israeli society provided an opportunity to study the integration of communities from pre-industrial settings into an industrial or industrializing environment. The social and cultural disruptions this may cause was a great concern also among Western planners as they could potentially increase the appeal of communism in many societies around the globe. In brief, the relevance of studies on Israel in the context of UNESCO's social scientific endeavors went far beyond the country itself and put the young nation into the limelight of an evolving transnational community of social scientists and political planners.

As in the Indian case, the initial impulse to launch the research on Israel came from governmental authorities that requested UNESCO to coordinate the project. But whereas in the Indian case the government was the most important financial contributor, the Israeli authorities could provide only meager means. After a brief moment of insecurity on whether the project could go ahead, the Ford Foundation contributed an important grant to cover the overall expenses.⁷¹ The main conductors of the research were the Departments of Sociology, Demography and Economics at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and scholars selected from the Israeli Ministries of Education and Foreign Affairs. The two most prominent contributing scholars were Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt, who later earned a reputation in Western academia for his work on "multiple modernities,"⁷² and Arvid Brodersen, a Norwegian sociologist at the New School in New York, who also played an important role at UNESCO headquarters.

Overall, the objective of the research was to address "problems of development of a new, homogeneous society out of heterogeneous elements" with a special focus on youth, ethnic diversity, leadership patterns and the impact of large-scale immigration.⁷³ The field work was completed in the summer of 1953 with the first reports submitted by the end of that year and in the course of 1954. To study the social and cultural dynamics of concern, a sample of "Oriental Jews" was selected, that is, Jews of Near Eastern, North African and Far Eastern origin employed in eleven different industrial plants in the district of Haifa in the north of the country. The other sample was Bet Mazmil, a newly founded suburban settlement near Jerusalem, where people with a background in a dozen different ethnic groups, newcomers as well as long-term settlers, had recently moved in.

For the communities of "Oriental Jews," the researchers reasoned that at the moment of their arrival in Israel, their "traditional social fabric" was still very much intact. Social coherence was meant to be strong and largely unquestioned, change was slow and the important social groupings



were small.⁷⁴ Their integration into industrial work and new forms of settlement, though, was a challenge: “A process of adaptation and transformation is set in motion on the psychic plane which tends to upset the former code of social reactions based largely on the inherent sense of time and cycle of life.”⁷⁵ This approach to non-European Jewish communities reflected a broader trend in Israeli academia in the early 1950s according to which immigrants from Arab countries were considered to be “backward,” culturally “primitive,” or even “mentally deficient.”⁷⁶ Leading scientists agreed with a considerable part of the political elite that Jewish immigration from Arab societies posed a severe threat to European culture in Israel. As the integration of people from non-industrial life circumstances into industrial settings was a shared concern in many societies around the globe, the investigation of these processes in Israel enjoyed a broader international relevance for economic and social planners.

Although the researchers found no discrimination against “Oriental Jews” in their working environment, employers frequently complained about the lack of punctuality and absenteeism.⁷⁷ “Oriental Jews” were perceived as far less reliable than other workers and little disciplined as regards the daily work rhythm. Managers also criticized that there was a high degree of sensitivity of these workers “to any form of genuine and imagined discrimination, from within and without. Unfortunately, the lack of close relations and the reluctance to establish such relationships has deeply pervaded the mentality of Oriental workers.”⁷⁸ Overall, though, the findings painted a positive picture about the status of integration of these communities with women being slightly ahead of men, who, particularly if less educated, would need more assistance to get acquainted with their new environment.

The sample in Bet Mazmil was different in terms of the ethnic background of the target population but similar in terms of class composition. The team around Judith T. Shuval, from the Institute of Applied Social Research, focused on about 450 families in one particular part of this suburb of Jerusalem, namely the low-cost housing project for new immigrants the government had started immediately after Israel's foundation. People in this settlement spoke several different languages including Arabic, French, German, Ladino (a form of Spanish spoken by Jews from various countries including Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria, and Egypt), and Yiddish. Under the harsh condition of scarcity of almost all resources including food, tensions between families and ethnic groups were virtually unavoidable. The central assumption of the researchers was that processes of scapegoating and stereotyping were closely related to the class structure of a community. In other words, the lower the class background, the more prevalent these phenomena were. At the same time, the class structure corresponded with ethnicity. Poor families usually belonged to non-European communities with Moroccans and Iraqis occupying the lowest socio-economic status.⁷⁹ Consequently, Moroccans and Iraqis had been singled out by almost all other communities as targets for their hostilities.

The interviews in the area suggested to the researchers that the crucial element of vulnerability was not ethnic background but the position a community attained in the socio-economic stratification of society. In other words, class mattered (much) more than ethnic minority status. In this reading, a group was more vulnerable because it was not in a position of control or authority to exercise sanctions against its attackers.⁸⁰

These findings were on the one hand good news for other postcolonial societies as vulnerable groups could (at least theoretically) be enabled to participate in power-holding structures. If correct, this conclusion opened up opportunities for science-based political reform in order to equip these communities with a certain degree of control and authority. At the same time, though, the Israeli contributors to the Tensions Project saw strong limitations for the generalization of their findings. In their interpretation, the main reason why class beat ethnicity was that the Israeli

society showed a strong notion of homogeneity in terms of Jewish origin, a shared experience of victimization and uprooting through migration, and a low socio-economic status as a consequence of this uprooting.

Overall, the studies on Israel show two important features relevant for the history of peace research in the early 1950s. The way the researchers interpreted their findings showed a strong focus on class and relativized the role of ethnicity in the evolution of tensions. Although scholars blamed ethnic background for work-related conflicts between employers and employees (and not, for example, stereotypes and prejudices on the part of the management), ethnicity played a minor role in the analysis of immigrants' milieus in the north of Israel. In line with the official state ideology of an Israeli society composed of equal Jewish citizens, who were different but nevertheless united irrespective of their ethnic origin, these findings confirmed the possibility of resolving existing tensions through social planning, industrialization, and the rise of general welfare. The blatant racism, which was clearly part of intercommunal relations in this early phase of Israel's history, did not show up in this research as an important driver of inter-ethnic tensions.

The second remarkable aspect is the total neglect in this research of the hostilities against and expulsions of Muslim communities on Israel's territory. The research refrains from any comments on this overall context of Israel's nation-building. To be clear, the objective of the project was to research and understand domestic tensions within Israel's communities, not the tensions that existed outside its borders. But this clear separation of Jewish community relations, on the one hand, and the situation of Muslim communities on the other, was largely artificial. As one of the overall purposes of the Tensions Project was to learn about evolution of conflicts in the context of decolonization and post-imperial nation-building, it is striking that, similar to India, essential manifestations of these conflicts and their root causes were simply excluded from the agenda. In both societies this neglect concerned Muslims, whose persecution, eviction, marginalization, and cultural displacement seem to have run against the limited confines of peace research in the context of post-imperial nation-building. A possible explanation is that, in both India and Israel, governmental authorities were the initiators of this research and UNESCO, against the will of its young member states' political elites was not in a position to set the research agenda. The research results also suggest a strong dose of intellectual compliance by researchers toward these elites and their political narratives.

CONCLUSIONS

When the Tensions Project was launched in 1947, its first contributors chose a pragmatic and simple understanding of the concept of tensions. By tensions, they meant "hostility, prejudice, intolerance, frequently of an inter-racial or inter-class nature, whose origins could not be justified rationally."⁸¹ From this understanding, it was clear right from the start that psychological approaches to the evolution and impact of anxieties, frustrations, individual stress and projections would play a central role in the research projects. At the same time, questions related to political economy, a thorough analysis of inequality structures inherited from the imperial era, or a comprehensive investigation into the systemic forms of racial stereotyping and discrimination in international and domestic orders were either fully absent, or less prominent in the project agenda.

However, the cases of India and Israel indicate that the selected approaches and the actual conduct of the research went far beyond psychology. The vagueness, or openendedness of the concept of tensions provided ample opportunity for various social scientific disciplines including political science, sociology, and anthropology to deepen their exchange and develop



a multi-disciplinary agenda to advance the understanding of how tensions and conflicts came about and could eventually be prevented.

The ambiguities of the tensions concept also facilitated the wide agenda of peace research that corresponded not only with the scientific ambitions of the Project's academic contributors, but also with the political needs of the elites in UNESCO's young member states. Selectively, the concept even allowed for bridging the gap within and between Western and communist-socialist academia. The context of the Cold War had a significant impact on the conduct of the Tensions Project. In many sub-projects it was a challenge to keep scholars from both sides of the Iron Curtain involved. Nevertheless, because the concept of tensions remained rather vague throughout the Project, this challenge was more easily addressed than otherwise would have been the case.

Another advantage of the tensions concept was that the political attention it generated supported attempts by social scientists in Western academia, and in postcolonial societies, to claim a more central role in political planning. In this field, Indian and Israeli scholars claimed their own space in what they acknowledged as the truly global endeavor to modernize societies on the basis of universal scientific knowledge about tensions within and between societies.⁸² Policy making based on (social) scientific evidence was an evolving pattern on both sides of the Cold War division and turned into a central element of the state's modernization agenda, particularly in postcolonial societies. Scientific efforts to understand the impact of industrialization on migrants from pre-industrial communities, to analyze the socio-cultural impact of globalization and decolonization processes, and to map the consequences of technological innovation on societies and politics were important tools for political planning that the Tensions Project tried to develop and deliver to UNESCO's member states. For the political elites in early postcolonial India and Israel, the Project was thus an important contribution to the use of (social) science as a major source of justification for the state and for their own political dominance.⁸³

Finally, the concept of tensions brought together what historians have only recently interpreted as entangled: the legacies of fascism and imperialism.⁸⁴ These two realms have for a long time been seen as two rather distinct spheres of historical experience. The idea of the Tensions Project was, though, to bring the analysis of both together and try to understand what was assumed to be their common nature in terms of psychology, family relations, social cleavages, mental patterns such as stereotyping, scapegoating and prejudicing, and political authoritarianism.

In spite of this ambitious and original agenda, the Tensions Project was confronted with strong critique while it was still ongoing. Raymond Aron, for example, who was involved in some of UNESCO's more philosophical initiatives during the first years of its existence, recognized the value of the questions the Tensions Project addressed. At the same time, he found the link between its findings and the pressing problem of war prevention barely visible. What is more, seven years after the Project had been approved, his critique was that contributing scholars in various sub-projects were "further than ever" from a shared understanding of the concepts and methods they used.⁸⁵ Others criticized the very scope of the Project as far too ambitious⁸⁶ or were skeptical about the application of concepts taken from individual psychology on inter-group relations, or even warfare.⁸⁷ With more distance in time, former UNESCO staff members criticized the Tensions Project and the organization's social science agenda more generally as "culture-bound and value-loaded" and thus insensitive toward the diverse functioning of social sciences in different circumstances around the world.⁸⁸

The cases of India and Israel, however, illustrate some more specific points on the possibilities and limitations of international peace research in the 1950s. One of the central goals of the Tensions Project had been to facilitate comparative research in order to strengthen the

generalization of findings and achieve a truly global scale of such academic endeavors. Since the research designs and the specific thematic foci were in both cases very different, though, the comparability of their results was limited. Coordinators at UNESCO headquarters such as Otto Klineberg, a social psychologist who had helped to build up the social sciences branch at UNESCO,⁸⁹ had formulated during the early phase of the Tensions Project that the existing literature did not provide much-needed comparable results on conflicts in and between societies. As a consequence, it did not allow for more general conclusions the world community would require. The Tensions Project, by contrast, should identify empirical patterns shared across continents.⁹⁰ In practice, due to different academic approaches, personal intellectual differences, and varying local motivations this objective was hard to achieve. A more coherent approach would have meant more direct intervention from the headquarters, which was a delicate issue particularly toward governments of newly independent states co-financing the research.

What these two case studies also reveal is the high degree with which UN-led peace research was determined by (narrow) national political interests and their impact on scientific knowledge production more generally. In both India and Israel, the research designs ignored ongoing, very disruptive large-scale conflicts within those societies. The archival sources do not document any single explanation for this pattern. However, it seems justified to assume that the governments of these young states decided for political reasons to exclude certain questions from this research in order not to turn these research projects into a critique of their own political shortcomings and repressions. In that light, the 20th century history of knowledge and science was not only a history of Western dominance and imperialism, but also a history of post-fascist and postcolonial nation-building with its own modes of domination, exclusion, and silencing. The eagerness of elites, in these young states, to acquire and popularize state-of-the-art scientific knowledge was not only a feature of an evolving global development ideology, but also constituted an important element of these elites' search for political legitimacy and power. In that sense, the Tensions Project was a landmark in the history of peace research after 1945 compromised by not so peaceful international and domestic political interests.

Lastly, the impact of the Tensions Project on policy adaptation within UNESCO's member states seems to have been limited. Although a precise conclusion is empirically difficult to draw, it is challenging to identify any significant political reactions to the research findings, which questions the impact of the Tensions Project as an intellectual endeavor.⁹¹ The Project no doubt reinforced intellectual exchange within Western academia and between Western universities and scholars in postcolonial societies. The Tensions Project also facilitated new scholarly networks and supported the evolution of social science infrastructure in several Western and postcolonial societies.⁹² Although it would be an exaggeration to argue that the Project was the main impetus for the institutionalization of peace research and peace studies in various academic landscapes around the globe, it did facilitate this broader trend and inspired local peace (research) initiatives, some of them promoted by women.

An illustrative example of the Tension Project's exemplary function is the role of Freda Wuesthoff in the foundation of German peace research (*Friedensforschung*). Shocked by the events in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the trained physicist Wuesthoff founded the "Bavarian Society for Unesco work" (*Bayerische Gesellschaft für Unesco-Arbeit*) in 1952 with the objective to translate the agenda of the Tensions Project into the German context. In her reading, the multidisciplinary academic attempt to understand the evolution of tensions was one of the most urgent tasks of her time.⁹³ In postcolonial societies, such bottom-up initiatives as well as state-led institutionalizations of peace research remained patchy and struggled with significant political and financial obstacles.⁹⁴



In concrete terms, though, UNESCO's influence on actual peace-related policies to reduce tensions within and between societies is empirically difficult to discern. Prominent defenders of UNESCO argued early on that it has always been unrealistic to expect the organization to directly contribute to the resolution of overt conflicts.⁹⁵ UNESCO simply did not have either the resources or the political influence to do so. At the same time, a visible political impact had been part of the Tensions Project's original agenda.

One possible explanation for this lacking impact is that the Tensions Project remained a largely intellectual undertaking with no direct connections with or involvement of civil society, that is, organizations, institutions, and transnational networks, below the governmental level. Right from the moment of its initiation, the Tensions Project itself evinced a form of tension between its intellectual-analytical agenda and its political purpose seeking to alter the social and political relations on the ground.⁹⁶ In order to translate its analytical findings on inter-religious and inter-ethnic relations in Israel and India into concrete changes, UNESCO would have needed to develop an advocacy and networking strategy to include various relevant stakeholders into the research process and the adoption of its result thereafter. Among other things, in both of these societies it would have been an essential requirement to get in touch with religious organizations and authorities to take account of their significant influence in local communities. Later generations of peace researchers insisted that, in contrast to other disciplines in the humanities such as historiography, the practice orientation was a defining criterion of conflict and peace research.⁹⁷ Leaving aside its political norms and at times lofty ideals, the actual conduct of the Tensions Project in India and Israel does not support this claim.

Another explanation for the missing impact might be its largely positivist approach to complex socioeconomic and political problems. Due to this approach, the studies of the Tensions Project were not very sensitive toward the cultural underpinnings of tensions nor toward the persistence of imperial patterns in the research methods. What has later been framed as epistemic violence also played out in the Tensions Project.⁹⁸ Although one of its core concerns was to diversify the scholarly community by, for example, including social scientists from Asia into the conduct of the projects and by actively pursuing the vision of a culturally decentralized scientific community, the grammar of research conducted in India and Israel remained within the confines of mainstream Western academia. This pattern was more dominant in India than in Israel, though. On the Indian subcontinent, the studies targeting rural and semi-urban communities were conducted by Indian scholars and students. But the general lines of the research design came from abroad. Indian scholars functioned more as vicarious agents of the Tensions Project rather than its co-authors on an equal footing with their white peers. The consequence was not only an academic hierarchy built into the Project but also a conceptual and hermeneutic distance from local social, cultural, and religious specificities.

As a consequence of these deficits, UNESCO could not develop sufficient political clout to address major obstacles for peace within and between its member states; or, indeed, initiate positive change. As an intellectual project, though, the Tensions Project did stimulate new forms of intellectual exchange, which is why it deserves a place in 20th century history of peace.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Mark Mazower, *No Enchanted Place: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009). See also Jo-Anne Pemberton, "The Changing Shape of Intellectual Cooperation: From the League to UNESCO", in *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 58/1 (2012): 34–50.

- ² UNESCO, *Unesco: twenty years of service to peace, 1946–1966* (Paris: UNESCO, 1966): 14–15. UNESCO, *What is Unesco?* (Paris: UNESCO, 1970), 10.
- ³ An early testimony from inside the organization was provided by F. Bender, *Unesco na zes Jaren* (Amsterdam: Contact, 1952), 27, and T.V. Sathyamurthy, “Twenty Years of UNESCO: An Interpretation”, in *International Organization* 21/3 (1967): 617–620.
- ⁴ Particularly outspoken on this point was Joseph Needham, the first head of the Natural Science Section at UNESCO. See, for example, his *Science and International Relations, being the Fiftieth Robert Boyle Lecture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1949), especially 15.
- ⁵ UNESCO, *Resolutions adopted by the General Conference During Its Second Session, Mexico, November–December 1947* (Paris: UNESCO, 1948), 25.
- ⁶ The Tensions Project thus centrally combined two of the three dominant approaches to peace research in the late 1940s and 1950s: sociopsychological analyses of conflict and peace, which UNESCO primarily facilitated, focused on the role of individual and collective prejudices, hatred, aggression, stereotypes, but also cooperative forms of behavior; and sociological conceptualizations of conflict considering more centrally the structures and dynamics between conflictive parties and the impact of their strategic assessments. A third approach saw conflicts as the result of communication failure and thus suggested the analysis of the semantic content of communication to foster understanding and peace. For a more detailed discussion see Dieter Senghaas, *Gewalt-Konflikt-Frieden: Essays zur Friedensforschung* (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1974), 124–125. One reason for UNESCO’s preference for sociopsychological approaches might have been the predominance of such expertise in policy-relevant academia in the United States; another that psychology enjoyed a reputation of being politically less sensitive. On the latter see Teresa Tomás Rangil, “Citizen, Academic, Expert, or International Worker? Juggling with Identities at UNESCO’s Social Science Department, 1946–1955”, in *Science in Context* 26/1 (2013): 76. On the general context of the Tensions Project within the evolving field of social sciences and, more specifically, UNESCO’s Department of Social Sciences see Per Wisselgren, “From Utopian One-worldism to Geopolitical Intergovernmentalism: UNESCO’s Department of Social Sciences as an International Boundary Organization, 1946–1955”, in *Serendipities* 12/2 (2017), 148–182.
- ⁷ See the standard work on the study of society, originally published in 1939, by Frederic Bartlett, M. Ginsberg, E.J. Lindgren, and R.H. Thouless, eds., *The Study of Society: Methods and Problems* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 4th imp. 1949), Preface.
- ⁸ In 1968, Johan Galtung analyzed the disciplinary composition of 70 peace research institutions and illustrated the diminishing importance of social psychology. See Johan Galtung, “Peace Research”, Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) publication No. 23–3, 1968, reproduced in Johan Galtung, *Peace: Research, Education, Action: Essays in Peace Research, Volume One* (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, 1957), 151.
- ⁹ Stuart Jeffries, *Grand Hotel Abyss: The Lives of the Frankfurt School* (London, New York: Verso, 2017), 268.
- ¹⁰ Many years later Galtung recalled that Naess introduced him to the ideas of M.K. Gandhi and B. de Spinoza, both essential sources of inspiration for Galtung’s own intellectual development. See Johan Galtung and Daisaku Ikeda, *Choose Peace: A Dialogue between Johan Galtung and Daisaku Ikeda* (London, Chicago: Pluto, 1995), 7–8.
- ¹¹ “Common Statement”, published in Hadley Cantril (ed.), *Tensions that Cause Wars* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950), 17.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 18.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 19.
- ¹⁴ Important steps in this direction were undertaken by Perrin Selcer, *Patterns of Science: Developing Knowledge for a World Community at Unesco*. Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertation, 2011, esp. 43–145; and Daniel Pick, *The Pursuit of the Nazi Mind: Hitler, Hess, and the Analysts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 207–215.
- ¹⁵ David Cortright, *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 109.
- ¹⁶ On the evolving fusion of military and scientific thinking in the 1940s and 1950s as a trigger for peace research see Georg Picht, “Was heißt Friedensforschung?”, in *Merkur* 25/274 (1971): 105.

- ¹⁷ Peter N. Stearns, *Peace in World History* (New York, London: Routledge, 2014), 140–141, 192. See also Antony Adolf, *Peace: A World History* (Cambridge, Malden: Polity, 2009), 3.
- ¹⁸ In the classic works on the history of peace quoted in the previous two footnotes UNESCO is not even mentioned.
- ¹⁹ Claude Ake, *Social Science as Imperialism*. 2nd edition (Ibadan: Indiana University Press, 1982, orig. 1979).
- ²⁰ Walter D. Mignolo and Catherine Walsh, *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis* (Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2018); Walter Mignolo, “Epistemic Disobedience: Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom”, in *Theory, Culture & Society* 26/7–8 (2009): 159–181; see also Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni, “Why Decoloniality in the 21st Century?”, in *The Thinker* 48 (2013): 10–15.
- ²¹ Syed Hussein Alatas, “Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems”, in *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 28/1 (2000): 23–45; Syed Farid Alatas and Vineeta Sinha, *Sociological Theory Beyond the Canon* (London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Syed Farid Alatas, “Deparochialising the Canon: The Case of Sociological Theory”, in *Journal of Historical Sociology* 34 (2021): 13–27.
- ²² Iris Clemens, “Decolonizing Knowledge. Starting Points, Consequences and Challenges”, in *Foro de Educación* 18/1 (2020), 11–25.
- ²³ Raewyn Connell, “Decolonizing Sociology”, in *Contemporary Sociology* 47/4 (2018): 399–407. See also Monika Krause, “‘Western hegemony’ in the social sciences: fields and model systems”, in *The Sociological Review Monographs* 64/2 (2016): 194–211.
- ²⁴ Ian James Kidd et al (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice* (London, New York: Routledge, 2017).
- ²⁵ See Per Wisselgren, “Decentering Cold War Social Science: Alva Myrdal's Social Scientific Internationalism at UNESCO, 1950–1955”, in *Cold War Social Science: Transnational Entanglements*, eds. Mark Solovey and Christian Dayé (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 287–313; similar Teresa Tomas Rangil, *The Politics of Neutrality: UNESCO's Social Science Department, 1946–1956*. CHOPE Working Paper No. 211-08, April 2011. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID1840671_code1549896.pdf?abstractid=1840671&mirid=1 (accessed 7 March 2023).
- ²⁶ On the “disintegration of the intellectual segregation” between the study of the West and non-Western areas in the globalizing social sciences after 1945 see Immanuel Wallerstein et al., *Open Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences* (New Delhi: Vistaar, 1996), 36–48.
- ²⁷ C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780–1914* (Malden, Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), Chapter 8. See also Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014), Chapter 16. A similar line of argumentation against simplistic diffusionist models in the history of science with a strong empirical focus on India in the 19th and first half of the 20th century develops Harald Fischer-Tiné, *Pidgin-Knowledge: Wissen und Kolonialismus* (Zürich, Berlin: diaphanes, 2013).
- ²⁸ Jürgen Renn and Malcolm D. Hyman, “The Globalization of Knowledge in History: An Introduction”, in *The Globalization of Knowledge in History*, ed. Jürgen Renn (Edition Open Access, 2017), 16, 21. In this perspective, modern science in the West and elsewhere has always been the product of “a long-term global history of knowledge” rather than colonial-diffusionist dynamics. See Jürgen Renn, *The Evolution of Knowledge: Rethinking Science for the Anthropocene* (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2020), 29–30 and Chapter 11.
- ²⁹ Johan Heilbron, Nicolas Guillot, and Laurent Jeanpierre, “Toward a Transnational History of Social Sciences”, in *Journal of History of the Behavioral Sciences* 44/2 (Spring 2008): 146–160; Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London: Allen Lane, 2012), Chapter 4; Simone Turchetti, Néstor Herran and Soraya Boudia, “Introduction: have we ever been ‘transnational’? Towards a history of science across and beyond borders”, in *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45/3 (2012), 319–336. On transnational political spaces see Mathias Albert et al, eds., *Transnational Political Space: Agents-Structures-Encounters* (Frankfurt/Main, New York: Campus, 2009).
- ³⁰ Kevin Myers, Arathi Sriprakash, and Peter Sutoris, “Toward a “New Humanism”? Time and Emotion in UNESCO's Science of World-Making, 1947–1951”, in *Journal of World History* 32/4 (December 2021): 688–689; Glenda Sluga, “UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley”, in *Journal of World History* 21/3 (2010): 397, 400. On UNESCO's attempts in the early 1950s to pave the way for a critical review of concepts such as

- East and West and to challenge a biological understanding of race see Laura Elizabeth Wong, “Relocating East and West: UNESCO’s Major Project on the Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values”, in *Journal of World History* 19/3 (2008): 349–374.
- ³¹ Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and “Nation Building” in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill, London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 22; Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore, London: The Johns Hopkins University, 2003), 2–3; Noam Chomsky, *American Power and the New Mandarins* (New York: Pantheon, 2nd imprint 1969), 31–34, 41. For a contemporary perspective on the change of “attitudes, values, and ways of acting” in “developing countries” through “modernization” see Alex Inkeles, “Making Men Modern: On the Cause and Consequences of Individual Change in Six Developing Countries”, in *American Journal of Sociology* 75/2 (September 1969): 208–225. For an Indian elite perspective in the 1950s see David Arnold, “Nehruvian Science and Postcolonial India”, in *Isis* 104/2 (June 2013): 360–370.
- ³² About 10 years after the discontinuation of the Tensions Project in 1957 Johan Galtung argued that peace studies would indeed exist only in the West because in “developing countries” new types of research were usually promoted under the heading of “development”. In both cases, though, scholars would discuss “the good world” but with “quite different emphasis”. See his “Peace Research: Future Possibilities and Necessities”, in *Peace: Research, Education, Action. Essays in Peace Research Volume One*, Johan Galtung (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, 1975), 190.
- ³³ See, for example, James L. Gelvin, *The Israel-Palestine Conflict: A History. 4th ed.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 175–176. A different but related notion of exception exists around Palestine and Israel/Zionism seen as distinct from other settler colonial projects. See Yara Hawari, Sharri Plonski, and Elian Weizman, “Seeing Israel through Palestine: knowledge production as anti-colonial praxis”, in *Settler Colonial Studies* 9/1 (2019), 160.
- ³⁴ Richard McKeon and Stein Rokkan, eds., *Democracy in a World of Tensions* (Paris: UNESCO, 1951).
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 471.
- ³⁶ Representative for a significant number of political scientists and historians in US and UK academia was Donald C. Rowat, “India: The Making of a Nation”, in *International Journal* 5/2 (1950): 95–108.
- ³⁷ Benjamin Zachariah, *Developing India: An Intellectual and Social History. C. 1930–50* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005); Sukhamoy Chakravarty, “Nehru and Indian Planning”, in *South Asia Research* 9/2 (November 1989): 95–106.
- ³⁸ Projit Bihari Mukharji, “The Bengali Pharaoh: Upper-Caste Aryanism, Pan-Egyptianism, and the Contested History of Biometric Nationalism in Twentieth-Century Bengal”, in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 59/2 (2017): 450, 452, and 456. More generally, on Guha’s intellectual biography and professional career see Mukharji’s *Brown Skins, White Coats: Race Science in India, 1920–66* (Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 2022), 53–56.
- ³⁹ The International Sociological Association, *The Nature of Conflict: Studies on the sociological aspects of international tensions* (Paris: UNESCO, 1957), 28.
- ⁴⁰ Various letters in 327.5: 301-18 A 53, Tensions affecting Int. Understanding – Community Studies Part II – from 1/XI/49, UNESCO Archives, Paris.
- ⁴¹ Gardner Murphy, *In the Minds of Men: The Study of Human Behavior and Social Tensions in India* (New York: Basic Books, 1953), 269.
- ⁴² On caste in India’s evolving democratic system see Dag-Erik Berg, *Dynamics of Caste and Law: Dalits, Oppression and Constitutional Democracy in India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), particularly chapter 1.
- ⁴³ For example, Radhakamal Mukerjee and Colleagues, *Inter-Caste Tensions: A Survey under the Auspices of the UNESCO* (Lucknow: University of Lucknow, 1951).
- ⁴⁴ Nico Slate, “Translating Race and Caste”, in *Journal of Historical Sociology* 24/1 (2011): 63.
- ⁴⁵ Two important contributors to this debate were Lala Lajpat Rai and Benoy Kumar Sarkar, who fled India for the US on the eve of the First World War. See Lala Lajpat Rai, *The United States of America: a Hindu’s*

- Impression and a Study* (Calcutta: R. Chatterjee, 1916), Chapter 2 (“The Education of the Negro”); and Lajpat Rai, *Unhappy India* (Calcutta: Banna, 1928). On B.K. Sarkar see Clemens Six, “Challenging the Grammar of Difference: Benoy Kumar Sarkar, global mobility and anti-imperialism around the First World War”, in *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* 25/3–4 (2018): 431–449.
- ⁴⁶ Myrdal's intellectual biographer called this book “one of the most influential works of social science ever written in America”. See Walter A. Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience: Social Engineering and Racial Liberalism, 1938–1987* (Chapel Hill, London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), Preface.
- ⁴⁷ Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York, Toronto, London: 1944), 54, footnote a, and 58.
- ⁴⁸ John Dollard, *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*. 3rd ed (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1949, orig. 1937); Allison Davis et al, *Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class* (Chicago, London: Phoenix Books, The University of Chicago Press, 1941).
- ⁴⁹ For example, Gerald D. Berreman, “Caste in India and the United States”, in *American Journal of Sociology* 66/2 (September 1960): 120–127, which recognized the concept of caste as a tool for “cross-cultural comparison” (120); Anthony de Reuck and Julie Knight, eds., *Caste and Race: Comparative Approaches* (London: J.&A. Churchill Ltd., 1967), which was based on a symposium chaired by Gunnar Myrdal in April 1966; Pierre L. van den Berghe, *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective*. 2nd ed (New York et al., John Wiley & Sons, 1978, orig. 1967) speaks of “rigid color-castes” around the globe (101, 133); Sidney Verba, Bashiruddin Ahmed, and Anil Bhatt, *Caste, Race, and Politics: A Comparative Study of India and the United States* (Beverly Hills, London: Sage, 1971); a more recent manifestation of this scholarly ‘tradition’ is Gyanendra Pandey's *A History of Prejudice: Race, Caste, and Difference in India and the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013). An early, non-American example for such a comparative perspective was provided by G.S. Ghurye, *Caste and Class in India* (Bombay: The Popular Book Depot, 1950, orig. 1932), Chapter V: “Elements of Caste outside India” (119–140).
- ⁵⁰ For example, Kingsley Davis, *Human Society* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), Chapter XIV; Oliver Cromwell Cox, *Caste, Class, and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1948).
- ⁵¹ For example, W. Lloyd Warner, “American Caste and Class”, in *American Journal of Sociology* 42/2 (1936): 234–237. When drafting his contribution on “caste” to UNESCO's *Vocabulary of Social Sciences*, Louis Dumont argued explicitly against Gunnar Myrdal in his “Caste, Racisme, et «Stratification»”, in *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie* 29 (1960): 91–112. See also Dumont's *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications* (Chicago, London: Chicago University Press 1980, French orig. 1966), 247–266.
- ⁵² One of the most important voices in this debate was Professor Govind Sadashiv Ghurye. After 1945, Ghurye, Head of the Department of Sociology at Bombay University since 1924, repeatedly criticized the racial and cultural bias built into the universalizing claims of American social scientific knowledge production. See Shefali Chandra, “Decolonising the Orgasm: Caste, Whiteness and Knowledge Production at the ‘End of Empire’”, in *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 43/3 (2020): 1179–1195.
- ⁵³ The controversy on caste and race continues in more recent times and has meanwhile acquired a sharp international political dynamic. See Human Rights Watch, *Caste Discrimination: A Global Concern. A report for the United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance* (Durban, South Africa, September 2001); Ambrose Pinto, “UN Conference against Racism: Is Caste Race?”, in *Economic and Political Weekly* 36/30 (2001): 2817–2820; Sukhadeo Thorat and Umakant, eds., *Caste, Race and Discrimination: Discourse in International Context* (Jaipur, New Delhi: Rawat, 2004); Shuvatri Dasgupta, “Can There Be a Global Intellectual History of Caste?”, in *JHI Blog*, 30 September 2020. <https://jhiblog.org/2020/09/30/can-there-be-a-global-intellectual-history-of-caste/> (accessed 7 March 2023).
- ⁵⁴ Murphy, *In the Minds of Men*, 241.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 141–149.
- ⁵⁶ For more details see Clemens Six, *Secularism, Decolonisation and the Cold War in South and Southeast Asia* (London, New York: Routledge, 2018), Chapter 2.

- ⁵⁷ There is plenty of evidence for this pattern in the stocks of the Indian National Archives and published sources; see, for example, Nehru complaining about the exclusion of Muslims from the Indian Army and the police forces around the same time; Nehru to K.N. Katju, 13 June 1954, in Jawaharlal Nehru, *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru, Vol 26* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000), 195–196.
- ⁵⁸ In India itself, certain forms of intellectual work and art produced in the early years after Partition featured a similar form of silence or, more accurately, state-induced amnesia. See, for example, Srirupa Roy's discussion of the Films Division of India in her *Beyond Belief: India and the Politics of Postcolonial Nationalism* (Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2007), Chapter 1.
- ⁵⁹ William Buchanan and Hadley Cantril provide summaries of UNESCO's findings in these fields: *How Nations See Each Other* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1972, orig. 1953); and *Unesco International Social Science Bulletin*, 3/3 (1951): Part I.
- ⁶⁰ One of the first comprehensive overviews on scientific trends in US psychology during WW2 was provided by Dorwin Cartwright, "Social Psychology in the United States during the Second World War", in *Human Relations* 1 (1948): 333–352. Central contributors to the research agenda of the Tensions Project's early phase such as Gordon W. Allport, Hadley Cantril or Otto Klineberg rank prominently in this synopsis. See also James H. Capshaw, *Psychologists on the March: Science, Practice, and Professional Identity in America, 1929–1969* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), Chapter 5.
- ⁶¹ Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923–1950* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1996), especially chapters 4 and 5; Jeffries, *Grand Hotel Abyss*, Part IV.
- ⁶² Otto Klineberg, *Tensions affecting international understanding: A survey of research* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1950), 103.
- ⁶³ Knut Pipping, Rudolf Abshagen, and Anne-Eva Brauneck, *Gespräche mit der Deutschen Jugend: Ein Beitrag zum Autoritätsproblem* (Helsingfors: Akademische Buchhandlung, 1954); Jean Stoetzel, *Without the Chrysanthemum and the Sword: A Study of the Attitudes of Youth in Post-War Japan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955).
- ⁶⁴ Pipping et al, *Gespräche mit der Deutschen Jugend*, 420.
- ⁶⁵ Stoetzel, *Without the Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, 162. *Unesco Courier* 4–5 (1954).
- ⁶⁶ Tom Segev, *A State at Any Cost: The Life of David Ben-Gurion* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2019), 464.
- ⁶⁷ Omri Boehm, *Haifa Republic: A Democratic Future for Israel* (New York: New York Review Books, 2021), Chapter 3.
- ⁶⁸ W.D. Borrie et al, *The Cultural Integration of Immigrants: A Survey based upon the Papers and Proceedings of the Unesco Conference held in Havana, April 1956* (Paris: UNESCO, 1959).
- ⁶⁹ For a prominent and empirically substantiated rebuttal see Tom Segev, *One Palestine, Complete. Jews and Arabs Under the British Mandate* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000), 490–491.
- ⁷⁰ See, for example, Riccardo Bauer, Birth of Fascism in Italy, UNESCO/SS/TAIU/16, Paris, 6 August 1949; John H. E. Fried, Techniques and Devices of Fascism in Italy and Germany after World War 1, UNESCO/SS/W/2, Paris, 31 July 1949, both UNESCO Archives, Paris.
- ⁷¹ Broderon to Frazier, 28 December 1952, and Ruth Ludwig, Report to the Members of American Committee for Social Research in Israel, Inc. (1953), both 301.16 (569.4) A 53, Box 114, UNESCO Archives, Paris.
- ⁷² S.N. Eisenstadt, ed., *Multiple Modernities* (London, New York: Routledge, 2017, orig. 2002).
- ⁷³ "Main Areas of Social Tensions in Israeli Society", 301.16 (569.4) A 53, Box 114, UNESCO Archives, Paris.
- ⁷⁴ Alfred Bonn , "The Adjustment of Oriental Immigrants to Industrial Employment in Israel", in *Unesco International Social Science Bulletin*, 8/1 (1956): 15.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 16.
- ⁷⁶ An illustrative example is the debate on Jewish immigration from Arab countries during the so-called Megamot-Symposium that took place in Israel in April 1951. For more details see Sagit Mor, "Tell My Sister to Come and Get Me Out of Here" – A Reading of Ableism and Orientalism in Israel's Immigration Policy (The

- First Decade), in *RELOADED Disability Studies Quarterly* 27/4 (Fall 2007), <https://dsq-sds.org/index.php/dsq/article/view/43/43#top> (accessed 7 March 2023); Tom Segev, 1949, *The First Israelis* (New York: Henry Holt, 1998), 157–158.
- ⁷⁷ Bonné, “The Adjustment”, 21.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 24.
- ⁷⁹ Judith T. Shuval, “Patterns of Inter Group Tension and Affinity”, in *Unesco International Social Science Bulletin*, 8/1 (1956): 88 & 93.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 96.
- ⁸¹ Adam Curle, “A Conference on the Methodology of Sociological Surveys, Centre Culturel de Royaumont, 2–7 April 1951”, in *International Social Science Bulletin* 3/3 (1951): 632.
- ⁸² On the self-positioning of Indian (social) scientists in the global production of universal knowledge particularly in the first half of the twentieth century see Gyan Prakash, *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000), especially chapter eight.
- ⁸³ For a more systematic critique of science and development as “reasons of state” in India and elsewhere see Ashis Nandy (ed.) *Science, Hegemony and Violence: A Requiem for Modernity* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- ⁸⁴ Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009).
- ⁸⁵ Raymond Aron, “Conflict and War from the Viewpoint of Historical Sociology”, in *The Nature of Conflict*, ed. International Sociological Association (Paris: UNESCO, 1957), 177.
- ⁸⁶ Walter R. Sharp, “The Role of Unesco: A Critical Evaluation”, in *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science* 24/2 (1951): 103.
- ⁸⁷ Jessie Bernard, “The Sociological Study of Conflict”, in *The Nature of Conflict*, ed. International Sociological Association (Paris: UNESCO, 1957), 47–48.
- ⁸⁸ Peter Lengyel, *International Social Science: The UNESCO Experience* (New Brunswick, USA; Oxford, UK: Transaction, 1986), 10 and 13. See also Edward H. Buehrig, “The tribulations of UNESCO”, in *International Organization* 30/4 (September 1976): 681.
- ⁸⁹ Besides his role at UNESCO, Klineberg acquired an important role in the development of peace research in the late 1950s. As a consultant of the Institute for Social Research in Oslo, founded in 1959, he worked closely with Johan Galtung and other leading scholars in this field and strongly influenced their intellectual career. See Johan Galtung, “Twenty-five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses”, in *Journal of Peace Research* 22/2 (1985): 141–143.
- ⁹⁰ See, for example, Klineberg to the Department of Social Sciences, “Development of work under ‘Tensions’ project – Resolution 5.1.1.1.”, 1 October 1948; critical on comparability: H.S. Sullivan to Klineberg, “Development of work under ‘Tensions’ project – Resolution 5.1.1.1.”, 13 January 1949, both in 327.5: 301.18 A 53, Tensions affecting Int. Understanding – Community Studies, Part 1 – up to 31/X/49, UNESCO Archives, Paris.
- ⁹¹ An argument against this observation is that the Tensions Project led to a greater emphasis on different forms of therapy against stereotypes, prejudices, and scapegoating and thus went beyond the acknowledged ‘cure’ of keeping hostile groups apart. See Charles Boasson, “The Unesco tensions project and conflict residues on Peretz Bernstein’s sociology of antisemitism”, in *The Changing International Community: Some Problems of Its Laws, Structures, Peace Research and the Middle East Conflict. Essays in honor of Marion Mushkat*, eds. Charles Boasson and Max Nurock (The Hague: Mouton, 1973), 164.
- ⁹² A rough overview of how far the institutionalization of peace research and peace studies was advanced in the mid-1960s was provided in the first edition of UNESCO’s World Directory of Peace Research Institutions published in 1966. Compare UNESCO, Social Science Documentation Centre, *World Directory of Peace Research Institutions. Fifth edition revised* (UNESCO: Paris, 1984).

- ⁹³ See Wuesthoff's comment on the Tensions Project quoted in Ulrike C. Wasmuht, *Geschichte der deutschen Friedensforschung: Entwicklung-Selbstverständnis-Politischer Kontext* (Münster: agenda, 1998), 83. On Wuesthoff's eventful biography see Hubert Olbrich, "Engagiert für eine Politik des Friedens", in *Berlinische Monatsschrift* 4 (2001): 66–70.
- ⁹⁴ On the institutionalization of peace research in the United States and (Western) Europe see Peter Lawler, "Peace Studies", in *Security Studies: An Introduction*, ed. Paul D. Williams (London, New York: Routledge, 2008), 80–81; Peter van den Dongen and Lawrence S. Wittner, "Peace History: An Introduction", in *Journal of Peace Research* 40/4 (2003): 372. On the lack of institutionalization of peace research in postcolonial societies and, more specifically, Pakistan see Mohammad Ahsen Chaudhuri, "Peace Research and the Developing Countries", in *Journal of Peace Research* 5/4 (1968): 371. In the mid-1960s, though, the International Peace Research Association observed during its inaugural conference that the number of peace researching institutions would grow faster in Europe "and other parts of the world" than in the United States. See Mari Holmboe Ruge, "Present Trends in Peace Research", in *Proceedings of the International Peace Research Association Inaugural Conference* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V., 1966): 297; Elise Boulding, "Inaugural Conference of the International Peace Research Association, Groningen, July 1965", in *International Social Science Journal* 18/1 (1966): 107–112.
- ⁹⁵ Reinhold Niebuhr, "The Theory and Practice of UNESCO", in *International Organization* 4/1 (1950): 6.
- ⁹⁶ This tension was not an exclusive problem of recently founded international organizations such as UNESCO. During the first one and a half decades after the Second World War, peace research in Western academia more generally struggled to move beyond intellectual dry runs and indeed contribute to political decision-making. But rather than interpreting those shortcomings as "analytical deficits", as Dieter Senghaas did, it seems more adequate to see them as the consequences of the structural and institutional features of the evolving cold war framework in the West and in Asia. See Dieter Senghaas, "Editorisches Vorwort", in *Kritische Friedensforschung*, ed. Dieter Senghaas (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1971), 8.
- ⁹⁷ See, for example, Annette Kuhn, *Theorie und Praxis historischer Friedensforschung* (Stuttgart, Munich: Ernst Klett & Kösel, 1971), 11, 21; a strong sense of imminent practical relevance of peace research was also in the air during the inaugural conference of the International Peace Research Association. During this event Johan Galtung defined the task of the Association as the "union of research to the cause of peace": "Concluding Remarks of Johan Galtung", in *Proceedings of the International Peace Research Association Inaugural Conference* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V., 1966), 20.
- ⁹⁸ On the relevance of decoloniality and (the history of) peace research see Claudia Brunner, "Friedensforschung und (De-)Kolonialität", in *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung* 6/1 (2017): 149–163.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Clemens Six is Associate Professor and Chair of Contemporary History at the Department of History, University of Groningen, the Netherlands. His current research interests include secularism in South and Southeast Asia, rural social engineering in decolonizing India and Malaysia, and the history of peace research since 1945.

How to cite this article: Six C. UNESCO's Tensions Project (1947–1957) on India and Israel: Peace research in an era of decolonization. *Peace Change*. 2023;48:183–204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pech.12619>