UNESDOC

Document partially illegible

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

# RECORDS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

*Eighth Session*
*Montevideo 1954*

## PROCEEDINGS

UNESCO



*Published in 1955 by the United Nations*
*Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*
*19 avenue Kléber, Paris-16e*
*Composed in Unesco's workshops*
*Printed by IFMRP, Paris*

© Unesco 1955
*Printed in France*
(.PG.54.VII.8A

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## GENERAL INFORMATION


Chapter I. GENERAL INFORMATION — Page

List of Delegates, Representatives and Observers . . . . . 9
Delegates of Member States and Associate Members . . . . . 14
Observers from non-Member States. . . . . 14
Representatives of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies . . . . . 15
Observers from intergovernmental organizations . . . . . 15
Observers from international non-governmental organizations . . . . . 16
Members of the Commissions and Committees of the General Conference . . 18

Time-table of meetings . . . . . 20

List of documents of the eighth session of the General Conference . . . . . 22

Statistical table showing the documents prepared for the eighth session of the General Conference . . . . . 32


## VERBATIM RECORDS


Chapter II. PLENARY MEETINGS

First Plenary Meeting, 12 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 35
Second Plenary Meeting, 12 November 1954, at 4 p.m. . . . . 41
Third Plenary Meeting, 13 November 1954, at 11 a.m. . . . . 46
Fourth Plenary Meeting, 13 November 1954, at 3.45 p.m. . . . . 57
Fifth Plenary Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 69
Sixth Plenary Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 4.30 p.m. . . . . 82
Seventh Plenary Meeting, 16 November at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 97
Eighth Plenary Meeting, 16 November at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 114
Ninth Plenary Meeting, 17 November at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 135
Tenth Plenary Meeting, 17 November at 3.45 p.m. . . . . 152
Eleventh Plenary Meeting, 22 November at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 160
Twelfth Plenary Meeting, 24 November at 11 a.m. . . . . 179
Thirteenth Plenary Meeting, 24 November at 6 p.m. . . . . 183
Fourteenth Plenary Meeting, 6 December 1954 at 3.45 p.m. . . . . 184
Fifteenth Plenary Meeting, 7 December 1954 at 3.55 p.m. . . . . 187
Sixteenth Plenary Meeting, 8 December at 3.50 p.m. . . . . 195
Seventeenth Plenary Meeting, 10 December 1954 at 10.45 a.m. . . . . 210
Eighteenth Plenary Meeting, 10 December 1954, at 4.50 p.m. . . . . 224


## SUMMARY RECORDS


Chapter III. GENERAL COMMITTEE

First Meeting, 13 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 237
Second Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 240
Third Meeting, 17 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 241
Fourth Meeting, 19 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 244

Fifth Meeting, 22 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 247
Sixth Meeting, 24 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 251
Seventh Meeting, 26 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 253
Eighth Meeting, 29 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 254
Ninth Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 9.15 a.m. . . . . 257
Tenth Meeting, 3 December 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 258
Eleventh Meeting, 6 December 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 261
Twelfth Meeting, 8 December 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 264
Thirteenth Meeting, 10 December 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 266

Chapter IV. PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

First Meeting, 17 November 1954, at 5.30 p.m. . . . . 269
Second Meeting, 18 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 272
Third Meeting, 18 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 278
Fourth Meeting, 19 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 282
Fifth Meeting, 19 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 289
Sixth Meeting, 20 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 297
Seventh Meeting, 22 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 301
Eighth Meeting, 23 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 306
Ninth Meeting, 24 November 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 315
Tenth Meeting, 25 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 320
Eleventh Meeting, 25 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 329
Twelfth Meeting, 26 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 337
Thirteenth Meeting, 26 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 343
Fourteenth Meeting, 27 November 1954, at 9 a.m. . . . . 353
Fifteenth Meeting, 29 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 363
Sixteenth Meeting, 29 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 370
Seventeenth Meeting, 30 November 1954, at 9.30 a.m. . . . . 378
Eighteenth Meeting, 30 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 386
Nineteenth Meeting, 30 November 1954, at 9.30 p.m. . . . . 396
Twentieth Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 403
Twenty-first Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 410
Twenty-second Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 9.30 p.m. . . . . 418
Twenty-third Meeting, 2 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 424
Twenty-fourth Meeting, 2 December 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 430
Twenty-fifth Meeting, 2 December 1954, at 9.30 p.m. . . . . 439
Twenty-sixth Meeting, 3 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 446
Twenty-seventh Meeting, 3 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 454
Twenty-eighth Meeting, 4 December 1954, at 11 a.m. . . . . 461
Twenty-ninth Meeting, 4 December 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 466
Thirtieth Meeting 6 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 476
Thirty-first Meeting, 6 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 482
Thirty-second Meeting, 8 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 488
Thirty-third Meeting, 8 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 496
Thirty-fourth Meeting, 9 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 500
Thirty-fifth Meeting, 9 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 505

Chapter V. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

First Meeting, 13 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 513
Second Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 515
Third Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 520
Fourth Meeting 16 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 525
Fifth Meeting, 16 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 530
Sixth Meeting, 17 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 535
Seventh Meeting, 18 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 542
Eighth Meeting, 19 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 546
Ninth Meeting, 20 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 551
Tenth Meeting, 20 November 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 556
Eleventh Meeting, 22 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 562

Twelfth Meeting, 22 November 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 566
Thirteenth Meeting, 23 November 1954, at 10.15 a.m. . . . . 567
Fourteenth Meeting, 23 November 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 571
Fifteenth Meeting, 25 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 579
Sixteenth Meeting, 25 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 586
Seventeenth Meeting, 29 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 595
Eighteenth Meeting, 29 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 601
Nineteenth Meeting, 30 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 608
Twentieth Meeting, 30 November 1954, at 3 p.m. . . . . 613
Twenty-first Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 620
Twenty-second Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 626
Twenty-third Meeting, 3 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 631
Twenty-fourth Meeting, 3 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 638

Chapter VI. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

First Meeting, 1 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 641
Second Meeting, 1 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 645
Third Meeting, 2 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 651
Fourth Meeting, 3 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 657
Fifth Meeting, 3 November 1954, at 3.45 p.m. . . . . 664
Sixth Meeting, 4 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 672
Seventh Meeting, 4 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 679
Eighth Meeting, 5 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 689
Ninth Meeting, 5 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 695
Tenth Meeting, 6 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 704
Eleventh Meeting, 8 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 709
Twelfth Meeting, 8 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 718
Thirteenth Meeting, 9 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 726
Fourteenth Meeting, 9 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 732
Fifteenth Meeting, 10 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 738
Sixteenth Meeting, 10 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 745
Seventeenth Meeting, 11 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 753
Eighteenth Meeting, 11 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 761
Nineteenth Meeting, 12 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 769
Twentieth Meeting, 13 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 776
Twenty-first Meeting, 13 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 781
Twenty-second Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 784
Twenty-third Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 789
Twenty-fourth Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 9 p.m. . . . . 795
Twenty-fifth Meeting, 17 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 805
Twenty-sixth Meeting, 17 November 1954, at 4 p.m. . . . . 811
Twenty-seventh Meeting, 23 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 816
Twenty-eighth Meeting, 24 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 822
Twenty-ninth Meeting, 24 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 828
Thirtieth Meeting, 25 November 1954, at 12 a.m. . . . . 832
Thirty-first Meeting, 29 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 835
Thirty-second Meeting, 30 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 840
Thirty-third Meeting, 30 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 845
Thirty-fourth Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 850
Thirty-fifth Meeting, 2 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 855
Thirty-sixth Meeting, 6 December 1954, at 6 p.m. . . . . 858
Thirty-seventh Meeting, 7 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 859
Thirty-eighth Meeting, 8 December 1954, at 5.30 p.m. . . . . 866

Chapter VII. NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

First Meeting, 12 November 1954, at 4.30 p.m. . . . . 870
Second Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 873
Third Meeting, 6 December 1954, at 4.30 p.m. . . . . 874
Fourth Meeting, 7 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 877
Fifth Meeting, 10 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 878

Chapter VIII. LEGAL COMMITTEE

First Meeting, 12 November 1954, at 6.10 p.m. . . . . 880
Second Meeting, 17 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 880
Third Meeting, 19 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 883
Fourth Meeting, 26 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 888
Fifth Meeting, 26 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 892
Sixth Meeting, 2 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 897
Seventh Meeting, 2 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 901

Chapter IX. CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

First Meeting, 12 November 1954, at 11.45 a.m. . . . . 904

Chapter X. COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF MEMBER STATES

First Meeting, 12 November 1954, at 6 p.m. . . . . 908
Second Meeting, 13 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 909
Third Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m. . . . . 911
Fourth Meeting, 18 November 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 912
Fifth Meeting, 18 November 1954, at 3.45 p.m. . . . . 913
Sixth Meeting, 22 December 1954, at 10 a.m. . . . . 915
Seventh Meeting, 23 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 917
Eighth Meeting, 24 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 920
Ninth Meeting, 29 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 924

Chapter XI. HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE

First Meeting, 15 November 1954, at 4 p.m. . . . . 926
Second Meeting, 25 November 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 927
Third Meeting, 1 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m. . . . . 933

INDEX . . . . . 937

# GENERAL INFORMATION

# CHAPTER I

# GENERAL INFORMATION

# LIST OF DELEGATIONS, REPRESENTATIVES AND OBSERVERS

## DELEGATES OF MEMBER STATES

### ARGENTINA

*Delegates :*
Dr. Leonardo José Antonio COLOMBO (Head of the delegation)
Dr. José Alfredo FERNANDEZ MORENO
Professor Prudencio OSCAR TOLOSA
Dr. Juan Emilio CASSANI
Dr. Enrique Roberto AFTALION
Dr. Carlos ASTRADA
*Deputy :*
Dr. Miguel Angel GUEZALEZ
*Press Officer :*
Mrs. Zoe MARTINEZ DE REYES URIBE

### AUSTRALIA

*Delegates :*
Mr. Joseph James PRATT (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Kevin Thomas KELLY
Dr. W. Gardner DAVIES
Mr. R. W. S. LINKSON
*Secretary :*
Miss J. DICKINSON

### AUSTRIA

*Delegates :*
H. E. Mr. Max LÖWENTHAL-CHLUMECKY
Dr. Fritz KALMAR

### BELGIUM

*Delegates :*
Baron François van der STRATEN WAILLET (Head of the delegation)
Professor Jean BAUGNIET
Professor Marcel FLORKIN
Mr. Louis de THIBAULT
Professor Armand HACQUAERT
*Adviser :*
Mr. Jean des ENFFANS D'AVERNAS

### BOLIVIA

*Delegate :*
Mr. Mario SANJINES URIARTE

### BRAZIL

*Delegates :*
Professor Paulo de BERREDO CARNEIRO (Head of the delegation)
Professor Joaquim COSTA RIBEIRO
Professor T. BRANDÃO CAVALCANTI
*Advisers :*
Mr. Ary MACHADO PAVÃO
Mr. Antonio FANTINATO NETTO
*Representative of IBECC ;*
Professor Isaias RAW
*Technical Adviser :*
Professor Inezil PENNA MARINHO

### BURMA (UNION OF)

*Delegates :*
Professor THA HLA
U THA MYAT
U PO CHEIN

### BYELORUSSIAN SSR

*Delegates :*
Mr. Stepan Andreievich UMREIKO (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Anatoli Emilianovich GURINOVICH
Mr. Giorgi Tijonovich KAVALEVSKY
*Adviser :*
Mr. Nicolas Jakovlevich AGAPOV
*Interpreter :*
Mr. Victor Sergueevich KOLBASIN
*Secretary :*
Miss Natalia Nicolaevna KOVALENKO

### CAMBODIA

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr. Nong KIMNY (Head of the delegation)
Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG

### CANADA

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr Sydney D. PIERCE (Head of the delegation)

Mr. Bona ARSENAULT
Mr. C.W. CARTER
Dr. Philippe PANNETON
Dr. Garnet T. PAGE

*Deputies :*

Dr. A. VIBERT DOUGLAS
Mr. F. K. STEWART
Mr. Fulgence CHARPENTIER

*Advisers :*

Mr. Malcolm N. BOW
Mr. C. F. W. HOOPER

## CEYLON

*Delegates :*

Mr. R. J. F. MENDIS (Head of the delegation)
Dr. B. A. ABEYWICKREMA

## CHILE

*Delegates :*

H.E. Mr. Carlos VASALLO ROJAS (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Julio BARRENECHEA PINO
Mr. Francisco WALKER LINARES
Mr. Manuel ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ
Mr. Alberto VILLALON GALDAMES

*Deputies :*

Mrs. Amanda LABARCA HUBERTSON
Mr. Héctor MARDONES RESTAT
Mr. Juan IBAÑEZ GOMEZ

*Adviser :*

Mr. Rodrigo GUTIERREZ PALACIOS

## CHINA

*Delegates :*

Dr. LI YU-YING (Head of the delegation)
H.E. HU CHING-YU
Dr. U TSUN-CHEN
Professor CHEN YUAN

*Advisers :*

Dr. SIAO-YU
Professor CHENG CHI-PAO
Dr. CHOU LING

*Secretaries :*

Mr. LEE WEI-O
Mr. CHEN KEH-CHI

## COLOMBIA

*Delegates :*

H.E. Dr. Rafael BERNAL JIMENEZ (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Dr. Pablo JARAMILLO ARANGO
Dr. Rafael GOMEZ HOYOS
Dr. Julio HOLGUIN UMAÑA
Dr. Agustín RODRIGUEZ GARAVITO

## COSTA RICA

*Delegates :*

H. E. Mr. Uladislao GAMEZ SOLANO (Head of the delegation)
H. E. Mr. Emilio VALVERDE VEGA
H. E. Mr. Luis DURAN MASIS
Mr. Eduardo TREJOS DITTEL

## CUBA

*Delegates :*

H.E. Dr. Orestes FERRARA y MARINO (Head of the delegation)
H. E. Mr. Miguel Angel CARBONELL
H.E. Mr. Francisco ICHASO
H.E. Mr. Ricardo RIAÑO JAUMA
H.E. Mr. Vicente VALDES RODRIGUEZ

*Advisers :*

Mr. Adolfo RIVERO RODRIGUEZ
Mrs. Patria MENCIA y de ARMAS

*Secretary :*

Mr. Fernando G. CAMPOAMOR

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

*Delegates :*

Professor Jiří HÁJEK (Head of the delegation)
Professor Frano PAZÚR
Dr. Václav NAVRÁTIL
Dr. Václav VANĚČEK
Dr. Vladimír STĚPÁNEK

## DENMARK

*Delegates :*

Mrs. Bodil KOCH (Head of the delegation)
Professor Jakob NIELSEN
Professor Andreas BLINKENBERG
Mr. Hans KJEMS

## DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

*Delegate :*

Dr. Antonio PANNOCCHIA ALVAREZ

## ECUADOR

*Delegates :*

H. E. Dr. José R. MARTINEZ COBO (Head of the delegation)
E.E. Mr. Clodoveo ALCIVAR ZEVALLOS
Mr. José Rafael TERAN ROBALINO
Mr. Gerardo MARTINEZ ESPINOSA
Dr. Víctor CHIRIBOGA TERAN

*Secretary :*

Mr. Carlos ALCIVAR MUIRRAGUI

## EGYPT

*Delegates :*

H.E. Dr. Mohamed AWAD (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Mahmoud M. HAMMAD (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Dr. Soliman HUZAYIN
Professor Hussein FAWZI
Professor Abdel Aziz AL-KOUSSI
Dr. Ibrahim Hilmi ABDEL-RAHMAN

*Deputies :*

Dr. Mohamed Hassan EL-ZAYAT
Mr. Boutros ABADIR

## EL SALVADOR

*Delegates :*

Mr. Arturo BUSTAMANTE
Professor Armando MARTI

## FRANCE

*Delegates :*

H.E. Mr. Jean BERTHOIN (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Daniel MAYER (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Mr. Paul RIVET (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Mr. Paul HAZOUME
Father Pierre LEROY

*Advisers :*

Mr. Saâdeddine BENCHENEB
H.E. Mr. Edouard GUYON
Professor Henri LAUGIER

*Deputies :*

Mr. Louis FRANÇOIS
Mr. Georges GAYET
Mr. Pierre JUVIGNY
Mr. Charles MORAZE
Mr. Fernand TERROU

*Secretary-General :*

Mr. Jean Pierre CABOUAT

*Technical Advisers :*

Mr. Claude CHAYET
Mr. FAYET
Mr. G. MORLOT
Mr. Jean Marie SEDES

*Experts :*

Mr. Robert BRICHET
Mr. Robert LEFRANC

*Secretary :*

Miss Marguerite LEVASSEUR

## GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

*Delegates :*
Professor Walter HALLSTEIN (Head of the delegation)
Dr. Walter ERBE (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Dr. Kurt Fritz von GRAEVENITZ
Professor Arnold BERGSTRAESSER
Dr. Maria SCHLÜTER-HERMKES
*Experts :*
Dr. Eugen LÖFFLER
Dr. Dolf STERNBERGER
Dr. Heinz KÜPPERS
Mr. Kurt FREY
Dr. Elisabeth SCHWARZHAUPT
Professor Dr. Otto STOCKER
Count Heinrich von HARDENBERG

## GREECE

*Delegates :*
Professor Alexandre PHOTIADES (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Constantin VATIKIOTTY
Mr. Georges P. KAPSAMBELIS
Mr. Gregorio PANTAZOGLOU

## GUATEMALA

*Delegates :*
Professor Vicente DIAZ SAMAYOA (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Virgilio RODRIGUEZ BETETA
Mr. Antonio CARRERA MOLINA
Mr. José Luis MENDOZA
Mrs. Manuelita de CORONADO
*Secretary :*
Mr. Virgilio RODRIGUEZ MACAL

## HAITI

*Delegates :*
Mr. León LALEAU (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Max JEAN-JACQUES (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Mr. Lelio FAUBLAS
Professor Amilcar LAMY
Mr. Gerard LOISEAU

## HONDURAS

*Delegate :*
Professor Rafael BARDALES

## HUNGARY

*Delegates :*
Mr. Ernő MIHÁLYFI (Head of the delegation)
Mrs. Magda JOBORU
Mr. Imre SZABÓ
Mr. Aladár TAMÁS
*Secretaries :*
Mr. József ELSÖ
Mr. Gábor KOVÁCS

## INDIA

*Delegates :*
Dr. Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (Head of the delegation)
Dr. A. L. MUDALIAR
Mr. Humayun KABIR
Dr. B. N. PRASAD
Mrs. Rukmini Devi ARUNDALE
*Deputies :*
Mr. A. R. WADIA
Mr. M. MUJEEB
Mr. M. S. SUNDARAM
Mr. L. R. SETHI
Dr. N. S. JUNANKAR
*Press Officer :*
Mr. M. D. SHAHANE

## INDONESIA

*Delegates :*
H.E. Dr. Raden SUDJONO (Head of the delegation)
Professor Ir. H. JOHANNES (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Dr. SOENARJO
Mr. R. SOEBROTO
Dr. Sudio GANDARUM

## IRAN

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr. Dr. Gholam Ali RAADI (Head of the delegation)
Dr. Zabihollah SAFA

## IRAQ

*Delegates :*
Dr. Ahmed Hakki AL-HILLI (Head of the delegation)
Dr. Nasir AL-HANI
Mr. Saadi KHALIL

## ISRAEL

*Delegates :*
H.E. Dr. Arieh L. KUBOVY (Head of the delegation)
Dr. Moshe AVIDOR (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Professor Samuel SAMBURSKY
Mr. Mordechai AVIDA
*Deputy :*
Mrs. Daphna ALLON
*Adviser :*
Mr. A. L. ALLON

## ITALY

*Delegates :*
Dr. Vittorio BADINI CONFALONIERI (Head of the delegation)
Dr. Vittorino VERONESE (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Dr. Bartolomeo MIGONE
Professor Francesco SEVERI
Professor Mario TOSCANO
*Deputies :*
Professor Giovani CALO
Professor Giuseppe UNGARETTI
Professor Francesco VITO
Dr. Gian Franco POMPEI
Professor Vittore BRANCA
*Advisers :*
Dr. Enrico GIUSTINIANI
Mr. Umberto CIANCIOLO
Dr. Maria Luisa PARONETTO VALIER
Dr. Alessandra da VENEZIA

## JAPAN

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr. Setsuzo SAWADA (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Toru HAGUIWARA
H.E. Mr. Tatsuo MORITO
Mr. Tadakatsu SUZUKI
Mr. Nobuyuki OKUMA
*Deputies :*
Mr. Jiro INAGAWA
*Advisers :*
Dr. Seiji KAYA
Mr. Takeo ITO

## JORDAN (HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF)

*Delegate :*
Mr. Khalil SALIM

## KOREA

*Delegates :*
Dr. George L. PAIK (Head of the delegation)
Mr. CHEUNG SOO HUH
Mr. David CHUNG

## LAOS

*Delegates :*
Princess Souvanne PHOUMA (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Inpeng SURYADHAY

LEBANON

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr. Charles Daoud AMMOUN (Head of the delegation)
Mgr Jean MAROUN
Mr. Takieddine SOLH
*Deputy :*
Miss Laila NEFFA

LIBERIA

*Delegates :*
Professor Nathaniel V. MASSAQUOI (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. J. Emery KNIGHT
Mr. Robert I.E. BRIGHT
Miss Winifred RAILEY

LIBYA

*Delegate :*
Dr. Fathi KEKHIA

LUXEMBOURG

*Delegate :*
Father Víctor KIRSCH

MEXICO

*Delegates :*
H.E. Dr. Manuel SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Dr. Pedro CERISOLA SALCIDO
Dr. Antonio GOMEZ ROBLEDO
Dr. José ROMANO MUÑOZ
Mr. Jesús FLORES AGUIRRE
*Secretary and Deputy :*
Mr. Federico SILLER BLANCO
*Secretary :*
Mr. Roberto de NEGRI

MONACO

*Delegates :*
Mr. Daniel SUPERVIELLE (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Roger MARTIN

NETHERLANDS

*Delegates :*
Professor H.R. KRUYT (Head of the delegation)
Dr. Frans BENDER
Professor Ferdinand L.R. SASSEN
Mr. Bernard J.E.M. de HOOG
Mr. E.O. van SUCHTELEN
*Secretary :*
Miss Riet KREMER

NEW ZEALAND

*Delegates :*
Dr. C.E. BEEBY (Head of the delegation)
Mr. David FORSYTH

NICARAGUA

*Delegates :*
Dr. Crisanto SACASA (Head of the delegation)
Professor Gilberto BARRIOS

NORWAY

*Delegates :*
Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Harald TVETERÅS
Mr. Sven EBBELL

PAKISTAN

*Delegates :*
Dr. Ishtiaq HUSAIN QURESHI (Head of the delegation)
Mr. S.M. SHARIF (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Dr. Ahmed Raziuddin SIDDIQI
Mr. M. AHMED

PANAMA

*Delegates :*
H.E. Dr. Bernardino GONZALEZ RUIZ (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Dr. Miguel O. AMADO BURGOS

PERU

*Delegate :*
Mr. Ricardo ALCALDE

PHILIPPINES

*Delegates :*
Dr. Mariano V. de LOS SANTOS (Head of the delegation)
Mrs. Paz REINOSO DE RODRIGUEZ (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Mr. Manuel ENVERGA
Mrs. Trinidad F. LEGARDA
*Delegate and Secretary :*
Miss Lumen POLICARPIO

POLAND

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr. Jerzy MICHALOWSKI (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Stefan WIERBLOWSKI
Mr. Seweryn MENCEL
Mr. Antoni SLONIMSKI
Mr. Stanislaw LORENTZ
Mrs Halina JACZEWSKA
Mr. Jerzy WIECHECKI
*Deputies :*
Mr. Stanislaw LESZCZYCKI
Mr. Wojciech WINKLER-KETRZYNSKI

SAUDI-ARABIA

*Delegate :*
Dr. Omar KHADRA

SPAIN

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr. Joaquín RUIZ-GIMENEZ CORTES (Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Carlos CAÑAL, Marqués de SAAVEDRA (Deputy Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Pedro LAIN ENTRALGO
H.E. Mr. Luis GARCIA DE LLERA
H.E. Mr. Pedro CORTINA MAURI
H.E. Mr. Juan ESTELRICH ARTIGUES
H.E. Mr. Francisco Javier CONDE GARCIA
*Deputies :*
H.E. Mr. Alfredo SANCHEZ BELLA
H.E. Mr. José Luis VILLAR PALASI
Mr. Manuel FRAGA IRIBARNE
*Adviser :*
H.E. Mr. José Sebastián de ERICE Y O'SHEA
*Experts :*
Mr. Vicente PEREZ SANTALIESTRA
Mr. Rafael FERNANDEZ QUINTANILLA
Mr. Rafael FERRER SAGRERAS
Mr. José PEREZ DEL ARCO Y RODRIGUEZ
Mr. Manuel PENELLA DE SILVA
Mr. José BLAT GIMENO
Mr. Antonio REUS CID
Mr. José María LOZANO IRUESTE
Mr. José CAVESTANY y de ANDUAGA

SWEDEN

*Delegates :*
Mr. Ingemar DÜRING (Head of the delegation)

Mr. Manne STAHL
Mr. Rune ERIKSSON
Mr. Gösta HEDENGREN

## SWITZERLAND

*Delegates :*
Mr. Pierre BOURGEOIS (Head of the delegation)
Professor Jean PIAGET (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Professor Jean-Rodolphe de SALIS (Deputy Head of the delegation)
H.E. Mr. Jean MERMINOD
Mr. Bernard BARBEY
Mr. Hermann WEILENMANN
Mr. André DOMINICE
*Deputy:*
Mr. Erwin WENK

## SYRIA

*Delegate :*
Mr. Nihad IBRAHIM PASHA

## THAILAND

*Delegates :*
Mom Luang PIN MALAKUL (Head of the delegation)
Mrs. D. PIN MALAKUL
Luang Pramodya CHARYAVIBHAJ
Mr. Bhunthin ATTAGARA
*Secretary :*
Miss Malee ATIBAEDYA

## TURKEY

*Delegates :*
Professor Hamdi Ragip ATADEMIR (Head of the delegation)
Professor Bedrettin TUNCEL (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Professor Nehmet KARASAN
Professor Bedi Ziya EGEMEN
Mr. Behram KÜR

## UKRAINIAN SSR

*Delegates :*
Mr. Boris Andronikovich KOVAL (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Philip Trofimovich DUDNIK
Miss Vera Petrovna TULCHINSKAIA
*Advisers :*
Mr. Konstantin Semenovich ZABIGAILO
Mr. Vsevolod Josefovich PROKOPCHUK
*Secretary :*
Miss Anna Pavlovna BABENKO

## UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

*Delegates :*
Mr. J.D. POHL (Head of the delegation)
Mr. H.J. WIDDOWSON

## UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

*Delegates :*
Mr. Vsevold Nicolaevich STOLETOV (Head of the delegation)
Mr. Alexandr Vasilievich SOLODOVNIKOV (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Mr. Alexandr Alexevich SOLDATOV
Mrs. Tatiana Mijailovna ZUEV
Mr. Imindjan KADYROV
*Deputies :*
Mr. Pavel Vasilievich ZIMIN
Mr. Sergei Alejandrovich GOLUNSKY
Mrs. Maria Ivanovna BURCHULADZE
Mr. Nikolai Semenovich TOROCHESHNIKOV
Mr. Boris Mijailovich VOLKOV
*Advisers :*
Mr. Anushavan Agafonovich ARZUMANIAN
Mr. Alexandr FILOSOFOVICH ALABYSHEV
Mr. Nikolai Stepanovich NOVIKOV

## UNITED KINGDOM

*Delegates :*
Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (Head of the delegation)
General Sir Ronald ADAM
Sir Kenneth GRUBB
Sir John SIMONSEN
Sir Charles WEBSTER
*Deputies :*
Miss M.J. BISHOP
Mr. A.B. CLEGG
Mr. F.R. COWELL
Mr. J.J. ROBERTSON
Mr. W.E.F. WARD
*Advisers :*
Mr. G.M. WARR
Mr. R.A.C. DU VIVIER
Mr. J.S. ARTHUR
Mr. J.L. NEVINSON
Mr. E.M. WEST
Miss S. STRACHAN
*Secretaries :*
Miss E.M. SMITH
Miss P.A. ROSEWARNE

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*Delegates :*
H.E. Mr. Albert F. NUFER (Head of the delegation)
The Honourable Samuel M. BROWNELL (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Mrs. Elizabeth E. HEFFELFINGER
Mr. Athelstan F. SPILHAUS
*Congressional Advisers :*
The Honourable Prince H. PRESTON
The Honourable Hugh SCOTT
*Chief Adviser :*
Mr. Walter KOTSCHNIG
*Advisers :*
Mr. Robert C. ANGELL
Mr. John D. CONNORS
Mr. Ralph W. HARDY
Mr. Henry R. HOPE
The Honourable David E. KAUFMAN
Miss Carol C. LAISE
Mr. Guy LEE
Mr. Max McCULLOUGH
Mr. Charles NORBERG
Mr. James SIMSARIAN
Mr. Francis B. STEVENS
Mr. Edward G. TRUEBLOOD
Mr. Hoyt N. WARE
*Secretary :*
Mr. David PERSINGER

## URUGUAY

*Delegates :*
Mr. Justino ZAVALA MUNIZ (Head of the delegation)
Professor Oscar SECCO ELLAURI (Deputy Head of the delegation)
Mr. Leopoldo C. AGORIO
Dr. Juan José CARVAJAL VICTORICA
Dr. Daniel BLANCO ACEVEDO
Dr. Isabel PINTO DE VIDAL
Dr. Felipe FERREIRO
*Deputies :*
Professor Clemente ESTABLE
Dr. Emilio ORIBE
Dr. Luis GIORDANO
Dr. Sarah BOLLO
Mr. Raul RANIERI
*Adviser :*
Mr. Julián NOGUEIRA
*Advisers for the Natural Sciences :*
Professor Clemente ESTABLE
Dr. Justino CARRERE SAPRIZA
Dr. Emilio BONNECARRERE
Dr. Inés LUISI DE VILLERO
Dr. Diamante BENATTI
Mr. Walter HILL
Dr. Benigno VARELA FUENTES
Dr. Estenio HORMAECHE
Mr. Germán VILLAR

Dr. Juan Carlos PLA
Dr. Juan A. COLLAZO

*Advisers for Philosophy and the Social Sciences:*
Dr. Luis GIORDANO
Miss Susana SOCA
Professor Carlos PITTALUGA VIDAL
Mr. Joaquín PAU
Professor Carlos BENVENUTO
Professor Antonio GROMPONE
Dr. Aparicio MENDEZ
Professor Lincoln MACHADO RIBAS
Dr. Héctor GROS ESPIEL
Dr. Italo CORBO
Dr. Enrique LAGES
Dr. Daniel RODRIGUEZ LARRETA

*Advisers for Education:*
Mr Luis O. NUNES
Professor Clemente RUGGIA
Professor Nicasio GARCIA
Professor Emilio FOURNIE
Mr. Horacio TERRA AROCENA
Professor Luis SAMPEDRO
Professor Anunciación MAZZELLA DE BEVILACQUA
Miss Carmen HERNANDEZ PENELA
Professor Hugo FERNANDEZ ARTUCIO
Professor María HORTICOCHEA
Professor Javier GOMENSORO
Professor Juan E. PIVEL DEVOTO
Professor Alicia GOYENA

*Advisers for Letters, Drama, Films:*
Dr. Emilio ORIBE
Dr. Enrique BELTRAN
Mr. Cyro SCOSERIA
Mr. Angel CUROTTO
Dr. Esther de CACERES
Mr. Eduardo de SALTERAIN Y HERRERA
Mr. Edovico REVELLO
Dr. Manfredo CIKATO
Dr. Sarah BOLLO

*Advisers for the Visual Arts:*
Mr. Carmelo de ARZADUM
Mr. José Luis ZORRILLA DE SAN MARTIN
Mr. Adolfo PASTOR
Mr. Jorge OTERO MENDOZA
Mr. Leonardo CANTU SIENRA
Miss Alicia MIR

*Advisers for Music:*
Professor Lauro AYESTARAN
Professor Luis CLUZEAU MORTET
Professor Vicente ASCONE
Professor Eric SIMON
Professor Héctor TOSAR ERRECART
Professor Enrique CAROSSELLI
Mr. Hugo SCOSERIA

*Advisers for Libraries:*
Mr. Federico CAPURRO
Mr. Dionisio TRILLO PAYS
Mrs. Esther DOSIL DE RAMIREZ
Mr. Miguel Angel PIÑEYRO
Mr. Secundino VAZQUEZ
Miss Elsa TRINKLE

*Representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:*
Mrs. Marta BLANCO ACEVEDO
Mr. Carlos M. HERRERA
Mr. Joaquín COSTANZO
Mr. Mario FERNANDEZ
Mr. Anibal DIAZ MONDINO

*Secretary:*
Miss Raquel PEREDA

VIET–NAM

*Delegates:*
Mr. NGUYEN DUONG DON (Head of the delegation)
Mr. VO VAN LUA
Professor DO VANG LY

YUGOSLAVIA (Federal People's Republic of)

*Delegates:*
H.E. Mr. Veljko VLAHOVIĆ (Head of the delegation)
Professor Sinisa STANKOVIĆ
H.E. Mr. Slavoljub PETROVIĆ

*Secretary:*
Mr. Milovan MATIĆ

# DELEGATES OF ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

BRITISH CARIBBEAN GROUP

*Delegate:*
The Honourable Roy A. JOSEPH

*Adviser:*
Mr. Harold HOUGHTON

GOLD COAST

Mr. John B. ERZUAH
Mr. C.M. OBUOBISA MATE

MALAYA – BRITISH BORNEO GROUP

*Delegate:*
Mr. Dato Nik Ahmed Kamil bin Haji Mahmood

SIERRA LEONE

Dr. E.W. BLYDEN

# OBSERVERS

# NON-MEMBER STATES

BULGARIA

*Observer:*
Mr. Nenco Draganov CHENDOV

HOLY SEE

*Observers:*
Mgr. Giuseppe SENSI (Leader)
Dr. Jean LARNAUD
Father Maurice QUEGUINER
Dr. Fernando OLIÚ CHIAZZARO
Professor Jorge PEIRANO FACIO

PARAGUAY

*Observer:*
H.E. Mr. Juan Isidro RAMIREZ

PORTUGAL

*Observer:*
Dr. Mário d'OLIVEIRA NEVES

RUMANIA

*Observers:*
Professor Mihail ROSIANU (Leader)
Professor Arthur KREINDLER
Professor Constantin IONESCU-BUJOR
Mr. Alexandru LAZAREANU
Mr. Mircea MALITA

*Secretary:*
Mr. Edgar RAFAEL

SAAR

Dr. E. STRAUS

## REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Léon STEINIG
Dr. Miguel ALBORNOZ
Mr. Marcos GANDASEGUI

## REPRESENTATIVES OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

*Food and Agriculture Organization:*
Mr. Pierre TERVER
Mr. Eduard I. KOTOK

*World Health Organization:*
Dr. Emilio BUDNIK
Dr. Jorge A. HIGGINS

*International Labour Organization:*
Mr. E. GARBARINI ISLAS
Mr. Rogelio CHERONI SAN ROMAN

## OBSERVERS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

*Cultural Commission of the League of Arab States:*
Dr. Raif BELLAMA

*European Council for Nuclear Research:*
Professor J. NIELSEN

*International Bureau of Education:*
Professor Clemente RUGGIA

*International Institute for the Unification of Private Law:*
Professor Eduardo J. COUTURE

*Organization of American States:*
Dr. Guillermo NANNETTI
Mr. A. SANCHEZ REULET
Dr. Víctor ESCARDO Y ANAYA

# OBSERVERS
# OF INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

*Académie internationale de la Céramique :*
Professor Juan Carlos HELLER

*Agudas Israel World Organization :*
Dr. E. SCHNURRMAN

*Boy Scouts International Bureau :*
Mr. Germán SELLERA GASTAMBIDE

*Catholic International Union for Social Service :*
Dr. Roman M. I.EZAMA MUÑOZ
Dr. Augusta SCHROEDER
Miss Sofía AGUIRRE TURIENZO

*Commission of the Churches on International Affairs :*
Miss Jorgelina LOZADA

*Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations :*
Mrs. Laura LLAZÁN DE MARGOUNATO

*Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences :*
Professor P. de BERREDO CARNEIRO

*International Association of Universities :*
Professor Jean BAUGNIET

*International Association of University Professors und Lecturers :*
Professor F. VITO
Dr. Eugenio RIESZ

*International Catholic Child Bureau :*
Father DIBAR
Mr. Ruben OREIRO VÁZQUEZ

*International Committee of Scientific Management :*
Dr. Juan RODRIGUEZ LÓPEZ

*International Confederation of Free Trade Unions :*
Mr. Hermes HORNE

*International Conference of Social Work :*
Miss Hortensia de SALTERAIN
Dr. Juan C. CHANS-CAVIGLIA
Miss María Mercedes LATORRE

*International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies :*
Dr. Ronald SYME

*International Council of Scientific Union :*
Sir John SIMONSEN

*International Council of Women :*
Miss Gisele SHAW

*International Federation of Catholic Youth :*
Mr. Daniel VASQUEZ DIAGO

*International Federation of Christian Trade Unions :*
Mr. Manuel VIERA FERNANDEZ

*International Federation of Library Associations :*
Mr. P. BOURGEOIS
Mr. L. A. DUTHU

*International Federation of University Women :*
Dr. Minnie MILLER

*International Institute of Differing Civilizations :*
Mr. GAYET

*International Music Council :*
Professor Lauro AYESTARAN

*International P.E.N. Club :*
Mr. Ernesto PINTO
Mr. Hyalmar BLIXEN
Miss María Luisa COOLIGHAM

*International Political Science Association :*
Professor T. BRANDAO CAVALCANTI

*International Social Service :*
Dr. Juan C. CHANS-CAVIGLIA

*International Sociological Association :*
Professor Isaac GANON
Dr. Aldo E. SOLARI

*International Theatre Institute :*
Mr. Emilio ACEVEDO SOLANO

*International Union of Architects :*
Mr. Héctor MARDONES-RESTAT
Mr. Leopoldo C. ARTUCIO

*International Union for Child Welfare :*
Mrs. María Pía BULA DE SURRACO
Mrs. Felicia ARECO DE FOLLE

*International Union of Family Organizations :*
Mr. Guillermo BRANDT

*International Union for Protecting Public Morality :*
Miss Elena C. CUMELLA

*International Union for the Protection of Nature :*
Professor M. FLORKIN

*Inter-Parliamentary Union :*
Professor Hamdi RAGIP ATADEMIR

*Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations :*
Miss M. J. BISHOP
Mr. Selmar BALBI

*League of Red Cross Societies :*
Dr. Tomás RAMOS DIAZ
Mr. Oscar Alberto SILVA

*O.R.T. World Union :*
Mr. M. SILBERMAN
Mr. J. FRIEDMAN

*Pax Romana,*
*International Movement of Catholic Students :*
*International Catholic Movement of Intellectual and Cultural Affairs :*
Miss María MONTERO SAPRIZA
Miss Raquel MEHARU
Mr. Juan José GONZALEZ

*Rotary International :*
Mr. Joaquín SERRATOSA CIBILS

*Union of Latin American Universities :*
Mr. Guillermo COTO CONDE

*Universal Esperanto Association :*
Dr. Ivo LAPENNA

*Women's International League for Peace and Freedom :*
Mrs. Amelita DAGORRET DE PUIGRREDON

*World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations :*
Mr. A. HAGO GRASSI
Mr. Julio SANJURJO

*World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts :*
Miss Gladys GOMIEN

*World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession :*
Miss Sarah C. CALDWELL

*World Federation of Catholic Young Women and Girls :*
Miss María T. SAN MARTIN
Miss Esther DELL'ACQUA
Dr. Teresa BEYHAUT

*World Federation of Democratic Youth :*
Mr. Hello BLOCH
Mr. Jacques DENIS

*World Federation of United Nations Associations :*
Dr. Roberto ARIAS-PEREZ
Mrs. Françoise de TAILLY

*World Jewish Congress :*
Dr. N. GOLDMANN
Dr. G. M. RIEGNER
Dr. A. STEINBERG

*World Movement of Mothers :*
Mrs. Yolanda TURENNE PUIG

*World Power Conference :*
Mr. Salvador MASSON

*World's Student Christian Federation :*
Mr. Luis E. ODELL

*World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations :*
Mrs. María Elena P.C. de ARTAGAVEYTIA
Miss C. PINEIRO-PEARSON

*World Union of Jewish Students :*
Mr. José FOSMAN
Miss Raquel MANDELBAUM

*World Union for Progressive Judaism :*
Mr. F. E. JOSEPHSON

*World University Service :*
Dr. G. M. RIEGNER

*World's Young Women's Christian Association :*
Miss Bernice A. MILLER
Miss Esther MARTINEZ URTHIAGUE

# MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

## PRESIDENT OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

H.E. Mr. Justino ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

## VICE-PRESIDENTS

H.E. Mr. Carlos VASSALLO ROJAS (Chile)
H.E. Mr. Joaquín RUIZ-GIMENEZ (Spain)
H.E. Mr. Albert F. NUFER (United States of America)
H.E. Mr. Jean BERTHOIN (France)
Dr. Vittorio BADINI CONFALONIERI (Italy)
H. E. Mr. Setsuzo SAWADA (Japan)
Dr. Ishtiaq HUSAIN QURESHI (Pakistan)
Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom)
Mom Luang PIN MALAKUL (Thailand)
Mr. Vsevolod Nicolaevich STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

*Secretary General:*
Dr. Luther H. EVANS

*Secretaries:*
Mr. M. MONTAGNIER
Mr. M. JIMENEZ

## GENERAL COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE *

*Chairman:*
H.E. Mr. Justino ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)
*Secretary:*
Mr. M. MONTAGNIER

## PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

*Chairman:*
Mr. Pierre BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)
*Vice-Chairmen:*
Mr. Stepan Andreievich UMREIKO (Byelorussian SSR)
Professor THA HLA (Burma)
Mr. Gerardo MARTINEZ ESPINOSA (Ecuador)
*Rapporteur:*
Mr. Henry H. HOPE (United States of America)
*Secretaries:*
Mr. J. CHEVALIER
Mrs. P. MATTHEWS
Mr. R. SKENAZI

## ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

*Chairman:*
Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand
*Vice-Chairmen:*
Dr. Soliman HUZAYIN (Egypt)
Mr. Mordechai AVIDA (Israel)
Dr. Antonio GOMEZ ROBLEDO (Mexico)
*Rapporteur:*
Mr. Rune ERIKSSON (Sweden)
*Secretaries:*
Mr. R. PIAT
Mr. H. WILMOT

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

*Chairman:*
Dr. W. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)
*Vice-Chairman:*
Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway)

* *Note.* The General Committee consists of the President and Vice-Presidents of the General Conference, the Chairmen of the Programme and Budget Commission and the Administrative Commission, and of the Credentials Committee, Nominations Committee, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, Legal Committee, Committee on Reports of Member States and Headquarters Committee.

*Rapporteur:*
Mr. Jean-Pierre CABOUAT (France)
*Secretary:*
Mr. R. SKENAZI

## CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

*Chairman:*
H.E. Dr. Rafael BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia)
*Secretary:*
Mr. C. LUSSIER

## NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

*Chairman:*
Mr. Humayun KABIR (India)
*Secretary:*
Miss L. McPHEE

## LEGAL COMMITTEE

*Chairman:*
H.E. Dr. Mohamed AWAD MOHAMED (Egypt)
*Vice-Chairman:*
Dr. Pablo JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia)
*Rapporteur:*
Professor Jean BAUGNIET (Belgium)
*Secretary:*
Mr. C. LUSSIER

## COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF MEMBER STATES

*Chairman:*
Dr. Nasir AL-HANI (Iraq)
*Vice-Chairmen:*
Mr. Hong HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia)
Dr. Antonio PANNOCCHIA ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic)
*Rapporteur:*
Mr. Paul HAZOUME (France)
*Secretary:*
Mrs. N. MALTERRE

## HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE

*Chairman:*
Professor Paulo de BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil)
*Vice-Chairman:*
Mr. Humayun KABIR (India)
*Rapporteur:*
Dr. W. GARDNER DAVIES
*Secretary:*
Mr. Y. LEGUEN

# TIMETABLE

| DATES | | Plenary Meetings | COMMISSIONS | | COMMITTEES | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Programme and Budget Commission | Administrative Commission | Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget | Legal Committee | Credentials Committee | Committee on Reports of Member States | General Committee | Nominations Committee |
| NOVEMBER | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monday 1 | Morning | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| Tuesday 2 | Morning | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | | | | | | |
| Wednesday 3 | Morning | | | | 4 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 5 | | | | | |
| Thursday 4 | Morning | | | | 6 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 7 | | | | | |
| Friday 5 | Morning | | | | 8 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 9 | | | | | |
| Saturday 6 | Morning | | | | 10 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | | | | | | |
| Monday 8 | Morning | | | | 11 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 12 | | | | | |
| Tuesday 9 | Morning | | | | 13 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 14 | | | | | |
| Wednesday 10 | Morning | | | | 15 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 16 | | | | | |
| Thursday 11 | Morning | | | | 17 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | 18 | | | | | |
| Friday 12 | Morning | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | |
| | Afternoon | 2 | | | 19 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Saturday 13 | Morning | 3 | | | 20 | | | 2 | 1 | |
| | Afternoon | 4 | | 1 | 21 | | | | | |
| Monday 15 | Morning | 5 | | 2 | 22 | | | 3 | 2 | |
| | Afternoon/Evening | 6 | | 3 | 23/24 | | | | | 2 |
| Tuesday 16 | Morning | 7 | | 4 | | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | 8 | | 5 | | | | | | |
| Wednesday 17 | Morning | 9 | | | 25 | 2 | | | 3 | |
| | Afternoon | 10 | 1 | 6 | 26 | | | | | |
| Thursday 18 | Morning | | 2 | | | | | 4 | | |
| | Afternoon | | 3 | 7 | | | | 5 | | |
| Friday 19 | Morning | | 4 | 8 | | | | | 4 | |
| | Afternoon | | 5 | | | 3 | | | | |
| Saturday 20 | Morning | | 6 | 9 | | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | 10 | | | | | | |
| Monday 22 | Morning | | 7 | 11 | | | | 6 | 5 | |
| | Afternoon | 11 | | 12 | | | | | | |
| Tuesday 23 | Morning | | 8 | 13 | | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | 14 | 27 | | | 7 | | |
| Wednesday 24 | Morning | 12 | | | 28 | | | | 6 | |
| | Afternoon | 13 | 9 | | 29 | | | 8 | | |
| Thursday 25 | Morning | | 10 | 15 | 30 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | 11 | 16 | | | | | | |
| Friday 26 | Morning | | 12 | | | 4 | | | 7 | |
| | Afternoon | | 13 | | | 5 | | | | |
| Saturday 27 | Morning | | 14 | | | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | | | | | | | | |
| Monday 29 | Morning | | 15 | 17 | | | | | 8 | |
| | Afternoon | | 16 | 18 | 31 | | | 9 | | |
| Tuesday 30 | Morning | | 17 | 19 | 32 | | | | | |
| | Afternoon/Evening | | 18/19 | 20 | 33 | | | | | |
| DECEMBER | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wednesday 1 | Morning | | 20 | 21 | 34 | | | | 9 | |
| | Afternoon/Evening | | 21/22 | 22 | | | | | | |
| Thursday 2 | Morning | | 23 | | 35 | 6 | | | | |
| | Afternoon/Evening | | 24/25 | | | 7 | | | | |
| Friday 3 | Morning | | 26 | 23 | | | | | 10 | |
| | Afternoon | | 27 | 24 | | | | | | |
| Saturday 4 | Morning | | 28 | | | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | 29 | | | | | | | |

| DATES | | Plenary Meetings | COMMISSIONS | | COMMITTEES | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Programme and Budget Commission | Administrative Commission | Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget | Legal Committee | Credentials Committee | Committee on Reports of Member States | General Committee | Nominations Committee |
| Monday 6 | Morning | | 30 | 25 | | | | | 11 | |
| | Afternoon | 14 | 31 | | 36 | | | | | 3 |
| Tuesday 7 | Morning | | | | 37 | | | | | 4 |
| | Afternoon | 15 | | | | | | | | |
| Wednesday 8 | Morning | | 32 | | | | | | 12 | |
| | Afternoon | 16 | 33 | | 38 | | | | | |
| Thursday 9 | Morning | | 34 | | | | | | | |
| | Afternoon | | 35 | | | | | | | |
| Friday 10 | Morning | 17 | | | | | | | 13 | |
| | Afternoon | 18 | | | | | | | | 5 |

OTHER MEETINGS

*Working Parties established by the Programme and Budget Commission:*
1. Decentralization. 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, November.
2. International Regulations 24, 26, November.
3. Mass Communication. 25, 27, 29, November. 1, December.
4. History of Mankind: 3, 4 December.

*Working Parties established by Administrative Commission:*
1. Contributions Committee: 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 26, November.

*Headquarters Committee:* 25, November. 1 December.

*Thirty-ninth Session of the Executive Board.* 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 20, November. 9, December.

*Fortieth Session of the Executive Board:* 11 December.

*Note:* Drafting Committees are not mentioned.

# LIST OF DOCUMENTS OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

## MAIN CONFERENCE DOCUMENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/1 | Provisional Agenda of the Eighth Session of the General Conference |
| 8C/1 rev. | Revised Agenda |
| 8C/1 rev. Corr. | Corrigendum |
| 8C/1 rev. Add.1 | Revised Agenda - Addendum - Inclusion of additional items |
| 8C/2 | Recommendations by the Executive Board concerning the admission to the eighth session of observers from non-governmental organizations. |
| 8C/2 Add. | Addendum |
| 8C/3 | Report by the Director-General and the Executive Board on the activities of the Organization during the year 1953 |
| 8C/3 Add. | Supplementary Report by the Director-General on the activities of the Organization from 1 January to 30 June 1954 |
| 8C/4 | Reports of Member States for 1952 and 1953 |
| 8C/4 Add. | Observations of the Director-General on the Reports submitted by Member States for 1952 and 1953 |
| 8C/4 Annex | Action taken by Member States to promote the free flow of information |
| 8C/5 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 |
| 8C/5 Index | Index |
| 8C/5 Corr. | Corrigendum |
| 8C/5 Corr.2 | Part III - General Administration |
| 8C/5 Corr.3 | Corrigendum 3 |
| 8C/5 Add.1 | Submission of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 by the Executive Board |
| 8C/5 Annex VIII | Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance |
| 8C/5 Annex VIII Add.1 | Addendum 1 - Experts engaged on Technical Assistance projects during 1953 classified by nationality (English only) |
| 8C/6 | Place of meeting of the ninth session of the General Conference |
| 8C/7 | Application by the Government of the United Kingdom for the admission of certain territories and groups of territories as Associate Members of Unesco |
| 8C/8 | Application from the People's Republic of Rumania for membership of Unesco |
| 8C/9 | Contribution of China |
| 8C/10 | Application from the People's Republic of Bulgaria for Membership of Unesco |
| 8C/11 | National Commissions - Resolution adopted by the Executive Board at its thirty-ninth session |
| 8C/12 | Letter from the Head of the Czechoslovak Delegation to the General Conference |

## DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/DR/1 | Natural Sciences: Radio-isotopes (France) |
| 8C/DR/2 | Adoption of Russian as a working language (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) |
| 8C/DR/3 | World Culture Week and Unesco awards (Nicaragua and Honduras) |
| 8C/DR/3 rev. | World Culture, Science and Education Week (Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ecuador and Haiti) |
| 8C/DR/3 rev.2 | World Culture, Science and Education Week and Unesco awards for Science, Art, Literature and Philosophy (Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Haiti and Ecuador) |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/DR/4 | Need for making Unesco a global Organization (India) |
| 8C/DR/4 Add. | Addendum |
| 8C/DR/5 | Peaceful coexistence (India) |
| 8C/DR/5 rev. | Peaceful co-operation (India) |
| 8C/DR/6 | Dissemination of Asian and African culture in the West (India) |
| 8C/DR/7 | Decentralization of Unesco's activities (India) |
| 8C/DR/8 | Race relations (India) |
| 8C/DR/9 | Peaceful utilization of atomic energy (India) |
| 8C/DR/9 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/10 | International students correspondence (Austria) |
| 8C/DR/11 | United Nations stamps honouring Unesco (Austria) |
| 8C/DR/12 | Translation of Unesco publications into German (Austria) |
| 8C/DR/13 | Continuation of subsidy to the International Society of Criminology (Austria) |
| 8C/DR/14 | Establishment of a Regional Office for South and South East Asia (India) |
| 8C/DR/15 | Clubs of Friends of Unesco (Japan) |
| 8C/DR/16 | Encouragement of International Co-operation in the Field of Educational Films on the Part of Unesco (Austria) |
| 8C/DR/17 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Cultural Activities (India) |
| 8C/DR/18 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Natural Sciences (India) |
| 8C/DR/19 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Mass Communication (India) |
| 8C/DR/20 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Education (India) |
| 8C/DR/21 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Social Sciences (India) |
| 8C/DR/22 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Mass Communication (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/22 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/23 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Exchange of Persons (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/24 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Exchange of Persons (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/25 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Cultural Activities (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/26 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Cultural Activities (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/27 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Cultural Activities (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/28 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Education (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/29 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Natural Sciences (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/30 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Cultural Activities (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/31 | Manuscripts in Europe relating to the Histories of Latin America and Asia (Japan) |
| 8C/DR/32 | Injuries and harm caused by radioactivity (Japan) |
| 8C/DR/32 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/33 | Discounts for administrative expenses in connexion with Unesco coupons (France) |
| 8C/DR/34 | Educational television broadcasts (France) |
| 8C/DR/35 | Assistance to scientific research (France) |
| 8C/DR/36 | Working day of manual workers (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/37 | Promotion of health education (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/38 | Teaching of the Charter of the United Nations and the Constitutions of the Specialized Agencies (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/39 | Parallel use of Spanish and English in the Americas (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/40 | Free education at all levels (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/41 | Measures for the development of drama and the spread of popular interest in the theatre (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/42 | Teaching of basic principles for the conservation of natural resources (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/43 | Establishment in Spain of a Latin American Educational Film Institute (Spain) |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/DR/44 | Establishment in Spain of a pilot centre for the study of methods of teaching science in secondary schools (Spain) |
| 8C/DR/45 | Publication of a Compilation of copyright laws in Spanish (Spain) |
| 8C/DR/46 | Exchanges between museums (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/47 | Scientific exchanges (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/48 | Free movement of persons (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/49 | Right of creative workers and research workers (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/50 | Co-ordination of the programme in the Spanish-speaking countries - Creation of a post of Assistant Director-General (Spain) |
| 8C/DR/51 | Scientific and technical education (Spain) |
| 8C/DR/52 | Latin American Educational Film Institute (Spain) |
| 8C/DR/53 | Work by children of school age (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/53 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/54 | Utilization, conservation and protection of water supplies (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/55 | Teaching about human rights (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/56 | Dissemination of science (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/56 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/57 | Circulation of educational, scientific and cultural publications (Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/57 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/58 | Teaching and dissemination of science (Belgium) |
| 8C/DR/59 | Arid Zone (Belgium) |
| 8C/DR/60 | Aid to Scientific research (Belgium) |
| 8C/DR/61 | Physical oceanography and marine biology (Japan) |
| 8C/DR/62 | Study preliminary to the establishment of a training centre for international Civil Servants (Iran) |
| 8C/DR/62 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/62 rev.2 | Revised |
| 8C/DR/63 | Unesco Publication on Mickiewicz (Poland) |
| 8C/DR/64 | The Social Sciences and problems of social development (France) |
| 8C/DR/65 | Proposal for the amendment of Rule 30, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference (Chile) |
| 8C/DR/66 | Draft Recommendation concerning the orientation of Unesco's Programme in the field of the visual arts (Belgium) |
| 8C/DR/66 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/67 | Draft amendments to article V of the Constitution (Japan) |
| 8C/DR/68 | Latin American Regional Centre for Secondary School-Teachers (Honduras) |
| 8C/DR/69 | International Cultural Fund (Brazil) |
| 8C/DR/70 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - Mass Communication (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) |
| 8C/DR/70 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/71 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 (United Kingdom) |
| 8C/DR/72 | Peaceful Co-operation (Czechoslovakia) |
| 8C/DR/73 | Anti-Scientific War Day (Nepal) |
| 8C/DR/74 | Legal Guarantees to be provided nationally for the Staff of the Secretariat (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/74 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/75 | Textbooks and Teaching Materials (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/76 | Adult Education (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/77 | The role of sport in education (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/78 | Humanistic studies in education (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/78 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/79 | Education and child development (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/80 | Teaching about the United Nations and Human Rights (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/81 | Scheme of co-ordinated experimental activities in education for international understanding and co-operation (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/82 | The school curriculum (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/83 | Production of reading material for new literates (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/84 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56: Education (Austria) |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/DR/85 | International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme (Indonesia) |
| 8C/DR/86 | Remodelling of the Future Programme of Unesco (Brazil) |
| 8C/DR/87 | Scale of Contributions (Chile) |
| 8C/DR/88 | International Cultural Fund - Amendment to document 8C/DR/69 (Brazil) |
| 8C/DR/89 | Natural Sciences - Regional Science co-operation Offices (India) |
| 8C/DR/90 | Amendments of the Financial Regulations (Spain) |
| 8C/DR/91 | Level of Contributions (France, Brazil and Japan) |
| 8C/DR/92 | Maximum total of contributions - Amendment to draft resolution 8C/DR/91 (Brazil, Egypt, France and Japan) |
| 8C/DR/93 | The School Curriculum (Ceylon) |
| 8C/DR/94 | The School Curriculum (Ceylon) |
| 8C/DR/95 | Improved Information on Foreign Cultures (India) |
| 8C/DR/96 | Information Campaign on Race Problems (Union of Burma) |
| 8C/DR/97 | Physical Oceanography and Marine Biology (Union of Burma) |
| 8C/DR/98 | Arid Zone (Italy) |
| 8C/DR/99 | Humid Tropical Zone (Ceylon) |
| 8C/DR/100 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56: Education (France) |
| 8C/DR/101 | Maximum Assessment Level - Proposal to amend draft resolution 71 (Norway) |
| 8C/DR/102 | Working Party on Mass Communication (suggestions presented by the United Kingdom Delegation) |
| 8C/DR/103 | Proposal on the Structure of Department of Mass Communication (U.S.A. and France) |
| 8C/DR/104 | Emergency Aid to States afflicted by Natural Disasters (France) |
| 8C/DR/105 | Race Relations - Proposed amendment of 8C/DR/8 (United States of America) |
| 8C/DR/105 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/106 | International Cultural Celebrations (Hungary) |
| 8C/DR/106 (rev. | Revised |
| 8C/DR/106 corr. | Corrigendum (English only) |
| 8C/DR/107 | Working Committee on Mass Communication - Structure of Mass Communication Department (France - U.K. and U.S.A.) |
| 8C/DR/108 | Peaceful Use of Atomic Energy (France, India and Japan) |
| 8C/DR/109 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56: Natural Sciences (Ecuador) |
| 8C/DR/110 | Rational Exploitation of Natural Resources (France, Belgium and Uruguay) |
| 8C/DR/111 | Archaeological Researches in Libya (Libya) |
| 8C/DR/112 | Programme of the Department of Mass Communication - Clearing House (France) |
| 8C/DR/113 | Legal Guarantees to be provided nationally for the Staff of the Secretariat - Amendment to the Draft Resolution 8C/DR/74 (U.K.) |
| 8C/DR/114 | World Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp (France) |
| 8C/DR/115 | Peaceful Co-operation (India, Czechoslovakia and the United States) |
| 8C/DR/116 | International petition in favour of Esperanto (Mexico) |
| 8C/DR/117 | Measures to prevent the use of means of Mass Communication for the propaganda of War - Draft Amendment to 8C/DR/70 (Colombia, Ecuador, Jordan, Liberia, Mexico and the United States of America) |
| 8C/DR/118 | Organization and Working Methods of the General Conference (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) |
| 8C/DR/119 | Organization of the ninth session of the General Conference (United Kingdom) |
| 8C/DR/120 | Need for making Unesco a Global Organization - Draft Amendment to 8C/DR/4 (China) |
| 8C/DR/121 | Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 - General Resolutions (Human Rights) (France) |
| 8C/DR/122 | Co-operation between Postal Congresses and Unesco (Ecuador and Spain) |

8C/DR/123 Measures to promote the use of means of Mass Communication to increase mutual confidence and understanding among the peoples of the world Replace 8C/DR/70 and 8C/DR/117 - (Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, India, Lebanon, Mexico, United Kingdom, United States of America, U.S.S.R.)

8C/DR/124 Use of Russian in the proceedings of the Executive Board (India)

8C/DR/124 rev. Revised

8C/DR/125 Vote of thanks by the General Conference to the Uruguayan Government (Bolivia, Brazil, Egypt, France, India, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America)

8C/DR/126 Use of Russian as a working language of the Executive Board (USSR)

8C/DR/127 Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (Ceylon, India and Liberia)

8C/DR/128 Need for Making Unesco a Global Organization - Draft Resolution recommended by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget

8C/DR/129 Organization of the Ninth Session of the General Conference (Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, France and the United Kingdom)

## GENERAL COMMITTEE

8C/BUR/1 Organization of work of the session

8C/BUR/2 Suggestion of the United States on the procedure for studying the draft programme for 1955-56

8C/BUR/3 Programme of Work: 2 - 12 December

8C/BUR/3 rev. Programme of Work: 4 - 12 December

## NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

8C/NOM/1 Nominations and elections for the posts of President and Vice-Presidents of the General Conference, and Chairmen of Commissions and Committees

8C/NOM/2 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Professor Paulo de Berredo Carneiro (Brazil)

8C/NOM/3 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. Orestes Ferrara Marino (Cuba)

8C/NOM/4 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. J.R. Martinez Cobo (Ecuador)

8C/NOM/4 rev. Revised

8C/NOM/5 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. Arnold Bergsträsser (German Federal Republic)

8C/NOM/6 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. Rafael Bardales (Honduras)

8C/NOM/7 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. H. Johannes (Indonesia)

8C/NOM/8 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. Vittorino Veronese (Italy)

8C/NOM/9 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Professor Nathaniel V. Massaquoi (Liberia)

8C/NOM/10 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. Antonio Castro Leal (Mexico)

8C/NOM/11 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. Franz Bender (Netherlands)

8C/NOM/12 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Dr. Stefan Wierblowski (Poland)

8C/NOM/12 Add. Addendum

8C/NOM/13 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Don Juan Estelrich y Artigues (Spain)

8C/NOM/14 Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Professor Jean Piaget (Switzerland)

8C/NOM/15 Nominations for the Executive

| | |
|---|---|
| | Board - Curriculum vitæ: Mr. Alexandre V. Solodovnikov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) |
| 8C/NOM/16 | Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Sir Ben Bowen Thomas (United Kingdom) |
| 8C/NOM/17 | Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Mrs. Paz Reinoso-Rodriguez (Philippines) |
| 8C/NOM/18 | Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Mgr Jean Maroun (Lebanon) |
| 8C/NOM/19 | Nominations for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ: Mr. Sharif (Pakistan) |
| 8C/NOM/20 | Presentation of nominations for the Executive Board |
| 8C/NOM/20 Add. | Addendum |
| 8C/NOM/21 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus (United States of America) |
| 8C/NOM/22 | Candidature for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Dr. Lak-Geoon George Paik (Republic of Korea) |
| 8C/NOM/23 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - H.E. Dr. Gholam Ali Raadi (Iran) |
| 8C/NOM/23 rev. | Revised |
| 8C/NOM/24 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Frau Dr. Maria Schlueter-Hermkes (German Federal Republic) |
| 8C/NOM/25 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Professor Samuel Sambursky (Israël) |
| 8C/NOM/26 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - M. L. Pin Malakul (Thailand) |
| 8C/NOM/27 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Mr. Toru Haguiwara (Japan) |
| 8C/NOM/28 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Professor Henri Laugier (France) |
| 8C/NOM/29 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Dr. Mohamed Awad (Egypt) |
| 8C/NOM/30 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Interim List 26 November 1954 |
| 8C/NOM/31 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Professor Jakob Nielsen (Denmark) |
| 8C/NOM/32 | Candidature for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Dr. Arcot L. Mudaliar (India) |
| 8C/NOM/33 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Professor Nathaniel V. Massaquoi (Liberia) |
| 8C/NOM/34 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Professor Oscar Secco Ellauri (Uruguay) |
| 8C/NOM/35 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Mr. Vicente Diaz Samayoa (Guatemala) |
| 8C/NOM/36 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Dr. A.H. Hilli (Iraq) |
| 8C/NOM/37 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Princess Souvanna Phouma (Laos) |
| 8C/NOM/38 | Candidatures for the Executive Board, Monday, 6 December 1954 |
| 8C/NOM/39 | Candidatures for the Executive Board - Curriculum vitæ - Mr. Vo Van Lua (Viet-Nam) |
| 8C/NOM/40 | Election of twenty-two members of the Executive Board |
| 8C/NOM/41 | List of Elected Members of Legal Committee - Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget - Committee on Reports of Member States |

## PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/PRG/1 | Proposal for the opening of an international school |
| 8C/PRG/2 | Standardization of educational statistics |
| 8C/PRG/3 | Report on the international petition in favour of Esperanto |
| 8C/PRG/3 Add. | Addendum |
| 8C/PRG/4 | Report on the results of the intergovernmental Conference on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict |
| 8C/PRG/5 | Report on the desirability of establishing international regulations with regard to archaeological excavations |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/PRG/6 | Draft Regulations for international competitions in architecture - Report |
| 8C/PRG/7 | Annual Report of the President of the International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, addressed to the Director-General |
| 8C/PRG/8 | Report of the Director-General on the draft international instrument to reduce obstacles to the free movement of persons engaged in educational, scientific and cultural activities and wishing to travel for purposes connected with those activities |
| 8C/PRG/9 | Official seal and emblem of Unesco |
| 8C/PRG/10 | Report by the Director-General on the draft international Covenants on Human Rights and on measures of implementation of educational and cultural rights |
| 8C/PRG/11 | Report on cultural agreements |
| 8C/PRG/12 | Development and improvement of the practice of sport for educational purposes |
| 8C/PRG/13 | Remodelling of the future programme of Unesco. Report presented by the Executive Board |
| 8C/PRG/14 | Improving arrangements for the micro-copying of library and archive materials |
| 8C/PRG/15 | Documentation centre on school broadcasting |
| 8C/PRG/16 | Press, Film, Radio and Television in their relation to children |
| 8C/PRG/17 | Co-operation with communications research Institutes |
| 8C/PRG/18 | The Unesco Courier |
| 8C/PRG/19 | Financial position of Unesco's Institutes in the Federal Republic of Germany |
| 8C/PRG/20 | Comments by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and by certain Specialized Agencies, on the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 |
| 8C/PRG/20 Add. 1 | Addendum - World Health Organization |
| 8C/PRG/20 Add. 2 | Addendum II - World Health Organization |
| 8C/PRG/21 | Observations of international non-governmental organizations in consultative status with Unesco on Unesco's proposed programme for 1955-56 |
| 8C/PRG/21 Add. 1 | Addendum I - Communications received from International Confederation of Free Trade Unions - Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations |
| 8C/PRG/21 Add. 2 | Addendum II - Communication received from Catholic International Union for Social Service |
| 8C/PRG/21 Add. 3 | Addendum III - Statement concerning Education for Living in a World Community. World Jewish Congress |
| 8C/PRG/21 Add. 4 | Addendum IV - Communication received from Agudas Israel World Organization |
| 8C/PRG/21 Add. 5 | Addendum V - Communication received from O.R.T. World Union |
| 8C/PRG/22 | Report on the activities proposed under item (c): (8C/5 - Project 2-22). Physical Oceanography and Marine Biology |
| 8C/PRG/23 | Report of the working party on International Regulations |
| 8C/PRG/24 | Peaceful Utilization of Atomic Energy - Note by the Secretariat relating to draft resolution 8C/DR/9, (India) |
| 8C/PRG/24 Annex. Corr. | Annex - Corrigendum in English and French only |
| 8C/PRG/24 Add. | Addendum - Work Plan suggested by the Secretariat |
| 8C/PRG/25 | Report of the working party on decentralization |
| 8C/PRG/25 Rev. | Revised |
| 8C/PRG/26 | Report of the working party on the administrative structure of the Department of Mass Communication |
| 8C/PRG/26 Rev. | Revised |
| 8C/PRG/27 | Report of the working party on the History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind |
| 8C/PRG/28 | Proposal by the Director-General concerning the Visual Information Section of the Department of Mass Communication |
| 8C/PRG/29 | Corrigendum: Social Sciences Programme (8C/5 - Project 34) |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/PRG/30 | Resolutions on the Programme and the Budget - Report of the Rapporteur |
| 8C/PRG/30 rev. | Report of the Rapporteur |

## ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/ADM/1 | Amendment to Article V of the Constitution - Composition of the Executive Board |
| 8C/ADM/1 Add. | Addendum |
| 8C/ADM/2 | Amendments to Articles V and VI of the Constitution. Director-General's Report |
| 8C/ADM/2 Add.1 | Proposed amendment to document 8C/ADM/2 (Union of South Africa) |
| 8C/ADM/3 (I) (II) (III) and (IV) | Amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference |
| 8C/ADM/3 (II) Add. 1 | Revision submitted by Delegation of the United States of America |
| 8C/ADM/3 (II) Add. 2 | Revisions submitted by the delegations of Australia, Brazil, the United Kingdom and the United States of America |
| 8C/ADM/3 (III) Add. 1 | Draft amendments submitted by the Union of South Africa |
| 8C/ADM/3 (III) Add. 2 | Draft amendments proposed by the United Kingdom |
| 8C/ADM/4 | Report of the External Auditor and Financial Report of the Director-General on the accounts of the Organization for the year ended 31 December 1952 |
| 8C/ADM/4 Add. | Addendum - Comments of the Executive Board on the Report of the External Auditor for the year ended 31 December 1952 |
| 8C/ADM/5 | Report of the External Auditor on the accounts of the Organization for the year ended 31 December 1953 |
| 8C/ADM/5 Add. | Addendum - Comments of the Executive Board on the report of the External Auditor for the year ended 31 December 1953 |
| 8C/ADM/6 | Draft amendment to the Constitution, and other provisions, relating to the withdrawal of Member States |
| 8C/ADM/6 Add. | Addendum - Withdrawal of Member States |
| 8C/ADM/6 Add. 2 | Addendum II - Draft amendment (United States of America) |
| 8C/ADM/6 Add. 3 | Addendum III - Proposed amendment (Belgium) |
| 8C/ADM/6 Add. 4 | Addendum IV - Proposed amendment (Australia) |
| 8C/ADM/7 | Adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board |
| 8C/ADM/8 (I and II) | Contributions: Scale, currency and collection of contributions of Member States |
| 8C/ADM/8 (I) Add. | Addendum - Scale of contributions of Member States for 1955-56 |
| 8C/ADM/8 (III) | Collection of contributions of Member States for 1955-56 |
| 8C/ADM/8 (III) Add. 1 | Addendum I - Contribution of Hungary |
| 8C/ADM/8 (III) Add. 2 | Addendum II - Contribution of Poland |
| 8C/ADM/8 (III) Add. 3 | Addendum III - Contributions receivable from Member States at 12 November 1954 |
| 8C/ADM/9 | Administration of the Working Capital Fund |
| 8C/ADM/10 | Amendments to the Financial Regulations: Distribution of budget surpluses - clarification of present regulations |
| 8C/ADM/11 | Personnel recruitment, standards and methods |
| 8C/ADM/12 | Measures to be taken to provide an in-service training programme |
| 8C/ADM/13 | Report on salary adjustments for staff in the Principal Officer and Director and Professional categories |
| 8C/ADM/14 | Personnel policy, obligations and rights of staff members: proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations |
| 8C/ADM/15 | Medical Benefits Fund of Unesco: Report of the Director-General |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/ADM/16 | Staff Compensation Fund for service-incurred risks |
| 8C/ADM/17 | Unesco Joint Staff Pension Fund. Report by the Director-General |
| 8C/ADM/17 Corr. | Corrigendum |
| 8C/ADM/18 | Recognition of the competence of international administrative tribunals |
| 8C/ADM/19 | Resolutions and recommendations of interest to Unesco adopted by organs of the United Nations |
| 8C/ADM/20 | Quadrennial review by the Executive Board of the employment of subventions granted to international non-governmental organizations (1950-53) |
| 8C/ADM/21 | Quadrennial review of the Directives concerning relations with international non-governmental organizations |
| 8C/ADM/22 | Recommendations of the Executive Board regarding applications by international non-governmental organizations for admission to consultative arrangements |
| 8C/ADM/22 Add. 1 | Addendum I- Ninth list (continued) of international non-governmental organizations having applied for admission to consultative arrangements |
| 8C/ADM/22 Add. 2 | Addendum II |
| 8C/ADM/22 Annex 1 Add. | Ninth list (continued) |
| 8C/ADM/23 | Renewal of formal agreements concluded with non-governmental organizations |
| 8C/ADM/23 Add. 1 | Addendum I - Draft formal agreement with the International Social Science Council - Comments of Member States |
| 8C/ADM/23 Add. 2 | Addendum II - Draft formal agreement with the International Social Science Council |
| 8C/ADM/24 | Permanent Headquarters Building: Report of the Headquarters Committee and Progress Report of the Director-General |
| 8C/ADM/24 Add. | Addendum - Supplement to Report of the Headquarters Committee and Progress Report of the Director-General |
| 8C/ADM/25 | Report on the Headquarters Agreement between the French Government and Unesco |
| 8C/ADM/26 | Statutes of the Appeals Board |
| 8C/ADM/27 | Staff Regulations and Staff Rules |
| 8C/ADM/28 | Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance - Report of the External Auditor on the statement showing the status of allocations to Unesco as at 31 December 1953 |
| 8C/ADM/29 | Request from the Government of Iran for the writing-off of the sum of $4,915.15, being a loss incurred by the Iranian National Commission acting as a distributing agency for Unesco coupons |
| 8C/ADM/29 Add. 1 | Addendum I - Request from the Delegation of Israel for the writing-off of the sum of $5,714.30 being a loss incurred by the Israeli National Commission acting as a Distributing Agency for Unesco Coupons |
| 8C/ADM/29 Add. 2 | Addendum II - Request from the National Commission of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia for the writing-off of the sum of $1,666.67, being a loss incurred by the Commission acting as a Distributing Agency for Unesco Coupons |
| 8C/ADM/29 Add. 3 | Addendum III - Comments of the Secretariat on the requests presented by the Governments of Yugoslavia and Israel concerning losses incurred in the sale of Unesco Coupons |
| 8C/ADM/30 | Committee on Contributions - First Interim Report |
| 8C/ADM/30 Corr. | Corrigendum (English only) |
| 8C/ADM/30 Add. | Addendum |
| 8C/ADM/31 | Committee on Contributions - Second Interim Report - Scale of Contributions |
| 8C/ADM/32 | Report of the Committee on Contributions on methods of financing the budget |
| 8C/ADM/32 Add. 1 | Addendum I - Proposal by the United Kingdom |
| 8C/ADM/32 Add. 2 | Financing of the Budget: amendment by the delegations of Brazil, Egypt, France and Japan |
| 8C/ADM/33 | First Interim Report of the Administrative Commission on matters relating to the ceiling of the budget for 1955-56 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/ADM/34 | Contributions Committee - Final Report |
| 8C/ADM/35 | Report of the Administrative Commission |
| 8C/ADM/35 Appendix | Result of vote in the Administrative Commission on resolutions appearing in its report to the General Conference |
| 8C/ADM/35 Corr. | Corrigendum |

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/BUD/1 (prov.) | Draft Report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget |
| 8C/BUD/1 | Report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget |
| 8C/BUD/1 Add.1 | Addendum I |
| 8C/BUD/1 Add.2 | Addendum II |
| 8C/BUD/2 | Remodelling of the Future Programme of Unesco |
| 8C/BUD/2 Add. | Addendum - Draft resolution concerning the Future Programme submitted by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget |
| 8C/BUD/3 (prov.) | Examination of the final report of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation |
| 8C/BUD/3 | Examination of the final report of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation |
| 8C/BUD/4 | Resumé of budgetary effects of decisions taken by the Programme and Budget Commission and the Administrative Commission and proposed reductions within the Budget for 1955-56 to balance the budget |
| 8C/BUD/5 | Decisions of the Advisory Committee on the Programme and Budget to balance the 1955-56 budget |
| 8C/BUD/6 | Appropriation resolution for 1955 and 1956 |
| 8C/BUD/6 rev. | Revised version |
| 8C/BUD/6 rev.2 | Revised version |

## LEGAL COMMITTEE

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/JUR/1 | First report of the Legal Committee |
| 8C/JUR/2 | Second report of the Legal Committee |
| 8C/JUR/3 | Third report of the Legal Committee |
| 8C/JUR/4 | Memorandum by the delegation of Japan to the Legal Committee on the interpretation of Article V, paragraph 3 |
| 8C/JUR/5 | Fourth report of the Legal Committee |
| 8C/JUR/5 Corr. | Corrigendum I |
| 8C/JUR/6 | Fifth report of the Legal Committee |

## COMMITTEE ON REPORTS BY MEMBER STATES

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/REP/1 (prov.) | Committee on Reports by Member States - Draft Final Report |
| 8C/REP/1 | Committee on Reports by Member States - Final Report |

## GENERAL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| 8C/INF/1 | Documents for the eighth session of the General Conference |
| 8C/INF/1 rev. | Revised list |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8C/INF/2 | Invitations to the eighth session of the General Conference | 8C/INF/4 rev. | Revised list |
| 8C/INF/3 | Handbook of the eighth session of the General Conference | 8C/INF/4 rev. Add.1 | Addend 1 |
| 8C/INF/4 | Provisional list of delegations to the eighth session of the General Conference | 8C/INF/4 rev.2 | Revised list of delegations |

## STATISTICAL TABLE

Showing approximate number of documents,
pages and copies prepared for the eighth session of the General Conference

### SUMMARY

| | |
|---|---|
| Total number of documents (in each language). . . . . | 632 |
| Total number of pages in one set (four languages) . . . | 23,460 |
| Total number of copies . . . . . | 1,118,250 |

In all approximately 11,000,000 pages were produced.

# SUMMARY RECORDS

# CHAPTER II

# PLENARY MEETINGS

## FIRST PLENARY MEETING

*12 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*President:* Dr. Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)

CONTENTS


Opening of the session by the Head of the Delegation of India 35
Addresses of welcome by representatives of the Government of Uruguay . . . . . 37
Statement by the President on arrears of contributions . . . 39
Speech by the Delegate of USSR . . . . . 40
Establishment of the Credentials Committee . . . . . 40


**OPENING OF THE SESSION BY THE HEAD OF THE DELEGATION OF INDIA**

(1) The PRESIDENT: Mr. President of the Council, members of the Uruguayan Government, delegates to the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco, and friends.

(2) May I extend to you all a very hearty welcome to this eighth session of the General Conference, meeting in this beautiful city, pleasing to the eye and soothing to the mind. It is the capital of Uruguay, reputed to be a model democracy in this part of the world. We are now witnessing democracy in action - the country is in the throes of a general election. It is said that democracies can function properly only in small States - here is an example. Hitherto, in history, when we wished to alter or abolish governments we have had either dynastic successions or violent revolutions. A more human, a more civilized, a more dignified method of altering constitutions, of changing government is the method of free elections, and in this country today we are experiencing such an election. I am informed that the people of this country do not look upon political freedom as an end in itself.

(3) Everything is being done to raise the material standards of the people of Uruguay. You have here free education - both in the schools and at university level; you have free medical services, you have pensions for the old and the sick and for people who have spent their lives in government service; thus the benefits of social legislation are widely spread. I believe then that Uruguay can be regarded as a model democracy. We wish it well. Nor have I any doubt that it is the more secure because the country has neither uranium nor oil.

(4) Since we last met, our membership has increased. We are very glad to welcome the delegates from the Soviet Union, which has for the first time joined this Organization. I venture to hope that their presence here will contribute towards dissipating the mists of misunderstanding, towards dissolving, so to speak, the frozen attitudes and rigid postures of fear, suspicion and distrust, and towards the development of world understanding, one of the main objectives of this great Organization. Not only the Soviet Union, but other countries have also joined, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, who were with us for a time, then left us, and now return to the fold like sheep that have strayed. It is my hope that their presence here, too, will help to promote world understanding. I am informed of certain technical difficulties, but, without prejudging the issue, without committing the Administrative Commission to any decision, I am just throwing out a suggestion to you - as a strictly temporary measure - that they may be allowed full voting rights. I shall be making a statement on that question as soon as time permits.

(5) The world, once divided by oceans and continents, is today physically united, but there is still suspicion and misunderstanding. It is essential for us not to live apart but to live together, understanding each

other, knowing each other's fears and anxieties, aspirations and thoughts. We have all subscribed to the United Nations Charter - that Charter which affirms faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person. Political freedom and economic justice are two sides of democracy; both are essential. We should lay stress on improvement of the economic conditions of people as well as on liberty and independence. No society can claim to be democratic if it does not permit political liberty, freedom of conscience, a free choice between parties, and provide opportunities for peaceful and orderly changes of government. No true democracy can remain satisfied merely with conditions which safeguard political liberty and freedom of the individual. It must secure the economic conditions which will justify this faith in the dignity of the human person if our professions about the dignity of the individual are to be taken seriously, we must do away with all sorts of discriminatory practices, we must encourage the independence movements in colonial territories, recognize that poverty in any part of the world constitutes a danger to prosperity in any other part. We must not acclaim racial extermination, enslavement or segregation, but work for racial harmony. In large parts of the world there are millions of people, who, on account of their race, have no share in the civilization around them. In this Organization we must try to look within ourselves, to find out our insufficiencies, remedy them and get together in a spirit of humility and understanding.

(6) The international situation is somewhat better. The difficulties are many, the hazards great, but there is hope in the air. We find that the situation has to some extent improved. In Korea the war has stopped, although anxiety is felt that there is as yet no unification of Korea. It must be brought about on the basis of free elections. The Indo-China war has ceased and it is the general hope that the three States of Laos, Cambodia and Viet-Nam may become independent and answerable to themselves. Outside interference with these States may spoil the chances of a democratic settlement. The Anglo-Egyptian agreement over Suez is a considerable step towards peace in the Middle East. There are many colonial problems still unsolved, though a marked advance is noticeable in regard to the future of the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Tunisia and Greenland. I may be pardoned here for referring to a small colonial problem, the matter of the French possessions in India. It has been solved in a peaceful, democratic, civilized way. I should like to congratulate the Government and the people of France and their great Prime Minister, who has been acting with rare courage, vision and foresight in international questions. The France that gave the world the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity can do no other.

(7) The ticklish problem of Trieste has also been settled with the goodwill of the powers concerned. The question of the Saar is, I hope, nearing solution. Even in regard to disarmament, we see signs of revived hope. While we are glad that such outstanding questions are being tackled, it is unfortunate that in many of these matters the United Nations has been bypassed. At the Geneva Conference on Indo-China, we had discussions with the People's Government of China, and their attitude was co-operative and helpful, yet that Government is still unrepresented in the United Nations, so that the Indo-China Conference had to be held outside the framework of the United Nations, thereby weakening the Organization itself.

(8) In spite of all its defects, the United Nations is a symbol of that hope of unity which man has sought for centuries. The spark of the spirit of man compelled its creation. Science and mechanical ingenuity have been busy for more than four centuries in knitting together the whole habitable surface of the planet by a system of communications. Every form of human intercourse is now rendered possible. The political unification of society is inevitable. The present system of a world broken up into 60 or 70 national States is an anachronism in an age which has discovered the technique of flying and the manufacture of the atom bomb. Will unification come about by force, which in this atomic age will mean not only material but moral devastation, or will it be by the alternative method to war, by voluntary co-operation without the use of violence and coercion? The United Nations asks us to learn to live in a world community and not die of chauvinistic nationalism. We may be French, we may be German, we may be American, we may be Russian, but we are essentially human beings. Let us not overlook that fundamental fact.

(9) The weakness of the United Nations is mankind's weakness. If it is unable to function better it is not because there is anything wrong with the Organization, but because we members who operate it are lacking in moral capacity. We still believe in nationalism, though we aspire to be members of the international community. Powerful nations in the world are attempting to use the United Nations and its Agencies as instruments of their national policies. If we are to develop an international outlook, it is essential that member nations should, at any rate in their relations with international organizations, subordinate national considerations to international obligations. This they do not always do.

(10) I am afraid that, in our attempts to defend democracy, we are throwing away the content of democracy. Governments are becoming more centralized, more thoroughgoing in their administration, more coercive towards their citizens, more effective in their control of thought and opinion, even in democratic States. Oliver Wendell Holmes, a great liberal, who was Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, once wrote that "freedom of speech is freedom for the thought we hate". There is no freedom in allowing freedom to express only what we desire. If we allow freedom to people who express undesirable, distasteful thoughts, then it is that we are the advocates of freedom. To attempt to compel persons to believe and live as we do is not a feature of democracy and has been a perpetual source of strife in the world. Evangelism in politics, in business, in religion will have to be restrained if we are to live together in this world. We should not punish people for holding opinions which are unpopular or disagreeable, we can punish them only if they commit offences or violate the laws of the land. We must assume people to be innocent unless they are proved to be guilty, and not hold them to be guilty until they prove themselves to be innocent. If the drift to totalitarianism in democracies continues, there will be nothing left for democracies to defend.

(11) The programme and the budget of Unesco will come up for detailed consideration in these three or four weeks. I do not wish to anticipate or prejudge your discussions and decisions. In considering the different items on the agenda, the main objective of Unesco - education for living in a world community with all that it means by way of fundamental education, international understanding and co-operation, economic development, improvement of health and community development - will have to be borne in mind.

(12) The gross result of the Second World War was not the defeat of the Axis powers - they have all been regaining their former positions and we welcome it - the real result of the Second World War was the rise of Asia and Africa. A large number of countries in the East have gained their independence - Pakistan, India, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon and others. The outstanding fact about these countries is mass misery, and the redeeming feature is their anxiety to escape from the backward conditions in which they have found themselves. What they are attempting to do is to raise their standards, standards of literacy, standards of health and sanitation, and it is here that Unesco is doing a good deal of work. If we help to remove destitution and despair, we better safeguard the interests of peace. It is the one way of demonstrating that we are members one of another.

(13) This Organization has been concerned with the spread of fundamental education. It regarded illiteracy as the main disease from which millions of people in the world suffer. We are using all the media of mass communication for the spread of literacy. But fundamental education is not to be confused merely with the acquisition of information and skill. We have to impart scientific habits of mind. The immense impact of mass media upon our lives encourages passivity, acquiescence and conformity. Young minds are exposed to surface objectivity, to slogans and catchwords, to the acceptance and elaboration of the obvious. We all eat, think, hear and read substantially the same things. We are developing stereotyped attitudes of mind. We are resisting independent thought, individual creativeness or contemplation. But those are the ways by which we can best contribute to human welfare. All the finest work of scientific genius, of metaphysical insight, is done in those few moments when individuals withdraw into themselves and try to contemplate and meditate. In those few moments they are able to glimpse visions of beauty and truth, bring them to earth, clothe them with emotion, carve them into words, cast them into philosophies. These great achievements are the deeds of men and women who have known how to resist the current of the crowd and have been able to sit alone and in silence and reflect for themselves. If these mass media are going to make our minds automata, if they are going to destroy our spirit, then they are the gravest of dangers. Essential as they are, educators must be awake to the disadvantages of these things. Do not imagine for a moment that I am trying to discourage the use of mass media, I am merely warning against their abuse, which reduces human individuals to robots. That must be prevented.

(14) The most essential need of our age is the spirit of religion, religion not in the narrow sense of the term but in its widest sense. Think truth, live love - these constitute the essence of religion. The pursuit of money and pleasure, technological civilization, is killing the power of mind and spirit. T.S. Eliot said that when we come to die, the wind will blow over the ruins of our homes saying:

> "Here were decent godless people;
> Their only monument the asphalt road
> And a thousand lost golf balls."

That would be the comment on this civilization if it should become merely technological and cease to be moral.

(15) We in Unesco should base fundamental education, for youth and adults, for all of us, upon the twin principles of truth and love. Reverence for every form of life should be created in the minds and hearts of the young. Education, to be complete, must be humane, it must include not only the training of the intellect but the refinement of the heart and the discipline of the spirit.

(16) We live today in a state of cold war, that is, armed fear. It is not peace that we enjoy, but a precarious equilibrium in which dissension is prevented from declaring itself only by mutual fear. It is not a state of order, there is no inner tranquillity. We have to build up loyalty to the world community in men's hearts and minds. Only then shall we have a human society bound by love of one and the same end; then the outward order will be the spontaneous expression of an inward peace. To build that peace in the minds of men is our task.

(17) Wealth and power depart from nations as they depart from individuals. No nation in the world can maintain its primacy in perpetuity. What counts is our moral contribution to human welfare. Let us therefore try to develop the qualities of charity in judgment and compassion for those who suffer. If we adopt such an approach, the tensions of the world will relax rapidly. There is much misunderstanding but we can build peace even on the basis of misunderstanding. Once peace is built, misunderstanding will diminish. Let us work, therefore, with humanity for our goal. In the words of St. Paul: "If it be possible, so far as it depends on you, live in peace with everyone".

(18) I have great pleasure in declaring open the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco.

### ADDRESSES OF WELCOME BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF URUGUAY

(19) Mr. MARTINEZ TRUEBA (President of the National Council of Administration of Uruguay) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the National Council of Administration, I have much pleasure in bidding you most heartily welcome.

(20) The holding of the eighth session of Unesco's General Conference in Montevideo is an event which confers an honour on us and gives us great satisfaction. You are in a country which is striving for the achievement of the same ideals that inspired the creation of your worldwide Organization, in which the hopes of all the peoples are centred. You will be

conducting your debates in a moral climate in which it cannot but be pleasant for you to live and work - a climate in which all currents of ideas can flow without impediment, a climate of freedom and understanding, favourable to the loftiest aspirations of the mind and spirit.

(21) We are persuaded that, of all the bodies set up to forge permanent bonds of peace and solidarity between men, yours is the one which has the greatest opportunities of helping towards the attainment of those ends. We think so in the first place because the abundant information regularly disseminated by Unesco on everything affecting man as a moral being, master of his own fate, and as a member of society, serves to work on men's minds and to build there the "defences of peace", as your Constitution describes them. We think so secondly because this activity of yours will have its effect on every man, by ennobling his life, and on every nation by exalting the worth of democracy as a way of life for the people and as a political structure for States.

(22) Our faith in Unesco's work arises from the fact that we have ourselves made the education and culture of the masses the cornerstone of our institutions and the bulwark and buckler of our freedom. And what we have felt to be good and effective for ourselves, we also believe to be good and effective for the other peoples of the world.

(23) The conviction that has guided us has been that all the main differences that divide men, whether political, social or economic, invariably have at their roots a cultural problem and that, if we apply ourselves to resolving that problem, the others will be more easily settled. The same idea is unmistakably implied in Unesco's Constitution, in its advocacy of the "wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace."

(24) Our hearts are with you in your work and we are ready at all times to do what little we can for you, who do so much for us and all the world. The people and Government of Uruguay assent without reserve to the principles which govern your activities, and we have been at pains to serve them both at home and internationally. Our support of this conference furnishes full proof of our sympathy with Unesco's work and ideals.

(25) Unesco has done much already to develop and improve educational methods. Through its seminars and the expert missions assisting education in many lands, it is giving the work of leading teachers and educators a wider currency. It is doing much, too, to spread a knowledge of art and science among the masses. But what it can do, and what we need it to do, is much more still.

(26) This is particularly true in regard to science. If science is to contribute chiefly to the happiness and well-being of mankind and not to its suffering and destruction, there is an urgent need to convert it into a bond of understanding and concord, by spreading a knowledge of its advances as widely as possible. From this point of view, Unesco's support of various centres throughout the world for the dissemination of science can fairly be applauded; but where its active co-operation is chiefly to be desired is in connexion with research institutes.

(27) Ladies and gentlemen, the watchword of the day for those who, like yourselves, have embarked on that noblest of enterprises, the pursuit of freedom, is "persevere". Persevere until the day dawns when, in Bertrand Russell's striking words, "the desire for mastery shall be replaced by equality, the desire for victory by justice, aggressive ignorance by intelligence, competition by co-operation... to the point when we learn to think of the human race as a single family".

(28) On behalf of the Government of this Republic, I extend to you our warmest wishes for the success of your work, the ultimate aim of which is to build up the defences of peace by strengthening the solidarity and mutual understanding of mankind.

(29) The PRESIDENT: I call upon Mr. Zavala Muniz.

(30) Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Minister of Education and Social Welfare of Uruguay) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, in bidding you welcome to this country and at the commencement of our labours, allow me to say that here you are at home, not only because of the warmth with which the Government and people of Uruguay welcome you but above all because the warmth of our welcome derives from the very growth through the ages of our nation's spirit. The building in which you are assembled is the Palace of the Laws, a palace which we built to show to our own people and to the men of other lands that here the only sovereign who rules over our will is the law-maker who represents, guides and determines that will.

(31) We have received you, then, in the sovereign seat of our nation and we have received you to the sound of our youth chanting the Canticle to Hope, which is the canticle of our country. In this small territory of ours, with our frontiers open to men from all over the world who come here to work with us in the cause of human progress, with our minds open to ideas from all over the world which contribute to our intellectual and spiritual advancement, we welcome you simply but warmly, confident that we are worthy of your presence in our midst because here you will find the habit of freedom that is necessary for a meeting of this kind, freedom which we are striving to make secure for ever because for us the ultimate objective of all policy, of all government action, is man himself, in the full development of his moral qualities. Our whole activity is and ever has been directed to the protection of man from the political despotism which degrades his human dignity and from the economic tyrannies under which his just claims and aspirations can never find really free expression. We have fought and are fighting to defend man from the tyranny of ignorance, since it would avail nothing to have satisfied his material needs if we forbade him dreams of new adventures for mankind. And this brotherhood which has been our desire for ourselves is also our desire for the whole world. We make no distinctions of race or people; we are a country to which immigrants from all over the world have come, to enrich our land by their labour and our minds by their ideas.

(32) No man is a foreigner here who loves freedom and will work with us to build our future; though our tongues may differ, our minds are one.

(33) It is because of that attitude, ladies and gentlemen, that I am able to repeat with conviction, as

Uruguay's Minister of Education, that here you are at home, in an atmosphere supremely conducive to free consideration and discussion.

(34) The PRESIDENT: I call upon Dr. Armando Malet.

(35) Mr. MALET (Mayor of Montevideo) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, the city of Montevideo and our whole country are conscious of the honour that has been conferred upon them by the choice of Montevideo as the place of this Conference.
(36) Neither the business of daily life, nor the recurrent group effervescence characteristic of the period before an election, such as that which will take place in our country in a few days' time, have been able in any way to detract from the significance of the fact - exceptional in the life of this city - that men and women from the most distant and diverse corners of the world should have come here at Unesco's request to discuss questions relating to education, science and culture. To discuss them, moreover, in world terms but in awareness of the significance of national cultures and of what they can contribute and in full realization of the fact that those cultures neither can nor should exist as separate and over closely welded entities.
(37) The question was once asked: "Can national culture exist solely as a monolithic entity embracing the whole nation, without heretics in its midst or, if heretics there are, without regard for them? And the questioner answered himself: "Without heretics, there is no culture". Who said that and where? It was a Spaniard, Don Miguel de Unamuno, and the place was Madrid, at a session of the Permanent Committee of Arts and Letters of the League of Nations, held there between 3 and 7 May 1933. That committee must, I suppose, have been one of the earlier institutions that were in people's minds when Unesco was set up.
(38) In the meetings now before us, we all have something to say, whether we come from underdeveloped or from very advanced countries, whatever the standard of life of our people. And, however varied and disparate the forms of culture which may here be represented, we all know that truth, beauty and justice inevitably convey an awareness of the oneness of the world - an awareness which gathers strength and becomes more widespread as the era of the primitive community gives place to a cultural awakening whereby man is enabled to raise his whole being to a higher level, to refine his sensibilities, to live by reason and to acquire the sense of justice that is essential if society is to survive. But all that is not enough.
(39) At the Madrid meeting in 1933, of which I was speaking a few moments ago, another Spaniard, also a philosopher, who was then lecturing in a Montevideo faculty, argued that the suppression of freedom could never serve to improve culture or to set it in the right direction. That philosopher was Manuel Garcia Morente. He went on: "There are people in our day who think that, because we are not quite clear what to do with freedom, it is better to abolish it. That is not only useless; it is also absolutely impossible. Once man, in the process of his evolution has reached a certain level, it is madness to imagine that he will sink back from that level. Certain phases in the evolutionary process may perhaps be looked upon as reversions to a lower standard, but they are so in appearance only. To my mind, evolution is really more like a spiral, on which man is always turning round the same perpendicular, but each time, of course, at a higher level.

> "I consider it absolutely impossible to maintain that the upsurges of dictatorship, harsh or mild, which have set limits to individual freedom, can prove to be anything more than mere episodes... It is as though we were to argue: 'since it is difficult to live as free men, let us do away with freedom'. That is easy enough to say, but difficult to do - so difficult that I am convinced that the various attempts to suppress liberty which have been made in our day can only endure very briefly."

(40) This, may I remind you, was said nearly twenty-five years ago, at a meeting not, perhaps, on so impressive a scale as the present one, but where, as I have already mentioned, Unamuno and Garcia Morente were present, besides other eminent people such as Jules Romains, Paul Valéry, J. B. S. Haldane, Madame Curie Sklodowska, F. Orestano, Julio Dantas and others.
(41) During that quarter century the world has lived through hours, months and years of anguish and tragedy. It saw the extinction of freedom under régimes which came to power in different nations, and witnessed later the revival of freedom which is still proceeding.
(42) This very conference is a confirmation of the words I have quoted from our Spanish philosopher, and those words have a singularly fitting ring in this land and city - living as they ever have in and for freedom - and in this meeting of delegates, met likewise under the banner of freedom, to whom the city of Montevideo, through my mouth, extends its greetings.

### STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON ARREARS OF CONTRIBUTIONS

(43) The PRESIDENT: I have now to make a statement on the question of arrears. According to Article IV, sub-section 8(b) of the Constitution, the right to vote is made conditional upon the payment by Member States of their financial contributions. Certain States whose contributions were in arrears were advised of this fact by the Director-General in letters despatched between 7 and 13 October of this year. These States are: Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, Cuba, Hungary and Poland. These States will be unable to vote during this session of the General Conference because the amount of their arrears exceeds the amount of the contributions due from them for the current year and the immediately preceding financial year.
(44) Paragraph 8(c), of Article IV declares, however, that the General Conference may permit such Member States to vote, if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond their control. It is

therefore left to the delegations of the countries concerned, if they think fit, to request the General Conference to adopt this latter course. Requests should be addressed to the President of the General Conference, who will transmit them to the General Committee. The General Committee will decide which body of the Conference shall examine these requests. I should inform the Conference that such a request has already been addressed to the Director-General by the Head of the Chinese delegation by letter dated 23 October 1954 (document 8C/9). The Director-General has also received communications from the Governments of Hungary and Poland requesting special treatment regarding the arrears of their contributions (document 8C/ADM/8 (III) Add. 1 and 2).

**SPEECH BY THE DELEGATE OF USSR**

(45) Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (English text supplied by the Soviet delegation): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. The delegation of the Soviet Union deems it necessary, at the very outset of the work of the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference, to draw the attention of the Conference delegates to the abnormal situation which has arisen in the matter of the representation of the Chinese People's Republic in Unesco and its organs.
(46) Can we really consider it a normal state of affairs where the great People's Republic of China, which has an ancient culture and which, along with other Great Powers, plays an outstanding part in the settlement of international problems, is so far not represented in Unesco and where the seat of China's lawful representatives is still occupied by persons belonging to the Kuomintang Chiang Kai-shek group with which the Chinese people has finished once and for all?
(47) The General Conference has met to discuss and settle important questions of international co-operation in the field of education, science and culture. In this connexion it cannot but be recognized that the work of the Conference would yield the most successful results if the above-mentioned abnormal situation were eliminated.
(48) It would be a good moment to point out that, in the interval which has elapsed since the proclamation in October 1949 of the Chinese People's Republic, the Chinese people have achieved remarkable successes in every sphere including also cultural development; that, I have no doubt, is sufficiently well known to the delegates to our Conference.
(49) A proper settlement of the question of China's representation in Unesco would be in the interests of peace-loving peoples and would be consonant with the principles and standards of international law. There is no need to make special mention of the fact that such a solution of this question would be a serious contribution towards the development of international co-operation in science, culture and education.
(50) In drawing the attention of the Conference to the abnormal situation which has arisen in that China's lawful seat in Unesco is so far being occupied by people who do not represent the great Chinese people, the USSR delegation expresses the hope that the General Conference will take appropriate measures for a proper settlement of this question.

(51) The PRESIDENT: This is not a point of order. All the same it will be discussed in the Credentials Committee, and its report will come before the Conference.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE**

(52) We propose that the Credentials Committee consist of the following States: Colombia, Egypt, France, Indonesia, Philippines, United Kingdom, Uruguay, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. (Approved) The Credentials Committee will meet in Room 6 immediately after the end of this meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p. m.

# SECOND PLENARY MEETING

*12 November 1954 at 4 p.m.*

*President:* Dr. Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
*later:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Report of the Credentials Committee to the Conference . . . 41
Adoption of the revised agenda . . . . . 44
Establishment of the Nominations Committee . . . . . 44
Report of the Nominations Committee and election of the President and ten Vice-Presidents of the General Conference . . . . . 45

**REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE TO THE CONFERENCE**

(1) The PRESIDENT: I will ask the Chairman of the Credentials Committee to address the meeting.

(2) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) (Chairman of the Credentials Committee) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, ladies and gentlemen, the Credentials Committee, appointed by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, at its eighth ordinary session, met today, its members being the representatives of Colombia, Egypt, France, Indonesia, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the USSR and Uruguay. The Committee elected the Head of the delegation of Colombia as its Chairman. The Committee then examined the credentials submitted through the Director-General of the Organization by the States mentioned later.

(3) The delegate of the USSR raised objections to the credentials presented by the delegation of China, and submitted the following resolution:

Draft resolution by the USSR concerning non-recognition of the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek group at the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference:

"The General Conference,

In view of the proposal by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning non-recognition of the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek group at the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference,

Decides to consider invalid the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek group, at the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco."

(4) The representative of the United States of America tabled the following motion on this question:

"That the General Conference decides to adjourn any consideration at its eighth session of any proposal to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China."

(5) After a discussion in which the delegates of Indonesia, the United Kingdom, Uruguay, the USSR and the United States of America took part, the Committee decided to put to the vote the question of which of the two proposals should be voted on first. The Committee decided by 5 votes to one, with two abstentions, to vote first on the proposal of the delegation of the United States of America. The proposal in question was adopted by six votes to one, with one abstention.

(6) The Committee decided that the delegates of the States listed hereunder were duly accredited in conformity with Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference by instruments issued either by the Head of the State or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs or by another Minister authorized by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to issue credentials: Australia, Austria, Burma (Union of), Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Laos, Libya, Monaco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, USSR, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet-Nam, Yugoslavia.

(7) The Committee recomended that the delegations of the above-mentioned States be allowed to take part in the eighth session of the General Conference. Credentials were submitted by the representatives of the States listed hereunder in the form of letters, telegrams or other instruments issued by a Minister of

the State they represented other than the Minister of Foreign Affairs and not duly authorized by the latter, or by heads of diplomatic missions or by senior officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, Iraq, Korea, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Turkey.

(8) The Committee suggested that these instruments be accepted as provisional credentials from the above-mentioned States, subject to the later submission of credentials in due form, and that meanwhile the said delegations be admitted to take part in the eighth session of the General Conference.

(9) The Committee noted that some Member States had not furnished their delegations with credentials. The Committee decided to authorize its Chairman to report direct to the General Conference on any credentials that might be received from those Member States before the next meeting of the Committee.

(10) The Committee then considered the credentials of observers representing the following States not Members of Unesco: Bulgaria, Holy See, Portugal and Rumania.

(11) The Committee also examined the documents accrediting the representative of the Saar as observer.

(12) The Committee then examined the credentials of the observers from the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, the British Caribbean Group and the Malaya-British Borneo Group.

(13) Lastly, the Committee examined the credentials of the representatives of the following international organizations: International Labour Organization, World Health Organization. The Committee recommended the General Conference to admit the above-mentioned observers and representatives.

(14) The delegate of the USSR called for a separate vote on the inclusion of China in the list of Member States whose delegations had submitted their credentials in accordance with Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. The following States voted in favour of the inclusion of China in that part of the report: Egypt, France, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States of America and Uruguay. Against: USSR. Abstention: Indonesia.

(15) The following States voted in favour of adopting the whole of the report: Egypt, France, Indonesia, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States of America and Uruguay. Against: USSR.

(16) The PRESIDENT: I call upon the delegate of USSR.

(17) Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union has already drawn the attention of the General Conference to the abnormal situation which has arisen with regard to the representation of the Chinese People's Republic in Unesco and its organs.

(18) The position is that the great Chinese People's Republic, which has an ancient culture and plays an outstanding rôle alongside the other Great Powers in the settlement of international issues, is up to the present not represented in Unesco, while the seats of the lawful representatives of China in Unesco are occupied by people from the Kuomintang Chiang Kai-shek group, which the Chinese people have long since disavowed once and for all. The only lawful Government of China, representing the interests of the 600 million Chinese people, is the Government of the Chinese People's Republic, and only this Government can authorize its spokesmen on behalf of China to participate in the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation submitted a proposal to the Credentials Committee concerning non-recognition of the credentials of the representatives of the Kuomintang Chiang Kai-shek group. The adoption of this proposal would meet the interests of peace-loving peoples. It would conform to the principles and standards of international law and promote the development of all-round co-operation among peoples in the field of culture and science. Since this proposal has not received the requisite majority of votes in the Credentials Committee, the Soviet delegation, for the sake of developing cultural relations between peoples that will conduce to international peace and security, deems it necessary to submit this question for the consideration of the Plenary Conference. The delegation of the USSR submits the following draft resolution for consideration by the Conference:

"The General Conference,

In view of the proposal of the delegation of the USSR concerning non-recognition of the credentials of the representatives of the Kuomintang Chiang Kai-shek group at the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference,

Decides to consider invalid the credentials of the representatives of the Kuomintang Chiang Kai-shek group."

(19) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to make a small factual amendment regarding the credentials of the Brazilian delegation. The decree appointing the delegation was signed by the Head of the State on 22 October last. It was notified by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Brazilian Ambassador in Uruguay. The Brazilian Ambassador in Uruguay is the personal representative of the President of the Republic of Brazil. The Ambassador transmitted this communication to the Director-General of Unesco. We therefore consider that our situation vis-à-vis the Organization is in complete conformity with the existing rules of procedure.

(20) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: I am informed that, while a decree signed by the President, mentioned by the Brazilian delegate, has been received, there is a minor point in the Rules which has not been observed, namely, that powers must also be signed and transmitted to the Director-General.

(21) The PRESIDENT: Does any other member wish to speak on this? I call upon the representative of China.

(22) Mr. HU CHING YU (China): The Soviet delegation has just proposed to have my delegation ousted and to have its seat given to the people's régime. That is nothing new. As you will recall, they or their satellites have tried more than a hundred times and have failed more than a hundred times at international

conferences both within and without the framework of the United Nations. I am confident that this time they will fail again. The Soviet Union has been hostile towards Unesco ever since its foundation. It was the Soviet Union which tried to postpone the Conference of Unesco until the Economic and Social Council had been established. It was the Soviet Union which objected to the transfer to Unesco of the property formerly belonging to the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation of the League of Nations. It was the Soviet Union which took strong exception to the admission of the German Federal Republic, Japan, Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos when their applications for admission were supported by the Economic and Social Council. Three of their satellites even went so far as to announce their withdrawal from Unesco in protest against the admission of Spain, after that admission had been duly approved by the General Conference of Unesco. The Soviet Press and Soviet publications have at times accused Unesco of "serving the interest of war-mongers" and of "defending the policy of American aspirants to world dominion". In short, the Soviet Union has been boycotting, discrediting, sneering at and obstructing the good work of Unesco for almost nine years. Now they have decided to join the Organization and have already become a member of it. Does this mean a change of mind? A change of policy? Or merely a change of tactics? For us this question is not difficult to answer. I am sure that they will continue to pursue the same policy, but this time with new tactics and as a full member. Their attempt to get my delegation ousted is but one of many steps that they have mapped out in order to harm Unesco, in pursuance of the same old policy. As for the Soviet proposal, I have much to say, but at the present stage of the Conference I shall put it as briefly as I can, lest I play into the hands of the Soviet delegation, one of whose aims in introducing such proposals is apparently to waste the invaluable time of the Conference.

(23) I shall confine myself to two of the most important points. Firstly, the position of the Government I represent is unchallengeable. It is the same Government which, in 1945, co-sponsored the San Francisco Conference leading to the foundation of the United Nations, and the same Government which caused China to become one of the members of Unesco. It is the only Chinese Government which enjoys the support of the Chinese people. This is evident from the fact that more than 80 per cent of the so-called Korean prisoners of war have chosen Free China as the land of their repatriation, and that more than 90 per cent of overseas Chinese have demonstrated their loyalty to my Government. The status of its delegations has been repeatedly upheld by all international conferences and organizations. I feel strongly that, as Unesco is an organization of a non-political nature, here is not the proper place to fight out the issues involved in the Soviet proposal. I further maintain that it is for the Economic and Social Council to look to the General Assembly, and for Unesco to look to the Economic and Social Council, for guidance on this issue. Now that both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council are in session with the delegations sent by my Government in full participation, why should we waste our time in discussing the Soviet proposal? Under these circumstances, the best course that this Conference can follow is, I suggest, to dismiss this proposal summarily without discussion.

(24) In the second place, what the Soviet proposal seeks to achieve is not only the ousting of my delegation but also the admission of the Peiping régime. In this connexion, I must tell you that that régime is a purely Soviet creation. It was created and is maintained, controlled and directed by the Soviet Union. Since its inception it has been employed by the Soviet Union as an instrument of aggression, and has been declared such by the United Nations. For these and other reasons none of the international organizations has seen fit to grant it a seat. As one of the objectives of Unesco is to promote cultural co-operation, it naturally has further cause to deny that régime the right of participation. Basically, the Peiping régime is un-Chinese in origin, in character and in purpose. They see no good in what is known to us as Chinese culture, and in fact are trying in every way to destroy it. They are busy re-writing Chinese history to their liking, burning books not in line with their ideology, purging the minds of all who see China in the true light and, above all, killing all intellectuals who fail to respond to their indoctrination. In a word, they are bent upon nothing short of the total enslavement of our whole people. Not even the right of silence is to be tolerated. If such a régime were allowed to represent China in Unesco, it would be an insult to Chinese culture, to the Chinese as a nation and to this Organization itself. I appeal to you, Mr. President and fellow delegates, to have the Soviet proposal voted out without discussion.

(25) The PRESIDENT: I call upon the delegate of the United States of America.

(26) Mr. NUFER (United States of America): In the Credentials Committee the United States delegation presented the following motion:

"That the General Conference decides to postpone consideration at its eighth session of any proposals to exclude the repreresentatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China."

(27) This motion was approved democratically by a vote of 6 to 1 and the United States delegation is surprised that the matter has been raised again. The motion of the United States delegation has now become a resolution of the Credentials Committee and as such is before the Conference. It is a procedural resolution and therefore under Rules 75 and 77 has priority over the proposal of the Soviet Union and must be voted on first.

(28) The PRESIDENT: I call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(29) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom): The British delegation is exceedingly anxious that the careful consideration which has been given to this motion by the Credentials Committee shall not be disturbed. Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have made it clear on numerous occasions that they regard the Central People's Government as the Government of China. Nevertheless, they believe

that there are still many disadvantages in a debate on the question at the present time, and consequently think it appropriate, as has been suggested by the delegate of the United States of America, that the question now raised should be postponed for the present conference.

(30) The PRESIDENT: I call upon the delegate of Poland.

(31) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): The problem of the representation of China in our Organization is of great importance and may affect all the future work of Unesco. We are facing an absurd situation and the great Chinese nation of 600 millions is prevented from participating in the work of Unesco and cannot join in our efforts to strengthen and broaden international co-operation in the field of education, science and culture. For five years we have been facing this abnormal situation. During this time the Central People's Government has strengthened its authority within the country and has carried out a number of major social and educational reforms. On the basis of its ancient culture, the Chinese nation is developing new cultural values, spreading education among the people and promoting science and art.
(32) The continuance of this fiction by which the seat of China in our Organization is occupied by the Kuomintang delegation is a paradox. This group represents a set of political bankrupts dependent only on the support of the armed forces of the United States of America; it does not in any way represent either the Chinese people or Chinese culture and science. Nor can it contribute to the development of our work. You all know the principle of the Constitution of Unesco which claims that: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed". The whole record of the Kuomintang indicates that they place all their hopes in war, they aim at increasing tension in international relations. It has been proved by their piratical activity, to which, among others, two Polish ships recently fell victims. On the other hand, we know of the peaceful efforts of the Chinese People's Government, recently proved by the liquidation of the conflict in Indo-China. China is developing good neighbourly relations with other nations, for example, with India. The People's China demonstrates its readiness to enter into and strengthen cultural relations on the basis of respect for other cultures and for other political systems. Under these conditions, the further barring of China from participation in the work of Unesco is misguided; it is also harmful to our Organization and detrimental to the development and strengthening of international co-operation in the field of culture, a co-operation which is our most important aim and should be the goal of all who really seek peace and the peaceful development of civilization. The argument brought up before this Conference that it is for the United Nations to decide the problem of China's representation, we consider irrelevant. Unesco is a sovereign body and may decide this problem for itself. Finally, there is the motion of the United States of America. In our opinion, this is a resolution of substance and the Soviet resolution, which we support, should be voted upon first.

(33) The PRESIDENT: We have before us an amendment to the report of the Credentials Committee by USSR which says:

"The General Conference,

In view of the proposal by the delegation of the USSR concerning non-recognition of the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek group at the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference, decides to consider invalid the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek group at the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco."

(34) On this amendment the United States of America has proposed that the discussion of this question be postponed under Article 75. That proposal has priority and I am therefore putting to the vote the United States amendment that the question of non-recognition be postponed.

(35) (The motion for postponement was carried by 41 votes to 6.)

(36) We will now vote on the Credentials Committee's report.

(37) (The report was carried by 43 votes to 4.)

### ADOPTION OF THE REVISED AGENDA

(38) The PRESIDENT: I call on the Chairman of the Executive Board.

(39) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board): In accordance with Rules 9 to 12 of the Rules of Procedure, the Executive Board has drawn up the revised agenda of the General Conference which you have in front of you in document 8C/1 (Rev.). This revised agenda contains the items listed in the provisional agenda and supplementary items proposed, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, No. 9, by Member States, the Executive Board and the Director-General.
(40) On behalf of the Executive Board I propose the adoption of the revised agenda.

(41) The PRESIDENT: Your attention is called to Corrigendum 1, 8C/1 (Rev.) dated 9 November 1954. Any observations? Those for adopting the agenda?...

(42) (The revised agenda is adopted unanimously.)

### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

(43) The Nominations Committee will consist of the Heads of all delegations entitled to vote at the Conference. The Head of a delegation may delegate another member of the delegation to attend meetings and vote in his place. The representative of each delegation in the Committee may be assisted by another member. This Committee will elect its own chairman. It has to suggest the names of the President and the 10 Vice-Presidents of the General Conference. The Nominations Committee will meet immediately in Room 3. The Plenary meeting is suspended till the Nominations Committee submits its report.

The meeting was adjourned at 4.35 p.m.

The meeting was resumed at 6.05 p.m.

**REPORT OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE AND ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND TEN VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE**

(44) The PRESIDENT: The Chairman of the Nominations Committee will present his report.

(45) Mr. KABIR (India) (Chairman of the Nominations Committee): On behalf of the Nominations Committee I have the honour to present the following names for the various officers of this Conference.

For the President: the delegate of Uruguay;

for the ten Vice-Presidents: the delegates of Brazil, France, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, Spain, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

for the Programme Commission: the delegate of Switzerland;

for the Administrative Commission: the delegate of New Zealand;

for the Legal Committee: the delegate of Egypt;

for the Nominations Committee: the delegate of India;

for the Credentials Committee: the delegate of Colombia;

for the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget: the delegate of Australia;

for the Committee on Reports of Member States: the delegate of Iraq;

for the Headquarters Committee: the delegate of Venezuela.

(46) In presenting this report, may I, on behalf of the delegation of India, and on my own behalf, support the proposal made for electing the Minister of Education of Uruguay as the President of this Conference. I am sure you will all agree that this country has a small population but a great heart, about which we heard this morning. It has opened its doors to people of all races and to ideals of all kinds, and it is the right and fitting place for holding the session of Unesco. I think we are very fortunate in having the Minister of Education of Uruguay as the President of this Conference.

(47) The PRESIDENT: Your applause indicates that you approve the nomination of this delegate of Uruguay to preside over the Conference. I will now request him to come forward and take the Presidential Chair.

(Mr. Zavala Muniz, Uruguayan Minister of Education and Social Welfare, took the Chair.)

(48) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Ladies and gentlemen, it is with profound feelings of gratitude and emotion that I accept the honour which has just been conferred, not on my person, but on my country. I am sure that Uruguay, when it learns of the vote you have taken, will regard it as one of the highest honours in the whole of its history. For my part, I can only promise to do my duty with the utmost conscientiousness and to conduct your proceedings to the best of my ability.

(49) The applause of the Assembly leads me to believe that the proposal for nominating the ten Vice-Presidents has been approved by acclamation. This being the case, I will ask the delegations of the ten States elected to indicate the names of their representatives.

(50) The names submitted were as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brazil | : | Mr. Berredo Carneiro |
| France | : | Mr. Berthoin |
| Italy | : | Mr. Badini Confalonieri |
| Japan | : | Mr. Sawada |
| Pakistan | : | Mr. Husain Qureshi |
| Spain | : | Mr. Ruiz Gimenez |
| Thailand | : | Mom Luang Pin Malakul |
| United Kingdom | : | Sir Ben Bowen Thomas |
| United States of America | : | Mr. Nufer |
| USSR | : | Mr. Stoletov |

(51) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We shall now proceed to appoint the Programme and Budget Commission and the Administrative Commission, and elect their Chairmen. As you are aware, the General Committee of the Conference will meet tomorrow at 9 a.m. in Room 4 and, in order that this body may be at full strength the Chairmen of these Commissions should be appointed as early as possible. The Nominations Committee met this afternoon in accordance with its terms of reference. Following a precedent set by several General Conferences, I propose that, instead of calling meetings of the two Commissions in different rooms in order to elect their Chairmen, we should meet here together after hearing the Nominations Committee's report and noting the proposals. I will therefore ask delegates to remain in their seats and we will first call a meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission, with myself in the Chair, and invite it to elect its Chairman. We shall next close the meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission, and in the same way convene the Administrative Commission so that it may in its turn elect its Chairman.

(52) Once this second election is completed, we shall again meet in plenary session and return to the agenda of the General Conference. This procedure has the advantage of securing the speedy election of the two Chairmen of commissions, so that, when these bodies meet for the first time, their Chairmen will already be in office and able to start their work.

(53) I would further remind delegations that tomorrow, Saturday, 13 November, we are due to begin the general debate on the report of the Director-General and that delegations should inform the Secretariat of the meeting at which they desire to speak in the general discussion.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.

# THIRD PLENARY MEETING

*13 November 1954 at 11 a.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Communications by the President . . . . . 46
Admission of new Member States and of Associate Members 46

**COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT**

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): May I, as President, in opening the work of this Conference, be permitted to propose that, as a tribute to the efficiency with which he carried out his task as President, and in gratitude for his work at the General Conference, we should pass a vote of thanks by acclamation to the outgoing President, our illustrous colleague, Dr. Radhakrishnan. (Applause)
(2) The General Committee, at its meeting this morning, decided to recommend the adoption of the proposed organization of work of the eighth session (document 8C/BUR/1). May I draw the attention of the Conference to the draft resolutions which appear on the second and third pages of this document; and especially to the recommendation that the number of plenary meetings devoted to the discussion of the Director-General's report be limited to six; that those meetings are to last a maximum of three hours each; and that, to this end, the time allowed to each speaker will, in accordance with Rule 71 of the Rules of Procedure, be limited to a quarter of an hour. The plan of organization further proposes that the discussion be organized in the following manner: delegates will be asked to inform the General Conference Secretariat, not later than the end of the first day of the session, whether they wish to speak in the debate, and, if so, to indicate the meeting at which they would like to speak and the probable length of their speech. The Secretariat will then draw up for the General Committee a draft list of speakers for each of the six meetings. After revision by the General Committee, the list will be submitted by the President to the General Conference for approval. No change may be made in the list except by the General Committee itself on receipt of a request, giving reasons, from any delegation which desires that the time allotted to it be changed.
(3) Does the Conference approve this resolution?

(4) Adopted.

(5) The General Committee also approved the following draft resolution:

"The General Conference approves the decision of the Executive Board (document 39 EX/DIV/2) regarding partial use of the Russian language at the eighth session".
(6) If no one wishes to speak, it will be taken as approved.

(7) Approved.

(8) The General Committee likewise decided to refer to the Administrative Commission the applications for the right to vote, submitted by countries in arrears with payment of their contributions (documents 8C/9, 8C/10, 8C/ADM/8 part 3, Add. I and II).
(9) The General Committee decided, as an exceptional measure, to recommend the acceptance of draft resolutions 8C/DR/63 and 64, which involved the suspension of Rule 78 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, in accordance with Rule 108, which states that this may be done if the motion for suspension is adopted by a two-thirds majority.
(10) If no one wishes to speak, it will be taken as approved.

(11) Approved.

**ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBER STATES AND ASSOCIATE MEMBERS**

(12) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Executive Board.

(13) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board): On behalf of the Executive Board, which has the duty of recommending the admission or non-admission of new Members, I will read out the resolution adopted by the Executive Board at its thirty-eighth session.
"The Executive Board,
Considering that the Government of the People's Republic of Rumania applied for membership of Unesco on 13 May 1954; that, in accordance with Article II of the Agreement between Unesco and the United Nations, the Director-General forwarded the

application to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; that the Economic and Social Council, at its eighteenth session, decided to inform Unesco that it had no objection to the admission of the People's Republic of Rumania to membership of the Organization,

Decides, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article II of Unesco's Constitution, to recommend to the General Conference at its eighth session that the People's Republic of Rumania be admitted to membership of Unesco."

(14) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We turn now to the application of the Republic of Rumania for admission to membership of Unesco. I call upon the United States delegate.

(15) Mr. NUFER (United States of America): We have before us the request of the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic for admission to membership of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. We are aware that some countries are prepared to endorse this application on the grounds that Unesco should apply the principle of universality and that it should be a global Organization. The United States of America supports this principle, but believes that it must be subject to the demonstrated capacity of an applicant for membership to comply with the obligations of the Unesco Constitution and the rudimentary rules of international law. Unless this principle is qualified in this way we run the risk of undermining the very purposes for which this Organization was created. Viewed in this light, what is the record of Rumania?

(16) Paragraph 1 of Article I of the Unesco Constitution sets forth the purpose of the Organization as follows:

"... to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations."

(17) It is common knowledge that Rumania's record is one of constant violation of its international obligations in respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms, of freedom of expression, press, religion and political opinion. Rumania's violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms have been so widespread and so callously indifferent to the inherent dignity of man that its record was considered in the United Nations General Assembly in 1949 and again in 1950. The continued refusal of Rumania to comply with its Peace Treaty obligations was referred to the International Court of Justice, and the Court sharply pointed to its obligations under the Peace Treaty. Rumania, however, continued to ignore those obligations. The United Nations General Assembly consequently adopted a resolution in 1950 condemning the wilful refusal of the Government of Rumania to fulfil its obligations under the provisions of its Treaty of Peace, pointing out that those obligations had been confirmed by the International Court of Justice. The United Nations General Assembly furthermore observed in its resolution that the conduct of the Government of Rumania indicated that it was aware of breaches by it of its obligations under the Treaty of Peace, and that it was callously indifferent to the sentiments of the world community. In addition, the General Assembly voted that this Government had made no satisfactory refutation of accusations against it concerning its continued violations of its Treaty obligations. Rumania's record speaks for itself, it ignores its obligations under a Treaty which it has already signed to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. It ignores the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. It stands condemned by the United Nations for wilful violation of its treaty obligations. Such a country should not be admitted to Unesco. We are faced with a choice here, and in our opinion this Organization should reject Rumania's application. We should not turn membership of this Organization into an empty gesture. The Constitution and the obligations of Unesco should remain clear-cut and firm. For these reasons, and in the belief that membership of this Organization calls for compliance with its obligations, the United States of America will vote against the admission of Rumania to Unesco.

(18) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Czechoslovakia.

(19) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) (Translation from the French): The Czechoslovak delegation did not intend to take part in the discussions at this stage of the General Conference. But the speech which has just been made by the United States delegation - a speech designed to upset the atmosphere of understanding and co-operation - forces us to intervene in a matter which is absolutely clear-cut and irrefutable. Both the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the Executive Board of Unesco recommend this General Conference to admit the People's Republic of Rumania to membership of Unesco. Rumania has for long past - prior to this recommendation - given striking proof that its cultural policy is in conformity with the aims proclaimed in Unesco's Constitution. This is common knowledge.

(20) After its liberation in 1944 Rumania had to cope with the heritage of centuries of tyranny, foreign oppression, poverty, ignorance and a backwardness artificially prolonged by previous régimes. Added to all this were the ravages of the Second World War and the fascist occupation. The Rumanian people, with admirable self-sacrifice and heroism, have in a short space of time overcome these obstacles. They have brought literacy to millions of Rumanian citizens. They have instituted a system of free and compulsory education, built hundreds, thousands of primary and secondary schools, and dozens of higher educational establishments. They have given workers free access to education and culture. They have systematically encouraged the creative abilities of people belonging to all strata of the population, and helped the universities, research institutes and science foundations established since the liberation. We are witnessing a flowering of science - both natural and humanistic - the fruits of which are manifest in the expansion of industry and agriculture and in the rising cultural level of the entire population. Scholars, writers, artists and popular cultural groups have established close and fruitful contacts with many other countries.

There are, in the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, few other nations which could have obtained such striking results in conditions as adverse as those that faced the Republic of Rumania after the war.
(21) It is only natural that we should hail this country's co-operation with Unesco, thus facilitating the latter's approach to true universality, the importance of which has been emphatically stressed on many occasions, and at this very conference. Despite all this, we have just heard objections raised. Nothing could be more contrary to reason than to invoke human rights in the present case. It might be asked whether those who have raised these objections have, in their own countries, in fact introduced the right to education, and freedom of access to all the heritage of national and world culture; whether they have abolished all inequality between the sexes, all national, religious and racial discrimination as completely as the Rumanian people have. It is only just that the Rumanian people should defend its rights against all attacks, from whatever quarter they may come. The objections which have been raised are directed not against the Rumanian people alone, but also against the universality of Unesco, against the very aims of our Constitution, against peaceful coexistence, against international understanding between the peoples in all spheres, and in the sphere of culture in particular. That is why the Czechoslovak delegation invites the Conference to reject these objections, and to vote for the admission of the People's Republic of Rumania to membership of Unesco.

(22) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the USSR.

(23) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union supports the decision of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the decision of the Executive Board of our Organization on the admission of the People's Republic of Rumania to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that the development of cultural co-operation among all States, and active participation in the work of Unesco by all the countries which manifest a desire to be members of Unesco, would create a better atmosphere in the world, and help to establish a situation which would work for the maintenance of peace and friendly relations among the nations of the world. The delegation of the Soviet Union thinks that this is the desire of all the peoples whom we have the honour to represent here at the General Conference of Unesco. For that reason the delegation of the Soviet Union thinks that the admission of the People's Republic of Rumania to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization would work for the further development of co-operation between the peoples of the world in the maintenance of better relations between those peoples and for world peace and tranquillity.
(24) As far as the record of Rumania is concerned in the field of culture, science and education, I think all the delegates to this Conference know very well that the Rumanian people played a conspicuous part in the development of European culture in the past, and is playing a great rôle in the development of European culture today. We believe that the contribution of any country in the world to the development of world culture is a great thing and it does not matter whether this contribution is big or small; any such contribution will enrich world culture and encourage the peoples in their desire to develop better relations one with another. The People's Republic of Rumania has made great strides in its development in recent years, after the ravages of the war had been repaired. The representative of the People's Republic of Czechoslovakia has drawn our attention to the achievement of the People's Republic of Rumania in the field of education and culture and I will not lose time in developing this theme further. I would only stress one point, which is, that in Rumania there is a fundamental and organic law of the country stating clearly that the citizens of the Rumanian People's Republic, irrespective of nationality or race, are ensured full equality and rights in all spheres of economic, political and cultural activities. Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of the citizens of the Rumanian People's Republic, the establishment of any direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any manifestation of chauvinism, race hatred, national hate, or nationalistic or chauvinistic propaganda, is punishable by law. I do not need to refer to a number of other Articles in the Constitution of the Rumanian People's Republic which ensure the right of the citizens to develop culture, science and education so that these benefits may become benefits for all the peoples of the Republic. It is a great pity that a reference was made here to past discussions in the United Nations on the question of alleged violations of the rights of citizens in Rumania. That is a thing of the past, and I would like to say that the charges made were not confirmed by any facts produced at the United Nations. All the allegations against the government and people of the People's Republic of Rumania were refuted. I would remind the members of this assembly that the United Nations has long since dropped this matter, convinced that the issue was not one which deserved further consideration and because the rights granted to the people and the development of culture and science in Rumania proved that all those allegations were false.
(25) Mr. President, allow me to request all the members of our high assembly to support the decision of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and of our Executive Board and decide to admit the People's Republic of Rumania to our Organization. The delegation of the Soviet Union earnestly hopes that this decision will be unanimously accepted.

(26) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Israel.

(27) Mr. KUBOVY (Israel): Article 1 of the Unesco Constitution states that the final aim of this Organization, as also of the United Nations, is to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. Now the Rumanian Government has kept imprisoned for nearly four years, and without any kind of trial, a large number of men and women who formed the élite of the former leaders of the Jewish communities of Rumania. In the past year, Rumanian courts, sitting for the most part in secret, have sentenced some

hundred of these people to very long terms of imprisonment. The crime of which they were accused was that they had been in favour of the establishment of the State of Israel and maintained contact with Jewish organizations in other countries. They were condemned for activities which, at the time, were not only legal but were exercised openly, and with the consent of the Rumanian Government. This action on the part of the People's Republic of Rumania reflects a policy which is incompatible with the principles of Unesco, and in flagrant contradiction with its aims, which are to further the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth and the free exchange of ideas and knowledge. For these reasons the Israeli delegation will have to vote against the admission of the People's Republic of Rumania.

(28) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(29) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom approaches this important and difficult matter with four major considerations in mind.
(30) The first is that this Organization should strive for and attain universality, and no delegation is more eager than ours to see that ideal realized in practice in the life and work of this Organization. The second consideration is that Unesco is an autonomous body. It is not the Education Department of a super-State and it reaches its decision in the light of its own consideration of the evidence before it. The third consideration is that of timing. There is a time when a decision should be reached and there is a time frequently when it is unwise that a decision should be reached, which leads me to the fourth consideration - that our decisions should always be based on what we regard as the conclusiveness and the adequacy of the evidence. Now, it is certain that in the speeches so far delivered from this rostrum there is conflicting evidence before us and it is extremely difficult for us who are attending this session quickly to appraise this evidence and to reach a decision upon it.
(31) It therefore seems to the United Kingdom to be most desirable to oppose the admission of Rumania at this particular session, on the grounds that I have already indicated and to say that we shall be very glad indeed to see this application re-examined in two years' time, when this Conference assembles again. For that reason, I would like to propose an amendment, that a decision on the admission of Rumania be postponed for two years and that we would welcome the application at that time.

(32) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Canada.

(33) Mr. PIERCE (Canada): I speak to support the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation. Our aim in Unesco is not to have a specific number of members, say 73 or 72. I think our colleague from the Soviet Union, when he spoke a moment ago, put our aim more correctly. He said that our aim was to create better feelings and relations. To add a new member in face of the strong objections of members of long standing, who have been the [illegible] Organization, is not, I suggest, a step in that direction. With time, attitudes will modify and feelings may subside. It is for these reasons that the Canadian delegation supports the amendment of the United Kingdom.

(34) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Brazil.

(35) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) (Translation from the French): The Government of Brazil regrets very keenly that it is unable, at the moment, to support the application of Rumania. In making this statement I wish to stress that it is not to be regarded as even a temporary refusal or as expressing reserve or hostility towards the Rumanian people and the struggle it is waging to secure the conquests of which Unesco is the champion.
(36) We therefore request the Director-General to approach the Rumanian authorities without delay and to draw up for our next General Conference a report designed to inform all Member States and delegates of the real atmosphere in Rumania, and that country's accomplishments, so that we may all, with one accord, recognize its right to participate in our work. This is therefore not a refusal but merely a postponement; and we support the British proposal to this effect.

(37) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Poland.

(38) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): The Polish delegation supports the proposal of the Executive Board and the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council concerning the admission of the People's Republic of Rumania to membership of Unesco. We should admit Rumania to our Organization, because that country is acting, in the field of culture and in its international relations, in the spirit and in accordance with the principles of true progress. These are the principles which are the basis of the Constitution of Unesco. In our opinion, the principle of universality which underlies Unesco's Constitution is a pre-requisite of success in its work on a general and on a national scale. In our opinion, there is no conflicting evidence about Rumania, as has been said at this Conference, because no evidence against Rumania nor evidence barring Rumania from membership of Unesco has been presented here. The facts submitted by the representative of Israel are not facts but a repetition of political propaganda disseminated in the world in order to embitter the political situation. We are, for this reason, opposing the amendment of the United Kingdom representative. In our opinion it is our duty to admit Rumania to Unesco. It is a duty to give it the possibility to take part in our work and to enrich the work of our Organization. The Polish delegation therefore appeals for the rejection of the amendment of the United Kingdom delegation and for the admission of Rumania as a member of Unesco.

(39) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Denmark.

(40) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark): We are here faced with the different views of different delegations. Those who oppose the admission of Rumania are accusing them on grounds which it is very difficult for the

different nations to verify. We have known of these accusations for long, and I shall take no stand and pass no judgment on this point. On the other hand, we are faced with a proposal to defer the decision of this Conference, for reasons given by the delegate of the United Kingdom. Our delegation takes the view that it is desirable that the representatives of all nations should come together irrespective of the different views they hold in political or ideological matters. We deem it necessary to produce conditions in which the members of our human community can exchange their views, however different, in a spirit of co-operation, each endeavouring to make its views comprehensible to the others. On these grounds, we feel that we should not defer a decision, but should accept those who indicate their wish to co-operate with us. Even if our ways of life and our fundamental ideals differ, it is better to sit together in the same room and speak to each other than to insult and attack each other across frontiers. We are therefore in favour of taking a decision at once and our delegation is prepared to vote for the admission of Rumania.

(41) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Belgium.

(42) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): I wish to give the reasons why the Belgian delegation intends to support the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation.
(43) We regard the problem from two different angles: firstly, from that of the global character of the Organization - from this point of view it is clearly desirable that the greatest possible number of States should participate in the work of this Specialized Agency; secondly, from the point of view of respect for human rights and respect for the international obligations of the members of this Organization; and from this latter point of view, we cannot be deaf to the arguments which have been adduced by the various members of this Organization. We therefore consider it expedient to postpone taking a decision so that States which have applied for admission to Unesco - and Rumania in particular - can adapt their policy to conform to the requirements of members of this Specialized Agency. Accordingly, we support the motion to this effect submitted by the United Kingdom delegation.

(44) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Yugoslavia.

(45) Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) (Translation from the Spanish): The delegate of the United Kingdom made four comments on the problem before us. The Yugoslav delegation wishes briefly to add a few more.
(46) We in Yugoslavia have had very bitter and cruel experiences during the past five years; but let that pass - we will overlook it in the hope that the international situation will improve and because we believe that the principle of universality should be introduced into international organizations, Unesco as well as the United Nations. Our country is a member of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which approved the application of the People's Republic of Rumania - and, in view of this, the Yugoslav delegation will endeavour to think not of the past but of the future, believing that, if the delegations of those countries which are applying for admission to Unesco come here, we shall be better able to perceive what they think and desire; and also because they will here assume further obligations which they will have to discharge by working hand in hand with us. For these reasons we Yugoslavs, looking to the future rather than dwelling on the past, will vote in favour of the admission of Rumania.

(47) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We have three countries, Colombia, Lebanon and Italy, which have announced their intention to speak. If there are no objections, the list of speakers will then be closed. I call on the delegate of Colombia.

(48) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) (Translation from the Spanish): I must begin by declaring, on behalf of my country's delegation, that we support the principle of universality; that we cherish the desire to see all the peoples of the world, some time, assembled at this great Conference of the United Nations Specialized Agency for Education, Science and Culture; and that we hope, in the end, to see the ideal of friendship and universal peace realized in these lofty realms of thought. This is also the desire, this cannot but be the desire, of all men of imagination and courage.
(49) The wars of the past have been vast hecatombs which have scourged mankind and from which, we may aver, no nation has escaped. They are tragic memories which we cannot forget but it is the idea of universality which should always inform our aspirations. It is my hope that this day may not be far off, the day when all the peoples of the world will meet together in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and genuine solidarity. It is precisely because this is our hope that we deem it essential to prepare the way for it.
(50) It is natural and logical that the present members of Unesco should demand a minimum guarantee of human rights, a minimum sphere for free development in all States which are to become members of the Organization. Accordingly, it is logical also that, before the admission of a new Member State, there should be those minimum guarantees to reassure us regarding the actual fulfilment of the obligations assumed by this new State on entering the community of Unesco.
(51) Does this full guarantee exist in the case of the Republic of Rumania? Is it really certain that, at the present juncture, Rumania is in a position to fulfil the obligations it will be undertaking? Are we fully convinced that there really is a free exchange of ideas in that State, and that freedom of thought and movement is guaranteed there? If our delegation were convinced of this, we should have no hesitation about voting in favour. And we should be especially pleased to do so in view of our deep regard for that great people, to which we are bound by racial affinities.
(52) But since there exists no such conviction, since, on the contrary, there does exist a certain concrete fact, the fact mentioned by the United States delegate, who cited the case of the International Court of Justice, which has just completed its investigation of violations of human rights committed in the country now applying for admission to this Organization, we are unable to approve the admission of Rumania to

the new community of the United Nations. That is the opinion of the Colombian delegation.

(53) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the Lebanon.

(54) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) (Translation from the French): In the opinion of the Lebanese delegation, it is not for us here to pronounce judgment on States applying for admission: we are not awarding good conduct certificates. In principle, we must assume that the very fact of a State knocking at our door indicates its acceptance of all the principles to which we subscribe, and its intention to model both its domestic and its foreign policy on the principles governing our Organization. But since this interpretation does not seem to be general, and since, in spite of our wish to encourage the expression of differing opinions in this assembly and so promoting discussion, which constitutes the essence of life, we must avoid prolonging a debate which embitters the atmosphere of our discussion and impart to this vote the character of approval or of censure, we should do well, I think, to support the United Kingdom proposal. In so doing, however, we should make it quite clear that, in the interests of expediency, and in order to facilitate understanding between States which are or may become members of this Organization, we are postponing the consideration of this matter until the general circumstances indicate that, as we hope, the Rumanian application will be unanimously accepted. For the specific reasons stated we support the United Kingdom proposal.

(55) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Italy.

(56) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI (Italy) (Translation from the French): The Italian delegation attaches very great importance to the principle of universality, but considers that it can only be extended in practice to States which provide serious and convincing proofs that they cherish sufficient respect for the fundamental rights of cultural freedom to be qualified to enter the international community. In the trial which has been instituted here, it appears to me premature to take up any stand, since it is meet and necessary that the allegations made by the opposing sides be examined. We accept the United Kingdom proposal for the reason so clearly stated by the delegate of Belgium. I should like to add that there is, I think, a question of procedure involved here: the United Kingdom proposal should be voted on first of all; and I request that the vote be taken by roll-call.

(57) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The debate is now closed. We are going to vote on the draft amendment submitted by the United Kingdom delegation and seconded by several other delegations. The amendment is that the General Conference should postpone a decision on the application of the People's Republic of Rumania until the next session of the Conference two years hence. The vote will be taken by roll-call.

(58) Mr. MONTAGNIER (Secretary of the Conference) took the vote by roll-call.

In favour: Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Salvador, Spain, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Argentina, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, India, Indonesia, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, USSR, Yugoslavia.

Abstained: Australia, Austria, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, Libya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Viet-Nam.

Absent: Afghanistan, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nepal, Peru, Saudi-Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Venezuela.

(59) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The amendment submitted by the United Kingdom delegate is adopted by 28 votes in favour, 12 against, with 15 abstentions and 11 absent.

(60) The final consideration of this question will therefore be postponed until the next General Conference in two years' time.

(61) We will now consider the application for admission to Unesco of the People's Republic of Bulgaria (8C/10). I call on the Chairman of the Executive Board.

(62) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board): The Executive Board at its thirty-ninth session adopted the following resolution on 11 November last:

"The Executive Board,

Considering that the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria applied for membership of Unesco on 21 July 1954, that, in accordance with Article II of the Agreement between Unesco and the United Nations, the Director-General forwarded the application to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and that the Economic and Social Council, at its resumed eighteenth session, decided to inform Unesco that it had no objection to the admission of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to membership of the Organization;

Decides, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article II of Unesco's Constitution, to recommend to the General Conference at its eighth session that the People's Republic of Bulgaria be admitted to membership of Unesco."

(63) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We will now consider the recommendation of the Executive Board that the application for admission to membership of Unesco of the People's Republic of Bulgaria be accepted. I call on the United Kingdom delegate.

(64) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom): I have no wish to repeat the remarks I made in proposing the amendment when we were considering the admission of Rumania. I would merely say that my delegation is animated by the same considerations in approaching this important and difficult question, too. And we would like to propose as an amendment to the

motion brought forward by the Executive Board that we postpone consideration of the application for the admission of Bulgaria to this Organization for a period of two years, and we look forward to receiving a similar application and considering it at the end of that time. I beg to move that amendment.

(65) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I open the discussion on the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate to the effect that a decision on this question also should be postponed for two years, in the same way as the question on which we have just voted. I call on the delegate of France.

(66) Mr. MAYER (France) (Translation from the French): France will vote on this second question, concerning the admission of Bulgaria, in the same way as it has just voted on the admission of Rumania - in other words, it will vote in favour of the proposal put forward by the United Kingdom delegate. We would like to mention some of our reasons, which will explain the vote we have just given and the vote we are about to give. Without accepting any of the arguments of the delegate of Czechoslovakia, we would - if we were thinking only of Unesco as a world-wide body - be tempted to agree with his favourable conclusions. On the other hand, if we consider the speech of the United States representative, it would appear to be a detailed and exact description of what is going on and of the real situation inside Rumania, and now again in Bulgaria. But we do not consider that it is for Unesco to deal with political problems. And it is precisely in order to ensure that such problems are considered before Unesco examines requests for the admission of new Member States that the regulations provide for the United Nations to be consulted. The United Nations has been consulted: the Economic and Social Council recommended the admission of these States, and, as we see it, the proposal for postponement, which the United Kingdom proposed, and we approved, is perhaps, fundamentally - let us hope so, at least - tantamount to agreeing to admission at a future date when Unesco will consider the question not from the political aspect, but simply and solely from the standpoint of cultural relations or the need for universality in intellectual co-operation in the fields of education, science and culture. It is a pity that we did not, in previous years, adopt exactly the same attitude as is being adopted now. Nevertheless, the case of Bulgaria cannot be dissociated from that of Rumania. In our opinion, therefore, it is not a question either of rejecting or of accepting the admission of these States, but simply of considering the matter objectively in the light of the actual principles on which Unesco is based, and from which we hope, the General Conference will not deviate.

(67) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the USSR.

(68) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union, as in the case previously discussed, supports the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the decision of the Executive Board of Unesco on the question of the admission of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to Unesco.
(69) The delegation of the Soviet Union considers, as I have had the pleasure of stating already, that, in the development of cultural co-operation among States, active participation in the work of Unesco by all countries which desire to be members of the Organization would create the atmosphere, a much desired atmosphere, for the maintenance of international peace, in which, we are sure, all people in the world are vitally interested.
(70) The participation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in the work of Unesco would certainly help in this direction. The delegation of the Soviet Union cannot share the view expressed here by the representative of France and certainly cannot support the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom. The delegation of the Soviet Union sees no reason whatsoever, in the case of the People's Republic of Rumania as in the case of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, not to admit this State to Unesco. Accordingly the delegation of the Soviet Union supports the decision already taken by the Executive Board and the recommendation of the United Nations Economic and Social Council and would earnestly ask this assembly to admit the People's Republic of Bulgaria to Unesco.

(71) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Poland.

(72) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): I already invoked the great principle of the universality of our Organization when I supported the admission of Rumania, which most unfortunately was rejected. And I wish now to reassert the same principle of universality, when I speak on the application of Bulgaria to join our Organization. In our opinion we should admit that country not only in accordance with that principle, but in order to enrich the spirit of Unesco in the field of the dissemination and development of culture. On the other hand, we should enable Bulgaria to develop still further its valuable cultural relations with other countries. Bulgaria has proved that it is worthy to become a member of an international organization the aim of which is to promote progress and the development of friendly cultural relations amongst all nations.
(73) Bulgaria, under its Constitution, guarantees to its citizens the right to education and culture and to active participation in the maintenance of the national culture. These rights are consistently observed. Bulgaria spends a considerable part of its national budget on Education, Culture and Public Health. It can boast of great achievements in the combating of illiteracy, in the raising of the cultural level of the masses, and in the promotion of art and science. Bulgaria cherishes its national culture and at the same time teaches its citizens respect for and understanding of the culture of other nations. Bulgaria develops too, to a great extent, friendly and peaceful cultural relations with other nations, relations which are of value to all of us.
(74) We should therefore oppose changing Unesco into an organization of countries with one and the same political system, or one and the same kind of government. It would be contrary to the principles

of peaceful and amicable co-existence between countries to disregard their political or economic systems. This great principle of coexistence is now prevailing in the minds of all humanity over ideas of cold war, political discrimination and political manoeuvre.
(75) For these reasons we are against the amendment of the United Kingdom, an amendment which in our opinion is harmful to our Organization and may cloud the atmosphere in which we are starting our work. The Polish delegation therefore supports the admission of Bulgaria and asks this Conference to reject the United Kingdom's amendment.

(76) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the United States of America.

(77) Mr. NUFER (United States of America): In the view of the delegation of the United States of America, Bulgaria is not qualified for membership of Unesco. Bulgaria has a well-known record of constant violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms and disregard of its international obligations. The record of its Government speaks for itself. It, too, ignores its obligations under a Treaty it has signed to respect rights and fundamental freedoms. It, too, ignores the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. It, too, stands condemned by the United Nations for wilful violation of its Treaty obligations. In addition, the United Nations' Committee of Experts on Forced Labour, in its recent report, pointed to the widespread practice of forced labour in Bulgaria. Bulgaria claims that forced labour is necessary for purposes of "re-education". I submit that re-education through forced labour is not the kind of education contemplated by the authors of the Unesco Constitution as a contribution to world peace and freedom, nor does it fit into Unesco's unremitting pursuit of objective truth. In our opinion, a Government that callously and wilfully contests human rights and fundamental freedoms and ignores its international obligations, should not be admitted to Unesco. These are not political considerations, but considerations and facts of paramount concern to Unesco. The record of Bulgaria has demonstrated incapacity to comply with the obligations of Unesco. Nevertheless, the delegation of the United States of America supports the proposal of the United Kingdom to adjourn consideration of the application of Bulgaria to membership of Unesco.

(78) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Czechoslovakia.

(79) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) (Translation from the French): The last speech by the United States delegate makes it clear beyond any shadow of doubt, I think, what the issue here is. We are faced with a situation, with tendencies which, in the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, threaten both the atmosphere of this Conference and the future work of Unesco. A State or, rather, a group of States, is trying to exclude from this Organization - whose universal character most of the speakers have emphasized - certain other States on the grounds that they have an economic and social system which differs from their own. It is clear from the voting and from the speeches we have listened to that the so-called Human Rights are merely a pretext, for on what are the accusations against the People's Republic of Rumania and the People's Republic of Bulgaria based? On a few slanderous statements forming the political propaganda arsenal of the "cold war", which most of mankind condemns. A fact which becomes particularly striking when we see, posing here as judges the delegates of certain States whose record in this matter is anything but exemplary - States which are, on the contrary, notorious for their flagrant violations of those rights. In the face of this threat we are very sorry to see the delegates of the United Kingdom and of certain other countries succumbing to this slander-campaign and proposing compromises which - the delegates will, I hope, excuse me for saying so - represent not so much an effort to find a solution worthy of our Organization as the reflection of a bad conscience. These are the reasons why the Czechoslovak delegation is opposed to the solution recommended. We believe that it is a solution unworthy of Unesco, that it is seriously prejudicial to the atmosphere of this Conference, the attainment of its aims and to the very principles of our Constitution; and that it is calculated to introduce international tension into this Organization, which should strive for peaceful co-existence and co-operation between peoples, regardless of their economic and social structure.
(80) We therefore appeal to our esteemed colleagues to reject the United Kingdom proposal and to vote for the admission of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

(81) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If no one else wishes to speak, we shall now take a vote on the proposed amendment. In the view of the Chair the amendment under discussion, like that concerning Rumania on which a vote has just been taken, does not amount to rejection of the application for admission. On the contrary, it means that the matter will automatically be brought up at the next Conference, two years hence, without any fresh proposal being necessary. If there is no opposition, a roll-call vote will be taken.

(82) Mr. MONTAGNIER (Secretary of the Conference) took the vote by roll-call.

In favour: Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Italy, Japan, Korea, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Salvador, Spain, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Argentina, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, India, Indonesia, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, USSR, Yugoslavia.

Abstentions: Australia, Austria, Burma, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, Libya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Viet-Nam.

Absent: Afghanistan, Honduras, Israel, Luxembourg, Nepal, Peru, Saudi-Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Venezuela.

(83) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The result of the roll-call vote which has just been taken is as follows: 29 votes in favour, 11 against, with 16 abstentions, 10 absent. The United Kingdom proposal has therefore been approved.
(84) The next item on the agenda is the application by by the United Kingdom for the admission of certain territories and groups of territories as Associate Members of Unesco.
(85) Document 8C/7 and Article II of the Constitution of Unesco define the rights and duties of Associate Members. The Associate Members to be admitted on these terms would be: Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, Sarawak, North Borneo, Brunei, Singapore and the Federation of Malaya, as one group; and Jamaica, Trinidad, Grenada, Dominica and Barbados as another group.
(86) The General Conference has to decide whether these States are to be admitted as Associate Members. If there are no objections, I take the proposal to be approved and propose that the General Conference should acclaim these Associate Members which have just been admitted to Unesco. (Acclamations)
(87) I would be glad to give any of the delegates of the States which have just been admitted to Unesco as Associate Members an opportunity to speak, should they so wish. I call on Mr. Joseph of the Group of British Caribbean Territories.

(88) Mr. JOSEPH (British Caribbean Group): As I sat at the back of the hall and heard the discussion relating to the applications of Rumania and Bulgaria, I remained there in fear and trembling, for I realized that the fate of the application of my territories for associate membership hung in the balance; but your ready response to the application, presented by the United Kingdom delegation for the admission of the territories I have the honour to represent has inspired in me a desire to express, on behalf of the people of my country, our grateful thanks to this General Conference for admitting us, and to assure you that we are prepared to give every assistance possible in carrying out the high ideals for which Unesco stands.
(89) The territories I have the honour to represent lie in the Caribbean area stretching from the south of Florida to the north-east corner of Venezuela. The largest of them is Jamaica, with a population of a little over two millions, and from that territory my adviser, Mr. Houghton, Director of Education and Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, hails. The second largest territory is the one from which I come myself and is the most southerly of the Caribbean Territories, Trinidad. In all, we represent about four million people. We are a young people, anxious and willing to take our place in the scheme of things. These islands were discovered, a little under 500 years ago, by an illustrious son of Italy, who embarked on voyages sponsored by the Queen of Spain, and some of them were discovered in the name of that country. We have changed hands since then, several times, passing from Spanish to French, and most of us are now British, some still being French, some Dutch, some American. We are willing and anxious to give every assistance possible to Unesco in its labours, to help educate the peoples of the world, to improve world conditions, and to make the people a happier people.
(90) I would like here to express my thanks to the United Kingdom delegation for sponsoring us, and to you, the delegates of the various nations, for so readily supporting our application.
(91) In our territory free primary education is compulsory by law. We have secondary education, and a recently erected University College. We have the one and only Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, from which sons and daughters from many parts of the world come to us to increase their knowledge of agriculture. We cover a wide area, and we are confident that Unesco and its officials will find ample opportunity in our territory to practise the work for which this Organization was founded. I can say on behalf of my people that we are prepared to give all support to any measure, brought forward by any territory, which will assist in achieving the aim for which this institution stands.

(92) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the representative of the Gold Coast.

(93) Mr. ERZUAH (Gold Coast): It was with a deep sense of gratification that I heard that, on the motion of the United Kingdom, the Gold Coast had been accepted as an Associate Member of Unesco. I am proud to be my country's first delegate and to have the honour of expressing to this assembly the gratitude of my Government and the people of the Gold Coast on an occasion to which we have been keenly looking forward.
(94) The aims of Unesco, which we have shared since its inception, are well known and sincerely cherished by us, and I am grateful for this opportunity of saying how glad we are that we have been able both to contribute to and to receive from Unesco. The people of my country can be depended on to play their part to an ever-increasing extent in promoting the advancement of knowledge and mutual understanding for the cause of peace and the common welfare of mankind.
(95) The Gold Coast is not a large country and its population of about four and a half millions is chiefly concerned with agriculture and the natural products of the earth, but everywhere throughout the length and breadth of the land there is a burning zeal to increase and diffuse knowledge and thereby to create a fuller and richer community life. The whole system of formal education, which comprises the free primary schools and the middle schools, with a combined enrolment of half a million boys and girls, the commercial schools, the secondary grammar and technical schools, the teacher training colleges and, at the apex, the College of Technology, Arts and Science and the University College, is being expanded as fast as building capacity and the supply of teachers, both local and from abroad, permit. In this system equality of educational opportunity and insistence on the highest international standards of learning are paramount factors. The University College of the Gold Coast, which, like most of the secondary institutions and the College of Technology, Arts and Science, has complete academic independence, is a symbol of our determination to prepare our people for the responsibilities of independence.
(96) I should like to draw attention to the success

which our efforts in fundamental education have achieved. Already by this means close on fifty thousand people have obtained certificates of literacy in accordance with the recommendations of Unesco experts; also a strong nation-wide movement of community development has been launched for the promotion of all forms of betterment - in agriculture, health, communications, village improvement and the joy of living. The success of the Mass Education Teams throughout the country has lead to the provision of an extension service for the Departments of Government operating in rural areas, whereby the purposes of those departments can be the sooner achieved, whether they be improved methods of housing or agriculture or sanitation, better water supplies, roads, or any other of the many services provided for rural development by the Government. All this is already known to Unesco. In fact the fundamental education work of the Mass Education Teams has been included in Unesco's Associated Projects Scheme for the last three years.

(97) In the sphere of adult education, the needs of both urban and rural areas are being progressively met. We are proud of our national library system, which, I think, may claim to be one of the best in all Africa. The Extra-Mural Studies Department of the University College of the Gold Coast, through tutorial classes in liberal studies and also, in co-operation with the People's Educational Association, a national independent and voluntary body, through seminars and short courses in a wide range of subjects, provides opportunities for the spread of culture and learning throughout the country.

(98) Shortly before I left the Gold Coast to come here, an inaugural meeting was held of the National Commission, which will now become the co-ordinating body to direct the energies of the Gold Coast into the service of Unesco. I do not wish to take up too much of your time, but I should like to say - as an earnest of my country's determination to propagate Unesco's aims for the good of its people and of all other peoples - that the supporting bodies, which are for the most part independent of Government and which consist very largely of unofficial members, represent the diversified educational, scientific and cultural life of the country that the new Government of the Gold Coast is so keen to foster. We have supporting bodies for Social Sciences, Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, Arts and Letters, Museums, Monuments and Relics, and Natural Sciences, apart from those for Fundamental Education, formal education and libraries, which subjects I have already briefly touched upon. I do not wish to create an impression of complacency. We are far from complacent and are only too anxious to learn and to have the advice and aid of experts, but we can and shall co-operate to the full extent of our ability and, by so doing, I believe we may - in humble measure - be able to assist others not so fortunately placed as ourselves.

(99) On behalf of my country and people, I express to this assembly my sincere gratitude and I promise our full co-operation in the furtherance of the great ideals of Unesco.

(100) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Sierra Leone.

(101) Mr. BLYDEN (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I stand here filled with a sense of pride and satisfaction, of humility and gratitude, the first duly accredited representative of my Government and people to one of the principal international agencies of our times concerned with the educational, scientific and cultural advancement of mankind.

(102) As a student of history, and political history at that, particulary the history of dependent peoples in the modern world, I cannot but be deeply moved at finding myself in an assembly of world leaders on a basis of full-fledged equality with sovereign independent nations, excepting only as regards the privilege of the vote, a matter which we know, in the years ahead, will receive the desired corrective. Nevertheless, on behalf of the Government and people of Sierra Leone whom I represent, I deem it a great honour to be the one chosen to convey to you our most cordial thanks and felicitations at this meeting of the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco in the city of Montevideo. There is, in my judgment, honourable delegates and ladies and gentlemen, a threefold significance in this meeting.

(103) First, I personally, as a student of contemporary international relations, view it as more than a mere accident of history that this great nation of Uruguay, with its past and present history largely saturated with the literary ideas and influence of such illustrious names as those of Francisco Suarez, Francisco de Vitoria, Jean de Brie and others of the Spanish School of International Law and Jurisprudence, who first enunciated the idea of incorporating within the family of nations both sovereign and dependent peoples alike - that this great nation of Uruguay should be the nation to play host to a gathering of sovereign and non-sovereign peoples, close on four centuries after the theory was first enunciated.

(104) Secondly, it may not be known that the country known as Sierra Leone, lying 7 to 10 degrees north latitude, with a population of 2 million people, is the country of the African continent which enjoyed the earliest contact with the outside world. The records of antiquity, notably the Periplus of Hanno, afford us our earliest source of documentary reference regarding the country I here represent. We are told that about the year 500 B.C., under the direction of Hanno, the great Carthaginian, an expedition visited the coast of Africa on the Guinea Coast and reached the land which was later to be rediscovered by Pedro de Cintra in 1462, and named by him Sierra Leone or the "Lion Mountains". From that moment, by a paradox of human history, the current of history unleashed its rage upon a people whose only ineptitude and deficiency - if so it is - lie in their conservatism and over-developed sense of respect for law and order, in their strong affinity for causes not unrelated to the universal search for a world constitutional régime, in which all shall live in amicable coexistence - nations and peoples striving together in peace and freedom as brothers of the human race. And, if you will permit a diversion, I think our admittance to this august body without a single negative vote from any of the delegations (a fact for which I am grateful) is indeed indicative of the trend of the human mind and spirit, a sign that the world is moving towards a universal order in which nations shall not quarrel to prove which is the stronger.

Indeed, lest this equally significant fact go unrecorded, let me again remind you that Sierra Leone, having served as one of the principal stampeding grounds for the nefarious traffic in slaves, was later, under the aegis of Great Britain, to become the rehabilitation centre for those of our ancestors to whom the famous Mansfield Decision of 1772 and the indefatigable efforts of 18th Century abolitionists in England were to bring liberation and ultimate emancipation. Thus, Sierra Leone became the experimental station, as it were, in which the principle which has now become an accepted doctrine of international relations, namely, the doctrine of Trusteeship, enunciated by Edmund Burke, was to be practised. It is generally forgotten, too, that, fully 24 hours before the great Convention was to sit in Philadelphia on 10 May 1787, fully twenty-four months before the revolutionary cries of Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité were to be heard in the blood-strewn streets of Paris, Sierra Leone, conceived in the minds of its founders as "a free Negro State, a free Commonwealth", was already practising the art of self-government with a franchise enjoyed by all, "black and white alike, on the basis of full equality". The circumstances leading to our long-delayed entrance into formal membership of the family of nations are too well-known to bear recounting. And, even were it not so, it would ill become the representative of a people who make a boast of their loyalty to the cause of peace and harmony to indulge in recriminations over events which, measured by this grand event we are now witnessing, would appear but just another in the long series of human indiscretions and human follies. Let me invoke the authority of the ancient classicists who remind us throughout the years, "Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis"; and today I stand here the freely chosen representative of my Government and people to participate in the deliberations of this assembly.

(105) A last aspect of this historic meeting lies, I think, in the fact that the region of the African Continent which is here represented by the Gold Coast and Sierra Leone (the region loosely described as West Africa) is what may be termed, in my judgment, a veritable United Nations in miniature. Here in West Africa is to be found every known type of political organization in the modern world, and for all of which I am happy to note there is ample provision in the Charter of the United Nations, with more and better provisions to come, we hope.

(106) First, there is the sovereign Republic of Liberia, which has wrestled with the wind for upwards of a century and more and is one of the original signatories of the Charter. Then there are the Trust Territories of Togoland and the Cameroons, provided for in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Charter, and lastly, there are the traditional political subdivisions of Colonies and Protectorates, one of which I represent, whose interests are safeguarded by the provisions of Chapter 11 of the Charter - the Declaration regarding non-self-governing peoples. Finally, this region is also that particular segment of the Atlantic coast which, in better and more harmonious days, when the champions of democracy stood together during World War II - the USSR, the United States of America, Great Britain, their European and Commonwealth allies - this is the region which these allies in the cause of democracy were so eager to defend against the onslaught of the enemy, recognizing as they did the rôle of West Africa as one of the physical and natural bastions of the twentieth-century democratic world.

(107) Speaking therefore, on behalf of my Government and people, let me say, now that we have been made fully accredited Associate Members of Unesco, that we shall construe our rôle in this Organization to be, not one of mere observers or silent partners, but of participants, dynamic actors in the great drama of helping to eradicate, not only from backward and undeveloped territories but even from some of the more advanced nations, those proverbial ills of illiteracy, disease, poverty, inequalities of various kinds, and, finally, enslavement of the mind and body which have plagued mankind throughout the ages. We shall, wherever possible, make available to Unesco our special African talents and skills in the employment of tools and techniques which, in our own social and cultural backgrounds, have been proven useful and effective in the harmonization of local conflicts between tribes, as well as in the furtherance of the principles of mediation, conciliation and arbitration for which the United Nations stand. Let us look forward to the day when the mind of man shall no longer be shackled and we shall live, in the language of the great Indian Nobel prize winner, Rabindranath Tagore, in an atmosphere "where the mind of man is without fear, and knowledge is free, and men are no longer divided by narrow domestic walls". If we succeed in bringing to the world community, from the once Dark Continent of Africa, our own peculiar share of insight and experience into the work of this great Organization, you will have yourselves to thank and to congratulate, ladies and gentlemen of this assembly, for having participated in one of the noblest gestures of the international community.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

# FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

*13 November 1954 at 3.45 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Speech by the delegate of the Malaya-British Borneo Group 57
Admission of observers from international non-governmental organizations . . . . . 57
Submission by the Chairman of the Executive Board of the Report by the Director-General . . . . . 58
Speech by the Director-General . . . . . 59
General discussion of the Report by the Director-General: Speeches by the delegates of Greece, Sweden, Iran and Haiti 62

**SPEECH BY THE DELEGATE OF THE MALAYA-BRITISH BORNEO GROUP**

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the Federation of Malaya.

(2) DATO NIK AHMAD KAMIL (Malaya-British Borneo Group): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the General Conference of Unesco assembled at this session has done great honour to the Government and people of the territories of Sarawak, North Borneo, Brunei, Singapore and the Federation of Malaya, known as the Malaya-British Borneo Group, by admitting them as a group to Associate Membership of this great Organization. It is my pleasure and privilege today to express on their behalf their deep sense of gratitude and sincere appreciation of the consideration you have shown.

(3) May I also avail myself of this opportunity of saying how grateful we are to Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for sponsoring our admission as a group Associate Member. By our admission to the Organization and in assuming the privileges and obligations of Associate Membership, we are proudly conscious of the fact that we are now privileged to participate within such limits as are set by the General Conference in the deliberations of this Conference and to take an active part from time to time in the monumental task of the Organization. If we are permitted to devote our efforts and energies in some small measure to realization of the noble aims and objectives of Unesco then I can assure you that the people and governments of the territories of the group can be relied on to play their modest part and to give of their best.

(4) The territories comprised in the group are situated at the heart, as it were, of South East Asia, a region which is playing a bigger part than ever before in the promotion of peace and goodwill amongst the nations of the world. Political progress is being accelerated in our territories, but the happiness and welfare of the people are not to be measured in terms of political maturity alone. Side by side with this progress, we must also hasten the advancement of knowledge and understanding. The hearts and minds of the masses must be attuned to a fuller and better realization and acceptance of the obligations that go with wisdom, knowledge and truth.

(5) We have in the last few years set our hand to a vast programme of social reforms, and we must maintain that programme to the best of our abilities. But there is much more that we want to do. I should be failing in my duty if I did not here and now acknowledge with gratitude the benefits and assistance we have had in the past from Unesco through the good offices of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. I feel confident that we can continue to look to Unesco for further aid to enable us to continue our work. We are planting for the future, and not for ourselves. We may be impatient at times, but future generations will not bless us if we plant without due care. We must plant deep and firm. I take my seat as the accredited representative of the Group, with the firm conviction that, through Unesco, the people of our territory will be sharing fully in the common cultural heritage of mankind.

**ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS FROM INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

(6) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We will now consider item 12 of the agenda. I call upon the Chairman of the Executive Board.

(7) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board): The recommendations of the Executive Board on this matter are set out in documents 8C/2 and

8C/2 Add. In application of Article IV, paragraph 13, of the Constitution, and Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure, the Executive Board recommends that the Conference admit as observers at the present session representatives of the following non-governmental organizations. This, of course, is in addition to the 105 organizations which have consultative status with us and which automatically have the right to be represented. The first group consists of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation. The activities of these three organizations are international in scope and they have attended a number of our previous conferences as observers.

(8) Next is the Union of the Latin American Universities, and we consider that that organization has a special interest for us as we are meeting in Latin America. Finally, there are the International Association of Plastic Arts, the Universal Esperanto Association, l'Académie Internationale de la Céramique, the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth. These last four organizations have applied to be admitted to consultative arrangements, and their applications will be considered by the Conference later. Meanwhile the Board recommends that they be allowed to be represented by observers, in order that they can state their case when it comes up, if they are invited to do so.

(9) On behalf of the Executive Board, I recommend the admission of observers from the nine organizations I have mentioned.

(10) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If there is no objection to the proposal made, on behalf of the Board, by its Chairman, it will be considered to be approved.

(11) Approved.

**SUBMISSION BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

(12) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We now come to item 13 and I call again upon the Chairman of the Board.

(13) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board): In accordance with the Constitution, it is my duty to present to you today, on behalf of the Executive Board, the report of the Director-General and the Executive Board on the activities of the Organization during the year 1953 (document 8C/3) and the supplementary report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization from 1 January to 30 June 1954 (document 8C/3 Add.). In the case of the 1953 report, the first report communicated to Member States under the amended text of Article V (9) of the Constitution, which we adopted at our last session, we have included in the printed document, for the first time, the comments of the Board (pp. 7 and 8 in the English text) and the Board's report on its own activities, which you will find on pp. 25 and 26.

(14) As you can read it yourselves, I will only call your attention to certain points of the Report. The Board has pointed out that Article V (9), which asks the Director-General to present the report for 1953, for instance, in the year 1953, is quite impossible to carry out. With the best will in the world, the earliest date by which we could get the 1953 Report published was May 1954, and the Director-General has put a proposal in front of you for an amendment to dispose of this difficulty.

(15) When examining the Report, the Board suggested that in the future there should be an introduction highlighting the major events of the year or illustrating the carrying into effect of one or more major themes. The Reports of the Director-General are an account of the Organization's work, and are essential for the archives, but we felt that a short beginning to that Report highlighting things would be very valuable to members who are talking about Unesco in their own countries or to the Press. There were also suggestions that a conclusion be added about the work which has been accomplished, an assessment of the importance of the results and a statement of what remained to be done. That, I think, requires more consideration, for we do not want to add to the length of the reports if we can possibly help it. The Board also reports with satisfaction the visits the Director-General has paid to Member States. The Board felt it was most important for the Director-General, as soon as possible, to see Member States and where the work is really being carried on.

(16) During 1953, the Board was obliged to hold four sessions. Two were almost entirely taken up with the election of a new Director-General. One session was held, as usual, during the extraordinary session of the Conference which elected the Director-General. There was a meeting at the end of the year called for in order to take account of changes necessitated in the next year's programme, and to make the budgetary transfers which are always necessary at the end of the year.

(17) Early in the year, the Board made a study of the matters before it, hoping that we might be able to leave a number of items to the Director-General, and lessen the very heavy load of our administrative programme. With the help of the Legal Adviser, we studied this and we found, with one or two very minor exceptions, that everything we were doing was ordered either by the Constitution or by the Rules of Procedure or by resolutions of General Conferences, and that we could not legitimately reduce any of that load of work.

(18) The most interesting innovation of the year, which we owe to Dr. Veronese of Italy, a member of the Board, and for which we have been grateful ever since, was the suggestion that we should have informal meetings without an agenda or numerous working papers and, if possible, away from Unesco House. The first of these was held at Gif-sur-Yvette on 26, 27 and 28 November on a general appreciation of the Organization's position in the world today, and it was the starting point of the paper you have in front of you, or will have, on Remodelling the Future Programme .

(19) We felt that there were a number of other subjects we should like to discuss at length - methods of work, National Commissions and other matters - and we hope that it will be the practice of the Board in future years to take two or three days in which they can get down, with the minimum of documentary

material, to the discussion of the principles or work of Unesco.

(20) I will turn now to the second report. It has been quite impossible within the time available for the Executive Board to print anything on this report. It came up for our consideration just before the present session and I will only bring out one or two points that struck us in reading it. We particularly noticed the lack of concordance between the report of Unesco and the Reports of Member States, although one would have thought that the report of Unesco, which relates what is going on in most of our Member States, might find some echo in the reports of those Member States, which probably are in a much better position to assess the results of their own points of view than any one else. It has also been suggested that these reports might usefully contain an account of the implementation of the Conventions that Unesco has drawn up, this, partly for information and partly to stimulate signature by States that have not signed them.

(21) A further suggestion, which we did not have time to go into in detail, was that there should be some attempt at co-ordination between the various parts; the introduction to the chapters of the programme, the Report by the Director-General and the Reports by Member States. This is a difficult question and would have to be considered at some length. We all, I know, want to save paper, members of the Board before all others.

(22) An interesting point on technical assistance was raised, although it is a matter for the Technical Assistance Board and not for Unesco. You will see in the report on Technical Assistance that experts are to advise States, at their request, on subjects such as science teaching. Now their reports are confidential, coming direct from the expert who is serving the Member State; yet those reports would be of great value to other Member States and to other experts. It is not an easy question and it is not for Unesco to solve it but I know that the Director-General is considering approaching the Technical Board on the matter.

(23) I turn now to the Board's own work during 1954. It held three sessions. The first (No. 37), a long one, met in Paris from 10 March to 9 April. It was necessarily long because the Director-General, who is now responsible under the Constitution for both programme and budget, wanted our advice and we had to go through the programme in detail, and the Director-General in his final programme accepted a number of our suggestions. I believe that that was a very important meeting. We also had to prepare the comments on the report for 1953 which I mentioned.

(24) Our second session met in Venice from 14 to 28 July. The Board expressed both in writing and orally in Venice its gratitude to the Italian Government, the city of Venice and Dr. Veronese, but I should like to do so publicly here. We worked longer hours and got through more work even than in Paris, partly due to the delightful monastery on the Isle San Giorgio, which we were allowed to use by courtesy of the Foundation, and we have a great deal for which to thank Dr. Veronese and our old friend Mr. Branca, the Director of the Institute. We had opportunities to see something of Venice, mostly in the evenings and also of attending the Biennale and the Film Festival, which I believe was valuable to all of us. The Board continued its work in private meetings and studied the problem of the remodelling of the programme, afterwards turned over to a committee, and problems of decentralization and National Commissions, which we had not time to finish. I hope, before this Board disappears, we may have a chance of finishing that subject.

(25) Finally, I should like to report briefly on new journeys that I made in company with the Director-General and another member of the Board, one in Asia, and another, before this meeting, in some of the countries of Latin America. I am very grateful to the Director-General for his invitation, and to the Board for making it possible for me to go. On the visit to Asia, Professor Oscar Secco Ellauri, the member of the Board who comes from Uruguay, and on the second journey Mr. Sharif from Pakistan accompanied me and Dr. Luther Evans. The value of those journeys - to see in the field the actual work of Unesco, to attend the meetings of National Commissions, which we normally only read about, and to hear direct from Member States what they want from Unesco - was inestimable. We saw amongst other things the very interesting Latin American centre for Fundamental Education at Patzcuaro, the school project in a province of Thailand, the Japanese National Commission at work and a great many other things, and I should like to say how grateful we are to the governments - I speak now for the Board members and myself - for their hospitality and kindness to us. Lastly, I should like to thank the Government of Brazil and Professor de Berredo Carneiro for two delightful days we spent in Rio on our way here, days which I think were valuable in allowing Board members coming from Asia and other countries to see another Latin American State.

**SPEECH BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

(26) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Director-General.

(27) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President and honourable delegates, I wish to make a few brief remarks supplementing the lengthy account you will find in these two documents.

(28) First let me join you in thanking the Vice-President of India for his fine work as President at the last two Conferences and at the beginning of this one. It was he who administered to me the Oath of Office and signed with me my contract of employment, so that I shall continue to think of him in a way as your agent in giving me employment. I wish certainly to express my thanks to the Executive Board, which has worked with me in a wonderful spirit in the period since July of last year, and to the Chairman and those members of the Board who have journeyed with me on some of my visits to Member States. Their counsel to me in the course of our travels was indeed helpful and had a great deal to do with my thinking about the future programme of the Organization, including the proposals now before the Conference.

(29) I should like of course to take this opportunity also to thank the Government of Uruguay for all it has

done to make this Conference the success which I am sure it is going to be. I came here a little over a year ago to talk to the Government about arrangements for the Conference and I found the officers of the Government, and also of the city of Montevideo, most co-operative and helpful. I wish also to thank all the Member States, more than 30 of them, who were so kind to me on the occasion of my visits, and I thank all the other people and organizations who have co-operated so wonderfully with the Secretariat during the past sixteen months.

(30) The most important thing that I have tried to do in these sixteen months has been to increase the existing confidence in the Organization among all of the parties with whom it deals. I have wanted to increase the confidence of Member States in the Organization, to increase the confidence of the members of the United Nations family in the Organization, to increase the confidence of other intergovernmental organizations in us and in our work, and also to improve the relations of confidence that exist between us and the non-governmental organizations.

(31) In my travels and in the contacts I have had with representatives of governments who have visited me in Paris, or who are themselves in Paris, I have tried to speak frankly; I have solicited views on the welfare of the Organization and I have expressed my own views so that we might have a free and full exchange. The most important thing for the future of Unesco seems to me to be the attitude which our Member Governments, the international organizations, the non-governmental organizations and the peoples of the Member States take towards it. I felt that it was for the Secretariat to take the initiative in changing those attitudes where they were not favourable, and to discover the true views of all these partners of ours in the work in which we are engaged. My travels have taken me away from the office a good deal and I have sometimes been worried by the problem of how exactly I should apportion my time. The balance, I believe, will be about right if the Conference should choose to approve the budgetary implications involved in my having two Assistant Directors-General.

(32) One great effort of the year has been to give the programme now in course of execution and the draft programme for 1955-56 something of a new orientation. That orientation seemed, both to me and to the Board, to be necessary in order to make our programme correspond more precisely with the views of Member Governments. I think it is impossible for the views of Member Governments to be adequately expressed solely at a General Conference, for the procedural reason that, once the draft programme is prepared, you cannot change it as much as many of you would like to: there is simply not the time to think out new proposals and for the governments represented here to adjust their own thinking to the new ideas. The Secretariat and the Board have inevitably to face the Conference with something of a fait accompli. That is not altogether desirable, and I believe that there should be more consultation with Member States in the formative stage of the programme. That is one of the outstanding lessons I have learnt in the past sixteen months. I shall not discuss the programme at this time, but I wish to emphasize that its tendency to give more practical aid, establish more practical projects in Member States, is something which I regard as being in accord with the wishes of the governments and the peoples whom you represent. In this work I have relied heavily upon the views of the Executive Board, and the redrafted programme which is before you is based in considerable measure on the conclusions the Board arrived at in its session of last March/April.

(33) The Secretariat has made certain adjustments within the present programme in the light of this new trend. The Board has been glad to approve such transfers as required its approval. In connexion with the reorganization of the programme, the Board has asked me to call attention to one slight misuse of terminology in our Report for 1953, in which we referred to the "decentralizing" of the programme. That word is not very well chosen, but what we meant by it was not regionalization, but rather spending more of our money on practical projects in individual Member States and in groups of Member States which are co-operating in some kind of a common project. I have already referred to the fact that one of the corner-stones of our policies this year has been an effort to be frank with Member Governments; another has been our effort to be as responsive as possible to the wishes and needs of Member States. I have been able to clear up many misunderstandings, to improve many of our procedural routines, for Member States have been frank with me in telling me of things which appear to me to be wrong or not quite as well as they might be. We are trying also to devise better means of executing our work plans, to use our travel money to the best advantage, including the use of staff on home leave to do work for the Organization en route. We are trying hard to integrate the ideas of Member States at all stages in the programme development and in the execution of the work plans of the Organization. I can report with pride that in our co-operation with the United Nations and the United Nations family of organizations, and in our relations with other intergovernmental organizations, particularly the Organization of American States, and with the Council of Europe, and also in informal conversations with the Arab League, we have arrived in a number of instances at a better understanding and more fruitful measures of co-operation. I recently signed, and the Board has approved, a new agreement with the Organization of American States concerning Patzcuaro, the Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America. I have recently signed an informal understanding with the Director of the International Labour Organization concerning a problem of technical education that has plagued the two Organizations for years. I believe that the spirit of co-operation is bearing good fruit for us and, I hope, for the other organizations, and I must report to you that I found a wonderful spirit of co-operation in every one of them without exception.

(34) I should like to report also that, in my opinion, the non-governmental organizations are a tremendous source of support for the work of Unesco. I have had very frank and friendly meetings with groups of representatives of non-governmental organizations. I have discussed the project for the draft programme at various stages with them and I found them immensely co-operative. They do not use these opportunities to exert pressure on the Secretariat for individual

and specialized interests, they use them as genuine opportunities to help the Organization think out its programme, think out its problems of improving its programme and of getting that programme understood.

(35) Another important objective of the past year, in the pursuit of which I am glad to report considerable progress, is the development of the group spirit - a spirit of unity and co-ordination within the Secretariat itself. Certain controversies between myself and the Staff Association of the Organization may have obscured the fact that very fine and fruitful developments are going forward in two important particulars. One of these is what I would call the democratic management of the Secretariat with its many meetings of Department Directors and Chiefs of Services and Bureaux, to discuss the common problems facing the Organization. These discussions include administrative matters, questions of diplomacy, problems of the programme, questions of relations with National Commissions and so forth. I have found the Directors and Chiefs eager to expand and develop this method of running the Secretariat. I do not mean that we have developed a system by which the Director-General gets rid of his responsibilities, I mean that in the exercise of his responsibilities the Director-General is getting advice from his colleagues, and cases are fewer in which the Director-General has to take a decision that does not reflect the feeling of his colleagues. The second aspect is the development of good relations with the Staff Association, and I can report progress in that regard also, although, as I say, that progress is somewhat obscured by controversy over matters which have attracted a good deal of public interest.

(36) This leads me to a discussion of one other problem before I close this speech, the problem of the staff, the Staff Regulations and the relations of the Organization with persons of American nationality. I wish to explain this to you quite candidly, because there is much too much misunderstanding of the facts. The facts, briefly stated, are these: Unesco's Executive Board in 1947 adopted a resolution to the effect that the Director-General should not appoint members of the international staff without previously securing the views of the applicant's Member Government. There have been a few, but only a few, instances in which the Director-General has not carried out this mandate of the Executive Board. In implementation of this mandate the Organization agreed in 1953 to consider reports from the United States Government concerning present employees and new applicants for positions. The question was debated at the extraordinary session of the General Conference and the Conference took no exception to the arrangements made. Unesco has lived up to its side of these arrangements and what the United States Government has done is in full accord with them. Before I received reports on certain individuals who are present employees, I found that these employees did not enjoy my full confidence because they had refused to co-operate with the United States Government in the execution of the arrangements which Unesco had made with that Government. And the reasons they gave me in writing for not doing so were not deemed by me to be adequate and convincing. That posed the problem for me as to what I should do in regard to these individuals. I found that I had the power, under the Staff Regulations, to refuse to renew contracts when they expired, without giving any reason whatsoever. I therefore announced to these staff members (four of them, whose contracts are due to expire soon) that I did not have confidence in them of the sort that is required by the Constitution of the Organization and the Staff Regulations for renewal of contracts, and hence that I did not intend to renew their individual contracts. This notice was given at the same time that notice was given to other staff members that their contracts would be renewed. In other words, the notice was a matter of routine. I did not have to give any reason at all. However, I do not think that the Director-General ought to exercise that power, but should give reasons why he does not renew a contract, and I, personally, shall always be willing to do so. The four cases were referred to the Appeals Board of Unesco, which has no power to give a final decision in these matters, but only an advisory opinion, and the Appeals Board, I have been notified in the last few days, has advised that the reasons which I gave, being subject to scrutiny when actually given, were inadequate. I have not yet dealt with that opinion because I have not yet had the time to read it. There are three other persons in the same category as these four, except that they have indeterminate contracts; that means that they are permanent employees of the Organization. The question then arises: is the reason "loss of confidence in integrity" a sufficient ground for dismissal? I have decided that it is not. Under the Staff Regulations, the relevant power would be the power to find the individuals guilty of misconduct or, rather, of unsatisfactory conduct, which in the United Nations is interpreted (the same terms being used as are in the Regulations) as not including unsatisfactory service, but only misconduct. Unsatisfactory service is another concept irrelevant to the facts of this situation, for all these people have given satisfactory service, that is, the work they do is said by their supervisors to be satisfactory or better than satisfactory.

(37) Now here is where I come into conflict with the United States of America. The United States of America interprets the Staff Regulations to mean that I do have the power in the given circumstances to dismiss the three persons. This is a question of law, a question of interpretation of the Staff Regulations. I myself think that there is a case to be made out for the United States' position, and I hope this Conference will carefully consider the merits of these two points of view in a spirit of amity, and will recognize the fact that on both sides we are trying to be reasonable and we are trying to do what is right. I have had many discussions with the United States Government on this question and I am sure that the issue is simply one of what powers the Director-General has. In case of doubt, doubt in my own mind as to my powers in dealing with staff members, I would much rather decide the matter in favour of the staff member, because, unless we can create a feeling of confidence that the Director-General is not going to act illegally and is not going to act in a way that is legally questionable, it will be impossible to develop the kind of spirit, the kind of loyalty, the kind of international civil service concept which I

think must be one of our first duties to develop.
(38) I have taken the time to state this problem because I have talked to a number of delegations and I find that they have become confused regarding it. I have proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations which will go before the Administrative Commission and serve either to clarify the legal situation, or to change it if it is found that I have no power to act in cases when I have lost confidence in an employee's integrity. My proposal to amend the Staff Regulations was not conceived for the purpose of dealing with the American cases. I was of opinion before these cases arose that the Staff Regulations needed amendment and I should be in favour of the amendment even if these cases did not exist. I have proposed this and other amendments, which are contained in two papers before you, in order to bring our Staff Regulations into line with those of the United Nations and, if you should approve these amendments, they would be in line with the Staff Regulations of the United Nations except in one or two particulars that are a special problem of our own and are unrelated to the problem of the United States personnel.
(39) I refer now to the last question that I am going to mention, the problem of geographical distribution. I mention that subject although I do not wish to go into it at this time. In this case I do recommend action which is not in accord with the United Nations Regulations.
(40) I am making this report to you with a perfectly clear conscience. I have no scruples of conscience about anything I have done in regard to our employees. There has been no pressure from a Member State, nor have I taken any action for political reasons. I have acted solely on the basis of an unclouded view of what the Regulations provide and of what under the Regulations is in the interest of the Organization.
(41) One last word. The Report is planned on lines which I would propose, generally, to follow in the future. Hence I would welcome the comments of delegations on the plan of the Report. I shall try to carry out in future Reports the recommendations that Sir Ronald has reported on behalf of the Executive Board.
(42) In concluding, I wish to offer thanks to my staff. They have worked with me in the past year in a wonderful spirit of harmony and co-operation. The work recorded here is mostly their work rather than my own. I should also like to say that the Secretariat from top to bottom is here at this Conference to give you honest answers to your questions, to take no part in political combinations, in lobbying, or in efforts to thwart your wishes. If you find any of them doing that, I shall consider that they not only have lacked integrity, but that they have been guilty of misconduct.

**GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

(43) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Professor Photiades, the delegate of Greece.

(44) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, as we pay our tribute to the memory of José Artigas, we are glad to see for ourselves, in this place, that the wishes of the illustrious founder of Uruguay, who recommended to his compatriots "the union of great courage with intellectual progress", are being fulfilled in enterprises as noble as they are successful. The kind invitation we have received has more than earned the greetings which it is my pleasant and my bounden duty to convey, on behalf of my country and my delegation, to the Government and the people of Uruguay.
(45) The choice of Montevideo as the headquarters of the Science Co-operation Office for the Western Hemisphere, the generous part this fine capital has played, among other things, in the advancement of primary education; and the fact that we are meeting in this Parliament building to strengthen the intellectual bonds uniting our company - all these are tokens of a whole-hearted co-operated which quickens our sense of gratitude. What an advance this eighth session of the Conference marks over previous years! I remember the efforts we all made at Mexico City in 1947 on behalf of the Spanish language, without which, we said, there could be no true intellectual co-operation, and the progress we have made in this matter gives us hope of wider understanding at this eighth session of our General Conference.
(46) Commonsense, that estimable quality which so strongly marks the views expressed by our Latin American colleagues, will be a constant guide to all of us who are slowly but surely rising above purely political controversies and are advancing steadily towards a deeper universal understanding of the real interests of man and his society. Tolerance should surely encourage us to consider the opinions of others without prejudice or bias, for to do so is surely to obey the essential principles of the Constitution. May the progress already achieved be thus continued and consolidated. There are good auguries that the delegations we are welcoming in our midst on this occasion for the first time are inspired by the same desire for sincere co-operation and the same readiness for mutual understanding.
(47) Speaking now to you, Dr. Evans, my old colleague and friend, whose efforts I have followed during your travels, I wish to thank you and congratulate you, together with your colleagues and all the members of the Executive Board - and first and foremost its Chairman, Sir Ronald Adam - for preparing the new two-year programme, for the way it is set out, for its clarity, and for the co-ordination it betokens of Unesco's efforts with those of the sister organizations in the United Nations family. These achievements have certainly given us a clearer picture of the aims we are pursuing together. But we feel, none the less, that further efforts must be made to follow up those which were first made in Florence.
(48) We are particularly pleased with the idea of more liberal assistance to students, and with the decision to include education for living in a world community among the main fields of activity of our Organization. We hope that the report on education for living in a world community will be studied by the Programme Commission with all the attention it deserves. At three sessions of the General Conference, we have pleaded for young people and we are particularly pleased therefore to note that, barely a week

ago, the head of the Government of the French Republic, speaking at Lille, referred to eminently wise measures for the assistance of these young people, who have been so ill served for nearly 40 years past. We believe that, in this part of the programme, we are complying with ideas which have been expressed at many conferences, ideas which were voiced by Mr. Attlee and by representatives of the 200 universities which took part in the celebration of the fifth centenary of Glasgow University in 1951, and were referred to by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother, at Columbia University, during the ceremonies this year in commemoration of its second centenary. We are convinced that we are thus helping to build defences of peace in the minds and hearts of the young.

(49) We shall give the fullest support to the development of fundamental education. We have seen for ourselves in Egypt how great has been the encouragement in this field provided by our previous General Conferences.

(50) The development of research in the natural sciences, the establishment of science co-operation offices in Asia, and the work planned in connexion with the applied social sciences, foreshadow a time of hope which should give us extensive opportunities for subsequent development. We trust that the International Council of Scientific Unions, which is one of the mainstays of Unesco, will be allotted a larger share of the budget. Again, my country is very well satisfied with the work of the Department of Cultural Activities, which has given us such an impressive outline of what it intends to do; but we would also like another of the mainstays of the Organization - the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - to receive yet more assistance. The activities of this Department and the steps it has taken, particularly this year, for promoting the use of museums for educational purposes, will be of increasing interest to our compatriots. While, in the cultural field, in the broadest sense of the term, it is still difficult to achieve agreement on certain matters bilaterally, the procedure that we follow, and which we consider to be the best, will naturally be to seek understanding on a multilateral basis in order to safeguard those cultural freedoms which after the passage of centuries still illumine a civilization which succeeding ages have recognized as having been the first.

(51) Finally, I believe that some of the meetings in which we were kindly invited to take part by the Chairman of the Executive Board have produced good practical results. I have in mind the experimental study of the preparation and execution of the programme with special reference to the use of the time of Unesco officials. Even if, statistically speaking, this experiment produces only approximate results, we shall be more than satisfied. Expenditure can in fact be justified to the man in the street by showing the time spent on particular activities meeting the real and varied needs of our Member States. Moreover, the allocation of Unesco's benefits cannot be made contingent upon the contributions of the individual Members but should be determined by the fundamental needs of the great company we constitute in educational, scientific and cultural matters.

(52) Our goal is the attainment of peace by a more effective union among our Member States based upon the spirit of good, the spirit of which Dr. Radhakrishnan spoke to us in the inspiring address he gave at the opening of this Conference. We would thank him once again for watching over Unesco so untiringly - as untiringly as that other great labourer of our early days whose loss has affected us so deeply, the first Chairman of our Executive Board, that great Canadian Victor Doré.

(53) We are glad to find that, after the concentration of the programme which was begun in Florence in 1950, more practical methods are enabling us, for the future, to determine more accurately the level of the budget which the two responsible organs - the Executive Board and the Secretariat - anticipate will be necessary. It is to be hoped that confidence of our respective peoples in Unesco will assert itself in future by its being made possible for the results of the Organization's activities to be appreciated by the humblest of our citizens as well as by our press and information services.

(54) May the immediate future fulfil the hopes we cherished in 1942 at the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, and may our 72 Member States be able to celebrate the tenth birthday of this Organization with enthusiasm, and with good grounds for satisfaction. May we at this time keep in our hearts the spirit and the hopes which inspired our General Conference in London in 1945, and also be comforted by the realization that we are now nearer the goal we set ourselves on behalf of our peoples.

(55) It is our hope that this Amphictyony - this Conference - may lead us all towards a Peace more worthy of us, a Peace for civilized men and women.

(56) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Sweden.

(57) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, may I begin by conveying the cordial greetings of my country to the Government and people of Uruguay, who have given us such a friendly welcome, and by saying how delighted we are that this session of the General Conference is taking place in this beautiful city by the sea.

(58) The Swedish Government has followed the progress of Unesco over the past years with some concern. The Report, submitted jointly for the first time this year by the Director-General and the Exetive Board, shows, however, that the Organization has gone steadily forward and that very useful work has been done. The programme outlined in the budget document for 1955-56 is, in general, a good programme, based on sound principles. As regards its general trend, we are pleased to see that some of the desires previously expressed have now been carried out. It would perhaps not be true to say that it is, in substance, a new programme, since more than 90 per cent of the projects are already familiar to us, but its presentation is new and, in this respect, very considerable progress has certainly been made.

(59) The programme has been divided into a programme of general, continuing activities and a special programme

of projects which are to be limited in duration. In general, we approve the principles on which the division has been made, but we think that a number of questions still need further consideration before a fair and perfectly satisfactory balance can be achieved between the two divisions. There seems to be some danger that the division into two parts may lead to a reduction in the established service activities of the Organization. In the introduction to the programme, which is based on the report of the Executive Board on the remodelling of the future programme, we think we discern a tendency to undervalue Unesco's activities in connexion with international co-operation, which are, so to speak, the foundation of the whole building.

(60) While the international organizations of specialists in various fields have increased in numbers, partly as a result of Unesco's own work, and, at the same time, have come to take a more and more important part in the Organization's activities, the appropriations for these organizations in the present proposed programme and budget seem somewhat parsimonious. One matter calling for immediate attention, for instance, is the fact that the subvention to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, an organization which is really extremely important to Unesco, has been cut to a third of the amount that the Confederation is at present receiving.

(61) It must be made clear that aid to international scientific co-operation, which is the main feature of the general programme, is one of the fundamental conditions for enabling Unesco to carry out the programme of special activities. That aid therefore cannot be reduced without harm to Unesco itself. It may be true that this part of Unesco's programme is chiefly of interest, for the moment, to a comparatively small group of Member States, but we must not forget that today the development of science and technology is going forward at an increasing rate throughout the world and that therefore co-operation among scientific organizations will, in the long run, be extremely important even to the Member States which are now more interested in Unesco's special activities. Moreover, the number of Member States is growing, with a consequent extension of the opportunities for joint action. Even though some arguments can be advanced for stabilizing aid to international organizations at the level of the present budget, it will be necessary, in the long run, to reckon on quite considerable increases in the appropriations even in this part of the budget. It is therefore necessary that at the next session of the General Conference, at latest, there should be a discussion of the principles governing subventions to international non-governmental organizations.

(62) Owing to the admission of new Member States, we are now in the happy position of being able, without increasing the present annual contributions of the other Member States, to command resources approximately twenty per cent larger than in the current two-year period. There are very cogent reasons for accepting the higher budgetary level proposed by the Director-General. The rise in the number of Member States is extending Unesco's field of activity very materially and entails greater expenditure. As things are, it seems reasonable that Unesco should gradually adopt the United Nations practice with regard to working languages. This, too, implies increasing costs. But the main reason is that the more costly alternative will enable Unesco to achieve much more through the action programme with the same administrative divisions and staff. We also believe that the staff of the Secretariat has now gained so much experience that it may be said to be ready to undertake a bigger programme.

(63) We are fully aware that, if the alternative of the "higher budgetary level" is supported at this juncture, we shall in fact be committed for four years to come. We note that the Director-General has, very wisely, set aside such considerable sums for the 1957-58 budget, by cautious calculation of the annual contributions, that, until 1958, Unesco will be able gradually to extend its programme activities without needing to make larger demands on the governments of Member States. We suppose that, before the end of this four-year period, the programme of Unesco will be generally reviewed so that Member States can make up their minds about the question of the future budget of the Organization. We are convinced that some such system will, in the long run, be not only desirable but necessary.

(64) If, therefore, we approve this increase in the total budget figure, we have to consider the question of how the money is to be used. Thus the question is bound up with the remodelling of the programme.

(65) We consider that the programme now proposed meets three long-standing desires of Member States. An attempt has obviously been made to secure greater concentration, and it is stated that the projects are carefully planned and prepared. I am very glad to express my satisfaction with this statement of principles and I hope that it will serve as a guiding star and rule of conduct to the Secretariat in all its work.

(66) Moreover, the Secretariat has adopted as a principle the oft-repeated demand that projects should be planned in relation to present needs and should meet the desires actually expressed by the Member States. This, too, is very satisfactory and it is to be hoped that these principles are strictly observed in the present programme. There are still many allocations of funds which are not based on the real wishes of Member States.

(67) Speaking generally, it must be said that there are still a number of small extravagances or items of expenditure in the programme left over from the time when we were trying to do everything. If there is one chapter of the budget in which this is particularly remarkable, it is the Mass Communication chapter. It would seem that the General Conference should devote special attention to the question of the organization, programme and objects of that Department.

(68) In the present programme, there are allocations in each Department for purposes which are no doubt excellent in themselves, but, in each particular case, the amounts allotted are quite inadequate for the aims in view. If we have to choose between ten projects in which we can achieve half of what we set out to do, and five projects for which adequate appropriations can be made if the remaining projects are struck out completely, I shall have no hesitation in recommending the second alternative.

(69) I wish to lay special emphasis on the need for

Unesco to exercise the closest control over the publications brought out by the Organization in its name. Unesco is represented to the world at large by its publications, and readers, who are often experts in the matters discussed, naturally judge the standard of Unesco's work by the quality of its publications. In all Unesco publications, and particularly in those of a scientific character, the Organization must retain the right to insist on the highest standards.

(70) This means, among other things, that all the reports submitted must be most carefully checked. I am very pleased to congratulate the Executive Board on its recommendation to the Director-General that the Publications Committee of the Secretariat be given greater powers in regard to the review of publications plans and the revision of manuscripts before these are approved for publication.

(71) I now come to the question of the direction in which Unesco's programme should be expanded. Many good ideas are set forth in the excellent report of the Executive Board, to which I have just referred, and I hope that we shall have an opportunity of discussing them in greater detail. On this occasion, I shall simply suggest certain major considerations. In one respect the report is a little disappointing. Although there are certain statements of principle, there is no firm declaration of the overriding importance of the activities designed to further international understanding. Too little importance also seems to me to be accorded to the part played by the international exchange of information. The definition given by the Executive Board seems to me to be very narrow. An Organization such as Unesco ought not to limit the scope of its own activities in this way.

(72) We hope most earnestly that any increase in Unesco's financial resources will not be used to add still more to the number of projects but will be devoted to a few undertakings truly related to the needs of the time.

(73) In the opinion of the Swedish Government, Unesco's most important function is to assist, by fostering co-operation, in raising the standard of education, science and culture throughout the world. In the present state of the world, the Swedish Government thinks it fitting that such co-operation should be largely directed to carrying out work undertaken in agreement with the so-called underdeveloped countries. This does not mean that Unesco should give an entirely new direction to its programme of technical assistance. The Swedish Government certainly considers that the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, in which Unesco also has a very important part to play, is making a very much greater moral contribution to international fellowship than could be guessed from the financial amount of the aid supplied. This programme and similar endeavours to raise standards throughout the world and, in general, the broad and soundly conceived co-operation now established between the industrialized countries and the underdeveloped territories seem to us to be the most promising road to peaceful coexistence and lasting peace. My country considers that increased aid and technical development - taking this term in its broadest connotation - are the most urgent requirements in the present state of the world. As an indication of the importance it attaches to the principles on which this attitude is based, Sweden, which last year increased its contribution to technical assistance by 25 per cent, has just made a further 25 per cent increase in its contribution, bringing it to a total of three million Swedish crowns. This is not a very large sum in itself but, considering the size of our population, it represents a contribution, by way of taxes from the Swedish people, which is fully equivalent, as regards purchasing power, to the contribution that the allocation of 18 million dollars asked for by President Eisenhower would have represented for the taxpayers of the United States of America. Apart from this, we, like many other countries, have bilateral programmes, to finance which we are now launching an appeal covering the whole country.

(74) But it is extremely important to maintain a reasonably clear line of demarcation between the expanded programme and Unesco's own programme. Unesco should not on any account become merely a branch of the Technical Assistance Board. Unesco's own budget should be kept for its own basic work, without which the United Nations programme cannot be accomplished. First priority should be given to those projects which are designed to provide the basis for an enduring improvement of the standard of culture. I will only mention, as examples, Unesco's fundamental education centres and the projects for the production of reading materials for people who have just learnt to read. But in school teaching, popular education, higher education and the promotion of scientific research, as well, Unesco has the very important task of organizing and encouraging co-operation and guiding endeavours, with a full understanding of the aim in view, towards the solution of urgent problems in the underdeveloped countries. It is important to emphasize the principle that all countries should have exactly the same opportunities of receiving aid. When the question of whether or not aid should be granted is being considered, the deciding criterion must be evidence of need and not arguments suggested by the political considerations prevailing in any particular body of opinion. In this co-operation with the underdeveloped countries, Unesco should act, first and foremost, as a mediator and a clearing house of information and advice; it should establish contacts and foster the development of new and better working methods. I have often compared Unesco to a factory in which the tools of international cultural co-operation are produced, and this, I believe, gives a true idea of Unesco's most important mission.

(75) A very large number of the items appearing in the proposed programme and budget under the heading of Technical aid to Member States , and amounting in all to over fifty per cent of the higher budgetary level, relate to the activities I have just mentioned. In point of fact, they are concerned more with laying the foundations for future concerted action than with aid as such, and it would have been better if this had been made clear in the programme by some other heading or title, such as "Co-operation with Member States for special purposes" or something of that sort.

(76) One matter which the Swedes consider to be urgent, and in which we are fully prepared to co-operate, is Unesco's programme of adult education. This is naturally connected with the fact that in Sweden we have had wide experience of the importance of adult education in developing a society truly

imbued with democratic principles. We note that Unesco, with the assistance of a number of distinguished experts, has now given a new trend to its adult education programme, and we are prepared to co-operate in every possible way in this programme. Next summer, Denmark, Norway and Sweden are jointly to organize an international seminar, with Unesco's assistance, and we very much hope that this seminar will help to develop interest in adult education and in the Scandinavian Folk High Schools as a most useful instrument for the development of the people and society.

(77) I should also like to say a few words about a matter referred to in the Introduction to the proposed programme and budget. The programme of Unesco is always based on what the Director-General has called the diversity of disciplines, and the Secretariat is organized on much the same lines. There are also divisions in the Secretariat which are organized according to the nature of the work being done, such as the Exchange of Persons Service and various other units. As we stated in the discussion of this topic two years ago, the Swedish delegation considers that there would be great advantages in organizing the whole Secretariat so that the structure of the departments is determined by the type of work to be done. Since the Director-General calls this programme a transitional programme, it seems probable that he has considered the possibility of a more radical reorganization. The preparation of the programme and the organization of the Secretariat are closely inter-connected, so that it is difficult to achieve a more rational programme structure without a fundamental reorganization of the Secretariat. The Swedish delegation still thinks that such a reorganization would increase efficiency and make it easier to co-ordinate and concentrate more or less parallel projects. This would give Unesco what we called two years ago better aerodynamic lines.

(78) This programme is the fruit of a happy co-operation between the Director-General and the Executive Board and, from the reports of the meetings with the Executive Board, it seems that the work was very difficult. We therefore have the best of reasons for offering our sincere congratulations both to the Director-General and to the Executive Board on the results achieved. We also find a new note, both in the introduction to the proposed programme and budget and in the reports of the Director-General, which we think reflects a determination to build up a truly co-operative spirit and a co-operative approach in the Secretariat. We wish to state our confidence in the Director-General's personnel policy and we consider that the accepted principles applying to the staff of the United Nations should also apply to the Unesco Secretariat. We hope that the same spirit of co-operation will inform the relations between the Secretariat and the representatives of the governments of the Member States, because, when all is said and done, the Secretariat is the servant of some 70 Member States; we are delighted to acknowledge the inspired effort and the wealth of constructive new ideas it supplies - though it sometimes gives us some cause for uneasiness - but its main object is, nevertheless, to serve the Member States and to carry out the resolutions of the General Conference.

(79) May I, in conclusion, as a representative of a small nation standing midway between the great powers and whose only desire is to further a "good neighbour" policy, make a modest appeal for goodwill.

(80) Unesco is a governmental organization and it is pointless to close our eyes to the fact that the attitudes we adopt and the decisions we take are sometimes influenced by political considerations and arguments. We have come to this hospitable and highly civilized country from the four corners of the world, from different climates, with different backgrounds and mentalities, laden with preconceived ideas and prejudices of various sorts. We have great difficulties to overcome, and principally that of reaching agreement. Let us remember as often as possible that we have come together to carry out a great task which is of interest to us all - the fostering of understanding among the peoples of the world and the promotion of culture.

(81) Let us, as Unesco delegates, set an example of enlightened thought of the way to live in a world community, seeking wherever possible to lay aside political rivalries and considerations of national prestige, and let us seek, realistically and practically, to solve our problems in friendship, brotherhood and harmony.

(82) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Iran.

(83) Mr. RAADI (Iran) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, the distinguished colleagues who have already spoken have paid an enthusiastic tribute and expressed their warm gratitude to the Government and people of the Republic of Uruguay. May I take this opportunity of endorsing their expressions of gratitude on behalf of the delegation of Iran? I would add that, although we have come from a far distant country, we feel at home in this great and splendid land. A Persian poet has said: "My friend is very close to me despite the strange fact that I am so far from him". Indeed, though oceans seem to divide the countries of the East from South America, there are many similarities and affinities in their ways of life and aspirations.

(84) I venture now to put forward certain comments on the Report of the Director-General and on the proposed programme and budget.

(85) You undertook a heavy task, Sir, when our Organization was passing through one of the most critical periods of its life. You have made a beginning in the execution of that task with the calm and caution which are essential in such circumstances.

(86) Your Report shows that the change in the occupant of the post of Director-General has not affected the implementation of the programme adopted by the General Conference at its seventh session. We are as pleased as you are at this fact, which we attribute to your personal qualities, the loyalty of your colleagues, and the influence of your distinguished predecessors, who laid a sound foundation for ensuring continuity in the work undertaken since 1945.

(87) As you were elected in the period between two sessions of the Conference, you have had to carry out a programme which was not your own without being able to give it the stamp of your own ideas. On the other hand, those same circumstances have helped

you, to some extent, by giving you considerable time to make a thorough study of the many problems of the Organization which call for resolute, effective and urgent treatment. The time has now come for you to move on to the execution of projects and reforms which you yourself have advocated and to take your own measures, whose results will be assessed and judged by future conferences. We shall judge you by your deeds and we wish you every success.

(88) Secondly, we note with satisfaction that, from the time you took up your duties, you have travelled widely to all parts of the world in order to see local conditions for yourself. You returned from your travels with the firm conviction that a new emphasis was needed in future Unesco programmes, an emphasis which, while allowing Unesco's continuing activities of universal interest to develop in the normal way, would do more than has been done in the past to solve the special problems of various regions and to meet the immediate needs of certain groups of Member States.

(89) The Executive Board supported you in your endeavours, and indeed urged you to revise the first draft of the programme as a preliminary to the proposed reforms, because its consideration of the past history and future course of the Organization had almost inevitably led it to the same conclusions.

(90) This transitional programme has the advantage of following the basic principle of the remodelled programme - the division of activities into two groups - without breaking sharply with the past.

(91) The delegation of Iran considers that the excellent introduction to the proposed programme and budget shows a sound and realistic approach which is in line with the fundamental aims of Unesco. We are, of course, in favour of this approach but we have the following observations to make.

(92) The division of the programme into two distinct parts is undoubtedly an ingenious expedient, a necessary preliminary step, but, for the moment, it simply gives us a frame, whose usefulness will ultimately depend upon the value of its content. We hope that the content will improve quickly enough, as the result of your endeavours, to give us, in 1957 and 1958, a well-balanced whole, reflecting the aspirations of education, science and culture both at the universal level and at the level of the actual needs of Member States.

(93) Moreover, the division of the programme cannot produce good results unless the machinery for relations between the Organization and Member States, and the structure and working methods of the Secretariat, are reformed; this work of reform is difficult but absolutely necessary.

(94) The criteria at present applying to Unesco's relations with governments and National Commissions are unfortunately, in most cases, the product of hasty generalizations which do not always reflect the facts of the situation. The same comment applies to the definitions and standards adopted for determining how regional activities are to be organized and carried out. It is obvious that, as regards the activities of worldwide interest included in the programme, Unesco must, in general, follow a pre-established - and almost a Cartesian - policy. On the other hand, as regards relations with Member States and national co-operating bodies, Unesco ought, we consider, to use every means of exploring the ground and, at least for a time, to adopt a flexible, clear-sighted, empirical policy.

(95) Needless to say, such a task can be carried out only by a Secretariat consisting of two types of specialists in proper proportions - those working, as in the past, on continuing activities of universal interest, and a larger group of specialists who, besides having a sound educational, scientific or cultural background, must be adequately informed about the social situation and administrative and psychological conditions in the country or countries to which Unesco may wish to give effective aid. If a country is to be given really useful help, it is first necessary to know and understand it, to know its needs and how urgent they are in relation to one another; and sometimes to help it to realize its immediate needs or to encourage it to make them known so that they can be suitably met. All this, though necessary, is not easy. It is a bold undertaking and it is like a two-edged sword, which we must be very careful to use wisely.

(96) Another very important step which should be instituted as soon as possible is the alteration or, rather, the improvement of the present system for discussing and voting on the programme and budget.

(97) Experience has made it abundantly clear that the long discussions at the General Conference on the minor details of the budget, and the heated and often confused debates on the budget estimates, item by item and dollar by dollar, have not so far resulted in any great saving to the Organization, nor in a sounder policy nor in an appreciable prestige. Moreover, this method, when carried to the lengths with which you are all familiar, does not appear to be entirely in line with the spirit of Articles IV and IX of the Constitution, even if it fulfils the letter of the law. It is high time for the General Conference to concern itself, first and foremost, with the basic problems of education, science and culture, making it its first duty, in accordance with the terms of Article IV of the Constitution, to determine the policies and the main lines of work of the Organization and to take decisions, after a thorough study, on the intrinsic merits of the proposed projects. With regard to the budget, we consider that, in future, the General Conference should determine the general structure, chapters and major items, leaving the Director-General and the Executive Board fairly free to act and take decisions on the best methods to employ and the best use of appropriations.

(98) We are firmly convinced that the best guarantee that Unesco's resources will be wisely used lies not in rigid budgetary regulations or the introduction of new budget headings, but in the sense of responsibility, the professional integrity and the administrative and organizing ability of the team of international officials forming the Secretariat of Unesco.

(99) As regards future activities, we recommend, for cogent reasons that we propose to explain later, that an institute be set up under Unesco's auspices to provide a basic training for people in all countries who intend to enter the international civil service.

(100) One advantage of this measure is that it would achieve a rational union of the two criteria which ought to govern the recruitment of staff for the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies - geographical distribution and professional competence.

(101) We are also most anxious that an international centre should be set up for the training of fundamental education specialists. Far from duplicating the work of the regional fundamental education centres already in existence or which are to be established, such a centre would remedy a serious shortcoming which arises from the fact that, in spite of their urgent needs in this matter, many countries are unable, for linguistic, geographical or other reasons, to take advantage of the work of the regional centres.
(102) Unesco will soon be ten years old, I am proud and grateful that it was my lot to be present at the birth of this Organization in 1945 and that I have had the honour of serving it as the permanent delegate of Iran and, since 1952, as a member of the Executive Board. When I look back on the past, it seems to me that the history of the successes and difficulties of our Organization can be summed up in a few words. The enthusiasm, the faith and the devoted service of those who set up the Organization or who have worked with it have enabled it to establish itself in international life. But, in the past years, there have been three major factors thwarting its efforts and hindering its full development. These factors are inexperience, which is inseparable from youth; failure to cover the whole world; and, finally, a political atmosphere which has not been conducive to international co-operation. Now, however, these obstacles and difficulties are happily being removed. The experience Unesco has acquired in the last nine years has brought it far on the way to maturity; the admission of new members has just prepared the ground for worldwide co-operation; and, lastly, the signs of a slackening of tension which are to be seen on the political horizon are strengthening the hope and the possibility of a lasting peace. Unesco's time has therefore come.
(103) As this Conference opens, circumstances are favourable to a vigorous campaign against ignorance and misunderstanding, a campaign which can no longer be postponed, for our excuses, though justified in the past, will no longer carry weight. Let us bear this fact in mind. Let us realize the scope of our new opportunities and the range of our increased responsibilities. Let us rise above our political prejudices in our search for a sound basis of understanding in intellectual and cultural affairs. Let us forget the differences dividing us, for there are many values, many aims, aspirations and hopes in which we are united.

(104) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Haiti.

(105) Mr. LALEAU (Haiti) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the history of the human race, from our prehistoric ancestor, at the mercy of forces which crushed him, to the specialist on atomic fission, who can explain and control those same forces, has been a ceaseless process of creation. The greatness of an agency concerned with the fate of man is directly proportional not only to the quality of its programme and the way it carries it out but also to the balance which it succeeds in establishing between the demands of reality and the commands of the ideal.
(106) Unesco is great because its subject-matter is Man and Man's growth. Across the frontiers, beyond the different races and diverse civilizations, with their frequently conflicting customs, amid the storms unleashed by nature and our passions, there is gradually emerging the concept of a being that is evolving towards perfection. Valéry has said that "L'Homme est en project" - "Man is still but a ketch of what he might be" - and Francis Ponge repeats and emphasizes "L'Homme est l'avenir de l'Homme" - "Man is the future of Man".
(107) It is a slow process of evolution, going on through the centuries as thought is formed, hearts are moulded, and conscience emerges from a complex of different factors - conscience which, slaying the wolf in Man, will turn him from a predatory animal, to whom physical strength is the greatest good, into a being ready to co-operate with all those who, like himself, yearn for freedom and justice.
(108) That is our purpose: to strive for this ideal, and to begin the ascent by making understanding easier, through the improvement of material conditions, between peoples who comprehend their interests, who have broken free of hampering superstitions and have attained the certitude that the true fulfilment of the individual and the community consists not in the mad, sadistic exploitation of one by another but rather in increased human solidarity.
(109) As I speak of this development, I am irresistibly reminded of a small nation which has issued heroically from slavery, and, through indescribable sufferings, amid what was at first general hostility, has painfully attained its present status, to which it owes the honour of sitting in this illustrious company and of having stood sponsor - in my own person - to our Organization in London, one November morning in 1945. And it was natural that this small nation should have been among the first to respond to that stirring appeal, for the principles of the infant Organization were the very foundation of its own political ethics.
(110) I need not remind the pioneers of Unesco of the unceasing efforts to achieve the liberation of man; nor of the results gained despite opposition, nor of the hopes which those victories over day-to-day hostility justify.
(111) At these meetings, once annual and now biennial, we measure the progress made and draw each time fresh strength to continue our march.
(112) May our work at this eighth session of the General Conference be inspired by an irradiating vision, the vision of mankind set free for ever from distress and crime and reconciled at last beneath the twofold sway of Justice and Peace.
(113) For one day, there must be, here below, a little less misunderstanding and much more charity; children and women must cease to weep, and the young must no more shed their blood for causes whose inner significance often escapes them and which almost always come down to barren conflicts between ideologies, stupid frontier incidents or futile questions of prestige. We shall extinguish war in the heart of man, and compel man's actions to march in step with his dreams.
(114) Our delegation, following its own inclinations no less than the instructions of its Government, whose Head daily gives proof of his sense of solidarity, is determined, so far as its modest resources

permit, to work for the coming of those times so longed for by men of goodwill all the world over.
(115) I have been commissioned to bring you this solemn assurance, strong in the conviction that the policy pursued by our Organization in the things of the mind and heart is the only possible one at the present stage of civilization, and that it enables us to hand on to our impatient followers the torch which was once passed to us by other hands, now fumbling with age or from which life has departed...
(116) In conclusion, I am glad to state that my delegation accepts the Report of the Director-General and congratulates him on it most heartily.

The meeting rose at 6 p. m.

# FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Communication by the President . . . . . 69
Discussion of the Director-General's Report (continued) :
Speeches by the delegates of Italy, Argentina, Japan, Chile, Poland, Norway, Thailand, Korea and the USSR . . . . . 69

## COMMUNICATION BY THE PRESIDENT

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The General Committee held a meeting this morning and adopted the following decisions.
(2) As the Government of Venezuela has officially announced that it will not be represented at the present session of the General Conference, and as that country held the chairmanship of the Headquarters Committee, the General Committee has invited the Nominations Committee to elect a new chairman.
(3) The General Committee has taken into account the wide experience of Brazil in matters connected with the Headquarters Committee, and would suggest to the Nominations Committee that advantage be taken of that delegation's special experience to appoint it to the chairmanship of the Headquarters Committee. In that case Brazil's seat as vice-president of the Conference would become vacant. The General Committee suggests to the Nominations Committee that another Latin American State might appropriately be placed on the list of vice-presidents. The Nominations Committee will meet at 1.30 this afternoon; the Headquarters Committee will meet after the meeting of the Nominations Committee and will later report to the Plenary Conference.
(4) The Secretariat informs me that it has received from the Government of Cuba payment of the amount of its contribution required to entitle Cuba to vote at the present session of the Conference. From this moment, therefore, the delegation of Cuba enjoys full voting rights.
(5) In accordance with the decision adopted by the General Conference at the plenary meeting on Saturday morning, when reference was made to the partial use of Russian as a working language at the present session of the General Conference, the Secretariat has made arrangements, starting today, for simultaneous interpretation from and into Russian in this hall. Interpretation into Russian will be supplied by the technical staff of the Soviet delegation until such time as the Secretariat engages the rest of the staff required in Montevideo. During the next few days it is hoped to begin Russian interpretation in the other rooms where the simultaneous system operates.
(6) The Chairman of the Administrative Commission has announced that, beginning tomorrow (Tuesday) morning, his Commission will examine item 9.31 of the agenda: Draft Amendments to Article V of the Constitution (Composition of the Executive Board).The Commission will also consider the financing of the budget and the report by the Contributions Committee, starting on Wednesday next.

## DISCUSSION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S REPORT (continued)

(7) I now call upon the representative of Italy.

(8) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI (Italy) (Translation from the French): ladies and gentlemen, it is difficult for me, as Head of the Italian delegation, when rising to speak in Montevideo, and in this Palace, to suppress the emotion I feel at the welcome which has been given us by the Uruguayan people. There are indissoluble links of blood and culture uniting my own country with this nation, where one of the most famous heroes of Italian unity won his spurs in the struggle for freedom. Relatively small in numbers, but great in spirit and in its love of democracy, the Uruguayan nation seems to embody the ideals of Unesco in its own civilization, of which it is rightly proud and which it has built up in the greatest freedom and with the generous help of other nations. May I be allowed, Mr. President, though I may seem to you to be departing from the agenda and perhaps causing some embarrassment to you personally, to express here once again the gratitude of the Italian delegation.
(9) Unesco has been passing through a crisis. Two years ago this crisis reached a dramatic stage which is still graven on the hearts and minds of most of you - a stage when serious fears were entertained for its future.
(10) It may be that Unesco has weathered the storm, as some authorities have claimed. But, though we are

now sailing the high seas, there are many unknown dangers ahead and we can barely glimpse the course we are to set.

(11) Out of this crisis, after six months of uncertainty, there has come a new Director-General who has been at pains to establish contacts with the Member States. As Mr. Evans was himself happy to acknowledge at this very rostrum the day before yesterday, the Member States have been extremely frank with him - and we intend to continue to be so: for instance, the President of the Italian National Commission gave him a much fuller account of the Italian attitude to Unesco than would be possible during these debates.

(12) As regards the planned activities for 1955-56, we could - and indeed we should - be more critical if we confined ourselves to examining them intrinsically; we should find among them many activities and methods which have already been the source of futile disputes, in particular those two budgetary levels, the higher and the lower, which in Paris gave rise to such acrimonious argument. But we prefer to regard them as transitional activities leading up to the remodelled programme we all wish to see. It is in this future programme, this plan for remodelling as laid before us by the Executive Board, that our interest and our hopes are centred - not unmixed, it must be said, with some degree of optimism.

(13) But let us be under no illusion: although the proposed remodelling puts forward structural and substantive reforms which are more far-reaching than might at first sight appear, its main purpose is to form, for the time being only, an effective framework, and a useful and more flexible instrument. It is we, the Member States, who must fill in the canvas within that framework and, if Unesco is to succeed, it will be our duty during the coming two years, while the ordinary programme is being carried out, to determine the special activities in which we are interested and to review the activities of a permanent nature.

(14) To this end, by concentrating our efforts upon obtaining increased efficiency and a programme more directly corresponding to the needs of Member States, we propose at this Conference to urge that the rôle of the National Commissions be strengthened and better defined by more closely associating them with the framing of the programme. It is not that we wish to reduce the function of the Secretariat to that of a passive catalyst. We have too high a regard for its experience and its sense of mission not to accord it a leading part in choosing the objectives, and indeed in stimulating national activities. It has, moreover, proved its worth under difficult circumstances which are not yet such ancient history that we could forget them. The National Commissions, though, are the roots that feed Unesco with its life-blood, which they draw from the living tissue of the nations; it is they who can prevent the Organization from working in a dry and sterile vacuum by linking it with concrete achievements. As a member of the Government myself, and as a liberal politician, I would like to acknowledge the valuable work accomplished by the National Commissions and pay tribute - independently of the State's efforts - to the free expression of culture.

(15) We consider also that by calling periodic meetings of several National Commissions, without forming permanent groupings, we should arrive at a system of variable and elastic regionalism based on problems of common interest and not at all on political considerations, which should not cloud the field of culture. Regionalism of this kind, in our view, would be by far the healthiest solution and would help to prevent that decentralization which would gravely jeopardize the unity and universality of the Unesco spirit.

(16) There is another extremely important problem which demands special attention. What proportion should be kept between the more strictly scientific and cultural activities and those which concern education alone? The former are directed towards more highly advanced States, while the latter more often than not take the form of technical assistance to countries which, for historical and geographical reasons, are only now beginning to gain access to technical progress.

(17) Let it be clearly understood that we recognize the principal purpose of the Organization to be that of emphasizing all those activities which seek to raise the living standards of peoples not yet fully developed, and above all, of helping East and West to obtain wider knowledge of each other's civilizations. This is one way of serving the cause of peace, and thus of pursuing the fundamental aims of the Organization.

(18) But we also firmly believe that any educational activity, even the most elementary, would speedily be doomed to sterility, to stagnation in stereotyped and outworn teachings and even to complete failure, if the Organization lost contact with culture and science at the highest level.

(19) Far be it from us to wish to turn Unesco into a super-academy or international ministry of the Ministries of Education; we even see in that a very real danger. Believing as we do that art, science and culture are the free flowering of the spirit and that they cannot bring forth good fruit at the behest either of the State or of some super-State institution, there is nothing we fear so much as the creation of a special and exclusive Unesco doctrine which we should feel bound to disseminate or to impose.

(20) Among scientific and cultural activities there is, however, a vast field in which the Organization can exert itself by successfully concentrating its efforts, even saving money for the national budgets, and achieving more effective results through the reciprocal enrichment of national cultures. I should like to make it clear that in the Italian delegation's view such activities might well be included not only among those of a permanent nature, but also among the "special activities".

(21) There is one more point in the Director-General's report which the Italian delegation has found of special interest. I refer to the efforts directed at establishing and protecting human rights in general, and particularly the rights to education and culture. I should like to congratulate the Director-General on the course of action he has followed and to assert that the solution of the many outstanding difficulties does not merely depend on his goodwill. I am also anxious to assure him that in this question, which we hold to be one of the fundamental tasks of Unesco, the Italian delegation will give him every support. We are particularly interested in those rights which guarantee the free flow of culture, the verbal and written expression of thought, and the free movement of the men and women who are the bearers of that thought and culture. What we desire, however, are rights which are

not merely inscribed in the tables of the law (a relatively easy matter, but one which may prove disappointing), but rights which are translated into practical reality.

(22) I said just now that in the next two years we shall be engaged on a work of revision and selection in order to fill in the framework provided for us by the proposed programme in its revised form. On that selection depends in great measure the fate of Unesco. Too much stress cannot be laid upon its importance or upon the responsibility of those who will be called upon to make that selection or on the sense of proportion and realism they will have to display in carrying out a task which will entail the sometimes bitter renunciation of national prerogatives, consented to in favour of a higher interest and in a truly universal spirit.

(23) We still hear the echo of the splendid words spoken here in this connexion by the retiring President, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. The favourable atmosphere in which this Conference has begun its labours is a proof that his words were needed. In that spirit I should like to feel that we could undertake, as I do here and now on behalf of my own country, to work hard and unceasingly during the next two years so that the gap between our hopes of today and the realities of tomorrow may gradually be reduced.

(24) By the time the next General Conference meets Unesco will have reached its tenth anniversary. What finer, nobler celebration could be wished for than the continuing intellectual co-operation of men of goodwill?

(25) We were deeply moved three days ago by what we witnessed on the steps outside this Parliament House at the inauguration of Unesco's eighth General Conference. After the proud and moving strains of your National Anthem, Mr. President, had risen towards the blue sky above, the flags of all the nations were raised around those of Uruguay and the United Nations, and then it was that we heard the Canticle of Hope, creating the perfect atmosphere for the opening of our work. Traditional values and new forms, national elements and the universality of the spirit blended harmoniously in the lofty symbolism of this act, in which we took part with joy and gratitude; and it all found expression in the pure voices of the young people of that rising generation for whom it is so well worth while, ladies and gentlemen, to labour and to struggle.

(26) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the representative of the Argentine Republic.

(27) Mr. COLOMBO (Argentina) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the Argentine Republic has studied the report of the Executive Board and of the Director-General with keen attention, and feels it an honour to endorse the conclusions reached therein. While it is true that these suggest many ideas and a number of questions, they may be regarded as a direct result of the work which has been achieved or which still remains to be done, and also of the deep feeling of international co-operation which inspired the decisions of the members of this United Nations organization. Perhaps it may be asserted that everything is still in its early stages and that little has yet been done for the good of the peoples and the human race. This apparent paradox is perhaps the clue to the force which animates and impels us in the great work which has been started in the fields of science, culture and education. The primary objectives of science, culture and education are to kindle in the minds of men the light of peace and progress, to contribute to the brotherhood of man and to establish enduring links between the nations, free of prejudices and intrigues, so that there may be imperishable confirmation, not merely American but world-wide in its application, of the words of one of my country's statesmen: "Everything unites us and naught shall divide us".

(28) The report before us, which by its very importance deserves to be discussed and assessed by this august Assembly, contains in its introduction the crucial point around which is to revolve the future activity of the Organization which has drawn it up; for undoubtedly it is the projects already completed which will, by the eloquence of facts, drown the abuse and frustrate the manoeuvres of those who see in obscurantism a suitable way of distorting good intentions and sowing hatred and discord. Among those projects, may I be allowed, whether from a professional impulse or following the intimate promptings of my conscience, to draw your attention to those connected with the teaching of the social sciences and jurisprudence. Those in the former group, with their manifold branches and nuances, seek to guarantee the general well-being of the community, while those in the latter, in their dual aspects - the normative and the functional - are seeking the most suitable means whereby the community can guide its development within that order which is indispensable to its very survival.

(29) It is pointless, ladies and gentlemen, to go on piling up plans unless they are translated into realities. If it is true that dreams are a form of ideals and that ideals ennoble mankind and strengthen the greatness of nations, it is no less true that they should serve as a powerful lever to satisfy the immediate desires of the dreamers. Only if they do is it possible to eliminate confusion and destroy the spurious plans underlying certain types of claims that run counter to the equilibrium essential to the peaceful coexistence of the nations. Only thus, through powerful and continuous action, penetrating deeply into minds and feelings, convincing by its own force of attraction and by its irresistible example, shall we succeed in abolishing futile struggles and bringing about that state of happiness which mankind has been seeking in vain throughout the centuries.

(30) At the Tenth Inter-American Conference, held in Caracas a few months ago, the Foreign Minister of my country uttered words which, because of their special significance, may fittingly be repeated here, since they show very clearly the attitude of the Argentine Republic to so important a matter: "Since poverty must disappear", he said, "and capitalism must become humanized and place itself in the service of society, our peoples aspire to reach degrees of culture, humanistic in dimensions, in the three aspects which may be classified as the formation and development of the intelligence, the ethical sense and the aesthetic impulse. The community, without distinction of class, religion or sex, has the right of access to the sources of a common culture, and it is the duty of

governments to guarantee this, if they are seeking to form a genuine national feeling. A nation, when it is genuinely a nation, is not expressed in terms of kilometres of territory, in its national product, or in the strength of its armies, but in the consciousness which nations have of themselves when they go forth in search of their destiny".

(31) It is that culture which, pulsing through the heads and hearts of our brothers throughout the world, will lead them to understand what a great power is theirs and what magnificent weapons they possess to help them perfect their thinking, teach them honesty of conduct and bring their noblest hopes to fruition. It is that culture which, through proper educational systems - the fruits of a slowly developing knowledge - will enable the mind to look beyond the shadows and to glimpse whatsoever things are noble and pure, far beyond the primaeval instincts of the race.

(32) Thus it is that among the basic precepts justifying the creation of Unesco, which are summed up in its Constitution, we find one which recognizes as the determining cause of the most appalling war of all times, the negation of democratic principles, of the dignity and equality of man and of respect for his personality, as well as the deliberate desire to exploit prejudice and ignorance. For such an attitude there is but one remedy, namely the joint efforts of all to understand the malign influence of unbridled materialism, and but one solution, namely the clear expression of the brotherhood of man, so that it may no longer be true to say with the philosopher that man is his own worst enemy.

(33) But it is not enough that there should be international activity, unless it is accompanied by activity in each and all of our States. Major undertakings should be initiated at national level so that help to the needy, progressive improvements in the life of the working classes, the adaptation of laws to aspects of modern life, and the raising of the general economic and cultural level prepare the ground for transition from the local to that wider field which presupposes the co-operation on equal terms of several, many or all the nations. And where the internal impulsions are weak or the essential conditions for achieving desirable aims are lacking, help will be given, as it must be given, if a good harvest is desired; and so, behind the outstretched hand, eager to give, we find the loving heart.

(34) The considerable task which this Organization - whose assizes we are now again attending - has accomplished so far, is a real augury of what it can do in the future. The secret of its success lies in the fact that it is a spiritual community. There must be no relaxation of effort, no faltering in the enterprise, if its future development is to be assured. Young though it still is in years, it has already made an indelible mark on history; it is like a banner flying over the scene of battle, like a symbol of continuous rebirth, of a yearning to improve all those things which can be improved for the benefit of ourselves and of generations to come.

(35) The President of my country, in opening the first National Philosophical Congress in the city of Mendoza, said: "From an educational point of view, if we consider the possibility of providing the peoples with good living conditions, the problem ceases to be abstract and becomes an urgent reality. The man who is to be invested with dignity and started on the road to well-being, must first and foremost be trained and made aware of himself". These are ideas which admirably complement the words spoken by the Vice-President of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, at the seventh General Conference, when he said, among other things: "The cure is to restore the truths of the spirit to the central place in the minds of men. The truths of the spirit are liberality, understanding, freedom. Let us therefore send out from this Conference a message to this groping, uncertain, discontented world: that love and not hatred, that freedom and not fear, that faith and not doubt, have in themselves the healing of the nations".

(36) In praying as representative of the Argentine Republic for the success of this great World Assembly, I express the hope that these lofty ideals, unsmirched by any petty interests, may govern our deliberations and guide them firmly along their proper path.

(37) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the representative of Japan.

(38) Mr. SAWADA (Japan): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is with genuine pleasure that the Japanese delegation has come to participate in this memorable Conference. We are glad that it is being held on the friendly soil of Uruguay and on behalf of the Japanese delegation, let me express our appreciation of the courtesy and goodwill of the Government of Uruguay in inviting Unesco to hold it in this hospitable city of Montevideo.

(39) May I also take this occasion to express our sincere thanks to the Executive Board and to the Secretariat for the strenuous efforts they have made in the last two years in carrying out our programmes and in drawing up new ones together with the compiling of the draft budget. For these accomplishments, the Executive Board and the Secretariat deserve the profound gratitude of all Member States.

(40) The Japanese delegation has carefully reviewed the new draft programme. It is a matter of great significance that Unesco, now approaching its tenth year, is trying at this juncture to give a new direction to its programme. It appears that, in prosecuting its activities, Unesco will take into consideration, more than in the past, the particular circumstances of different regions of the world, as well as the aspirations of its Member States. Of all the activities of Unesco, I understand that special importance is attached to education for international understanding and co-operation, and also to the further promotion of technical assistance. The Japanese delegation desires to see Unesco put more emphasis on these questions.

(41) Last Saturday, we listened to very illuminating reports from the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General. Reference was made in their reports to their two trips undertaken in the course of the last year. You will remember that one of these was a visit to the Member States in Asia. The party included Mr. Oscar Secco Ellauri, Uruguayan member of the Executive Board. They had free and frank talks with competent authorities inside and outside the governments of the countries they visited. In the course of their tour, they were good enough to visit my country, where we were most happy to welcome them. Our National Commission and people interested

in Unesco's work did what little they could do to make their stay with us interesting and fruitful. Their sincerity of purpose, their enthusiastic belief in the ideals of this world-wide movement, left a deep impression on us. In this manner they gave great encouragement to us in the development of Unesco activities in our country. We understand that, as the result of their visit to Asia, the Executive Board and the Secretariat have come to recognize more need of expanding the Organization's work in that part of the world. It is earnestly hoped that the present Conference will share their point of view. In this connexion I may say that Unesco attaches great importance to the promotion of fundamental education in Asia and elsewhere. In this matter, Japan, with her long and rich experience in the advancement of education, is ready to give full co-operation to the Organization to the best of her ability whenever required.

(42) We also take a keen interest in the progress of science, contributing as it does to the raising of the standard of living and the promotion of the welfare of millions. In this belief, the Japanese delegation proposed at the seventh General Conference the study of oceanography in the Indian and Pacific region, and the proposal was adopted by that Conference. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that a project for giving a more definite shape to this work during the coming two years is included in the programme for 1955-56.

(43) Latin American countries, we are aware, are deeply concerned with this matter, and we have learned recently that the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics is also desirous of establishing an international organization for oceanographic study. Accordingly, the Japanese delegation has presented a proposal to the present Conference for the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Oceanographic Research, covering Indo-Pacific and Latin American regions. It is hoped that the Conference will adopt it with the ultimate aim of setting up a permanent and independent body responsible for the development of oceanographic research. This is our Proposal No. 1.

(44) The Japanese delegation is also deeply preoccupied by the question of atomic energy. To us it is a matter of the first importance to study from all possible angles the technological, economic and social effects of the use of atomic energy. We know, however, that the necessary materials are still lacking for the effective prosecution of these complex studies. It may therefore be difficult to lay down at present a definite programme for this purpose. We understand that the United Nations is now considering this and similar questions, but we hope that Unesco will seize every opportunity that may arise for such studies.

(45) In the meanwhile, we cannot ignore the inimical effects of radio-activity, even when atomic energy is used for peaceful purposes. We Japanese have witnessed with our own eyes the injuries and harm it has caused. For this reason, the Japanese delegation has submitted a proposal to the present Conference that Unesco shall initiate medical and biological studies of the physical injuries and damage caused by radio-activity. In the interests of human welfare a definite programme should be formulated as soon as possible to find ways and means to avoid such injuries and to provide suitable remedies for them. In spite, however, of the urgency of the problem, the studies we recommend would demand the close co-operation of the competent scientists and, with this end in view, the Japanese delegation wishes Unesco to encourage and facilitate joint study of this important problem by world experts. This is our Proposal No. 2.

(46) As regards Unesco's activities in Japan, a full report has already been presented to Unesco headquarters. As pointed out in that report, these activities are steadily growing, but I must confess at the same time that, in spite of our efforts, we have not yet been able to rally round us as much public energy and goodwill as we would like. Owing perhaps to the recent trend of the international situation, over which we have no control, we find it difficult to make the masses understand the aims and activities of Unesco as well as they should do.

(47) I may be wrong, but we are afraid that the case may be the same in other countries. In these circumstances, we feel it most desirable that Member States and Unesco headquarters should put forth further endeavours to make Unesco more popular among the masses of the people. According to our short experience, the establishment in Member States of Friends of Unesco Clubs or similar institutions is of great help in accomplishing this purpose. Consequently, the Japanese delegation has made a proposal to the present Conference to the effect that Member States shall, acting through their National Commissions, encourage the establishment of Unesco Friends Clubs or similar institutions to publicize and popularize the work of Unesco, United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. This is our Proposal No. 3.

(48) The armed conflicts which had broken out in one part of the world or another in the past few years have fortunately ceased and Unesco should seize the opportunity to redouble its efforts to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and security. The future of Unesco rests upon a decision to reorientate its activities, and I hope that that decision will be taken at this session of the General Conference. It is strongly desired that Unesco remodel its activities and concentrate upon major projects of first importance.

(49) At this session, the Organization has been joined by new members. It is hoped that, as a result, genuine co-operation will be established at this Conference on new foundations in order that Unesco may contribute more and more to international peace and security by promoting universal respect for justice, for the rule of the law and for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

(50) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the representative of Chile.

(51) Mr. VASALLO (Chile) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is only recently that the present Government of Chile decided to join this Organization, which aims at fostering increased solidarity between the peoples. It gives us great satisfaction to declare that the objectives pursued by Unesco and the ideals and values from which it draws its inspiration are by no means foreign to the basic principles underlying the civic and cultural history of our Republic. But, before voicing a few reflections on this subject, may I express to the Government and people of Uruguay our gratitude for the magnificent welcome accorded to Unesco on the occasion

of this eighth General Conference. Such an attitude is one more example of the nobility and vigour of the cultural and democratic life of this country.

(52) We are gathered together here because we feel Unesco to be a great international experiment for enhancing the highest values of the human spirit. We would not underrate any of its fine achievements. We have commended them unreservedly; I am thinking, in particular, of the Regional Centre of Fundamental Education for Latin America at Patzcuaro, in Mexico. Similarly, we believe that the contribution of a Member State should also take the form of a keenly vigilant attitude to ensure that the projects of this Organization are inspired by no consideration other than that of strengthening the understanding and friendship which bind the peoples together at this stormy period in the history of mankind.

(53) Chile desires to be a democracy in the fullest sense of the term. That is the course it has followed through more than a century of independent existence. In the formation of that democracy our aboriginal groups and men from all parts of the globe have played their part. Our country, which borders so largely on the ocean, has developed a special psychological attitude of always remaining open to the world and to the free circulation of ideas. That is why our national thought is characterized by a lively awareness of international affairs. Traditionally, at all times in its history, Chile has been the refuge of thinkers and men of action who have come to her shores to seek peace and serenity for their minds. Andrés Bello, that great American figure, was for over 20 years rector of our centenary University without on that account ceasing to be a Venezuelan. The Argentinian Domingo Faustino Sarmiento and his compatriot Alberdi made a joint contribution to Chile's nascent civilization. We are linked with Spain by bonds of race and language. France has nourished us with her great literary and artistic achievements. It was Germans who founded the Department of Education attached to the University of Chile, the oldest of its kind in this part of the continent and the one where most of the staffs of secondary schools and teachers training colleges in Latin America have been trained. In other fields of national activity we are indebted to immigrants from Italy, Yugoslavia and other parts of the world.

(54) Chile's contribution to the cultural and educational accomplishments of the Latin American peoples repays in some measure the great debt we owe to the rest of the world. Chilean teachers have had a decisive influence on the educational reforms carried out in various countries of Central and South America. The faculties, schools and institutes of the University of Chile open their doors to thousands of students who enjoy privileges equal or superior to those enjoyed by Chilean students. If I refer to these activities, it is not in order to evoke feelings of chauvinism but to draw the attention of this Conference to the special significance that is being assumed on a world-wide scale by the cultural contribution and outlook of this America of ours, which nowadays it would be an intolerable injustice to call the "continent of savages".

(55) Our six universities, three of which have their full complement of faculties, enjoy a wide degree of self-government, on both the teaching and the administrative sides, the University of Chile retaining only the right to control the conferring of certain academic titles particularly connected with public health and education. As long ago as 1833 our Constitution laid down the maxim that "education must be the special care of the State", and this is reflected in the constant efforts which have led to the development of teacher training colleges and the various branches and grades of general and technical education.

(56) Notwithstanding this general trend and the fact that primary instruction has been compulsory for more than 25 years, Chile has not succeeded in abolishing the illiteracy which is its regrettable blemish. We must therefore take advantage of the experiences of Unesco in fundamental education, a field in which we have none the less made some progress, as a result of our teachers' having long since become familiar with the dynamic, comprehensive conception of an education suited to the exigencies of community life and its many demands for increased technical progress.

(57) In other ways Chile has also fostered and practised the essential principles of Unesco on the free change of ideas and knowledge with a view to achieving greater moral and intellectual solidarity between the peoples. Since 1930 we have had a Chilean Commission for Intellectual Co-operation, which was for years a branch of the relevant organization of the former League of Nations. Throughout the country there are about 40 affiliated institutes functioning on a bi-national basis, and students and eminent research workers benefit by a system of fellowships which are granted under the best conditions consistent with our limited financial resources. The Commission in question has organized exhibitions of Chilean books abroad; it sponsored an American Conference on Intellectual Co-operation held in Chile in 1939, and has acted as the co-ordinating body for various cultural activities both at home and abroad. An important element in the expansion of education and culture has been provided by the University of Chile with its vacation courses and the growing popularity of the national symphony orchestra, the University ballet and choir, and the experimental theatre - all of them organizations created by the State.

(58) I should like to describe for you the broad lines of our policy at this General Conference and the course of our future action. We have studied the 'Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 and have been able to study the Director-General's Report on the work accomplished in the period now drawing to a close. In its broad lines this report seems to us a fitting exposé of work efficiently performed and holding out obvious prospects for the future. We are unable, however, to give an exact statement of our views, although we think that the task discharged by the Director-General and the Executive Board is praiseworthy and deserves to be endorsed by this Conference. We approve the idea that priority should be given to the tasks of fundamental education and to every form of technical assistance which will contribute to raising the capacity of the underdeveloped countries. We also think that the subsidies to certain international organizations should be closely scrutinized to ensure that these bodies are in fact engaged in activities consonant with the spirit of our Constitution. Let us hope that from now on, the Member States, in view of the special and generous aims of Unesco, will authorize budgets which will enable

its sphere of action to be widened and made more universal in all the three fields of education, science and culture. We would like, too, to see Unesco eliminating as far as possible every internal tendency to bureaucracy, which might upset its natural rate of growth. May its efforts conduce to the appointment of more experts, the granting of scholarships, gifts of books, and the organization of exhibitions and enquiries, and, in general, to the direction of an effective technical assistance. Perhaps a close study of the administrative machinery would help to give effect to these aspirations, which are not formulated with any idea of causing trouble or voicing baseless criticism. It may be, of course, that this is a mistaken impression; anyhow it is better to say things at the right time and in the right place.

(59) During the Conference we shall have our observations to make about possible corrections to the programme and budget for the two years 1955-56. On some points we have already put forward definite amendments. For the time being we wish to express our support for the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Honduras to secure your approval for setting up in Latin America an Institute for Vocational and Professional Training and a Higher Teacher Training College, an identical motion on which was put forward by Chile. We are confident that with the goodwill of this Assembly we shall be able to realize a scheme of incalculable importance for the future of secondary education and teacher training in this part of the continent.

(60) It is our hope that Unesco may day by day make more and more progress in the greatest possible number of concrete and practical projects. May the atmosphere of its researches, deliberations and agreements reflect a lofty spirit of universality! May a broad democratic sentiment govern its organization and operation! Chile's sole desire is to contribute to the spread of sincerity, trust and friendship between peoples and governments, as the cornerstones of all healthy and creative international coexistence; and we pray that the symbolic banner of Unesco may give fresh impetus to the expansion of culture, the basic condition for which is a climate of unrestricted freedom. Without that climate culture is doomed to extinction or death, and must surrender to the blind reign of instinctive forces, ever hostile to the uplifting of human dignity.

(61) Lastly, we should like to express our hope that at the next Conference we shall be able to proclaim that we have received from Unesco the attention demanded by the urgent educational and cultural needs of our Latin American continent.

(62) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the representative of Poland.

(63) Mr. MICHALOWSKY (Poland): Mr. President, fellow delegates, please allow me at the beginning of my speech to express on behalf of the Polish Government its thanks to the Government of Uruguay and to the town of Montevideo for the hospitality extended to us and to convey my country's best greetings to the Uruguayan people, to whom we wish the best of success, prosperity and progress.

(64) The present session has started in a somewhat different atmosphere from that in which previous sessions were held. We observe symptoms of diminished tension in the international situation; the threat of a new war has receded, a war which would bring about the sure destruction of our whole civilization. At present, for the first time in many years, no major armed conflict is being waged anywhere in the world. The armistice in Korea and in Indo-China, the Conferences of the great powers in Berlin and in Geneva and the unanimous decision of the United Nations on disarmament - these are essential elements in the new situation. A number of other problems and international disagreements have recently found their solution and the view that no controversial issue exists that cannot be solved through negotiations is gaining ever-increasing understanding and support. This new situation imposes upon all States and upon all international organizations the greater duty to make the maximum effort to speed up the process of easing international tension. All the peoples of the world are longing for it. This duty also lies at the basis of the existence and purpose of our Organization.

(65) Unesco came into being immediately after the victory over fascism and Hitlerism. When the Constitution of Unesco was being laid down, when the first plans for its activity were being worked out, nobody expected that the forces of evil would revive and would so quickly find a voice. In 1945 "re-education" was the point of issue, now, alas, it is "rearmament".

(66) The Constitution of Unesco says that wars begin in the minds of men. But the idea of war does not come of itself. The presumption that armed conflicts are necessary and inevitable is artificially created by a large-scale and lavishly equipped war propaganda. That is why under these conditions Unesco should develop intensified peace activity; it should the more become the ground for intensive and friendly co-operation.

(67) Unfortunately, we observe with anxiety in Unesco, as well as in the United Nations and in some other organizations, signs that there still exists a dangerous tendency to disturb international coexistence. Only a few days ago, here in this hall, we witnessed such symptoms. I have in mind, first of all, the refusal to admit to Unesco the rightful representatives of the 600 millions of the Chinese people, a people with an ancient and splendid culture which is now recording new achievements and creating new values of worth to the whole world.

(68) The principle of the universality of Unesco, which lies at its basis, was flouted by the postponement of the admission of Bulgaria and Rumania - two countries which are developing their culture in the true spirit of democracy, in the spirit of peace, international co-operation and understanding. Both these facts are alien to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of Unesco and are evidence of political manoeuvres which should find no place here and which are harmful to our Organization. The Polish delegation hopes that these mistakes will shortly be corrected.

(69) Resuming its co-operation with Unesco, Poland brings with it significant achievements in the field of culture and education, the fruit of tremendous efforts by the entire nation in the course of the ten post-war years.

(70) Following the war and Nazi occupation which had inflicted painful losses amounting to 20 per cent of the population and 40 per cent of its scientific

manpower and cultural assets, Poland has within a few years abolished illiteracy as a mass phenomenon in our country.

(71) We had in Poland before the war 2,350 seven-class elementary schools; now 11,000 schools cover nearly 100 per cent of our children. Before the war, we had 28 universities for a population of 35 millions - now we have 82 universities for the 26 millions of present-day Poland. The number of students per 10,000 of the population was 14 before the war - now it is 47, more than three times the pre-war figure.

(72) Our country is now covered by a network of schools, community halls and cultural clubs, museums, theatres, cinemas and professional and amateur art groups. We publish over 100 million copies of books yearly including 25 million textbooks.

(73) Before the war Poland had 15 scientific institutes with approximately 2,000 scientific workers - now there are 92 scientific institutes of different kinds employing 12,000 scientific workers.

(74) Our country aims at the development of a culture that shall be truly national in its essence and, at the same time, it teaches the people to respect and to understand the cultural values of other nations and promotes international co-operation in the field of culture.

(75) While developing its education, science and art, our country encourages large-scale cultural exchange with other countries. In the current year only, more than 40 cultural, social and political delegations have visited our country. Artists from Berlin and Peiping and theatrical companies from Paris and Moscow gave performances in Poland. Scientists and artists from Great Britain, France, Italy, India, the USSR, the people's democracies and many other countries have lectured or performed in our country.

(76) Polish scientists and artists frequently visit other countries. The Polish theatre played last year in Paris and in Moscow, and Polish dancers and singers have given performances in a number of towns from Shanghai to Paris.

(77) We constantly take part in international gatherings of exponents of music, fine arts and the cinema. We have participated in numerous festivals - Venice, Carlsbad, Cannes, Rio and Mar del Plata. We have attended PEN Club and ICOM conferences and many others.

(78) At home we organize numerous international competitions in the arts, for example, the Chopin and Wieniawski International Competition, and a number of exhibitions of the science, art and culture of other countries.

(79) We have come to this session of Unesco after a few years of absence with a positive balance of cultural achievement and a positive balance in our contribution to cultural international exchange.

(80) It is our intention to support in Unesco all valuable and concrete undertakings which tend, in practice, to increase international understanding. In particular we shall support every endeavour to raise the level of fundamental education and to spread culture in Member States.

(81) We have signed the Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. We shall further the exchange of theatrical and ballet companies and of exhibitions between museums.

(82) We shall back the proposals of the delegation of India to strengthen and develop the peaceful coexistence of different political systems and of co-operation among all nations. We shall also support the proposals of India on the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only, in the interest of mankind, and not as a threat to annihilate our culture and our existence. We shall also give our support to a campaign for teaching equality of and respect for all races and all nations.

(83) Similarly, we shall support here, as we do at UN, proposals for technical assistance to economically underdeveloped countries, animated by respect for the national culture and sovereign rights of those countries, by the spirit of peace and sincere peaceful international co-operation on the basis of equality and mutual benefits.

(84) We shall support increased exchange of scientific publications and the promotion of activities which will contribute to the better dissemination of scientific achievements among the broad masses of the peoples.

(85) We shall also support the idea of commemorating great thinkers whose works have essentially contributed to the cultural progress of humanity, an idea which has already been given practical shape by Unesco in the case of Goethe and Leonardo da Vinci. In this same spirit we submitted, on the occasion of the centenary of the death of Adam Mickiewicz, a proposal to commemorate this great Polish poet, who from Poland, Moscow, Paris, Lausanne and Rome preached the gospel of progress and of the brotherhood of man.

(86) Finally, our delegation intends to support all activity in the field of press, radio and film which aims at putting an end to war propaganda and aggression, to hostile propaganda against other States and nations and which will help to develop information in the spirit of international understanding, in the spirit of collective security, in the spirit of broad culture and economic exchange among all nations.

(87) We cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that in some countries a propaganda of revenge and hatred is being spread and supported, finding its way into textbooks and permeating literature, art, press and radio. Dangerous militarist slogans are being revived, and find their way into schools and scientific institutions. We cannot watch this with indifference just as we cannot but oppose racial discrimination and national and racial persecution.

(88) I have had to mention here today certain facts, among others, which lead to the weakening of our Organization. There are however other positive symptoms which testify to the growing strength of Unesco. The joining of our Organization by the nations of the Soviet Union, with which Poland is united by indissoluble ties of friendship, a great power not only from the political and economic points of view, but also a great cultural power, opens up new and broad horizons for the development of international co-operation in the field of culture.

(89) The eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco may be of great importance in the history of our Organization if we grasp the new possibilities offered by the improvement in the international situation and if we take advantage of the outward expansion and the inner reinforcement of Unesco. Let us seek in our everyday work understanding, solutions based upon mutual agreement; let us find a common language and communicate on friendly terms,

irrespective of differences in our political structures.
(90) The last fifty years have brought greater changes than past millenniums. Distance has been abolished. In the days of Caesar a messenger despatched to Gaul had to travel as long as, but no longer than a messenger sent by Napoleon from Italy to France. Uruguay was a very long way from Poland. Today the distance between us has been reduced to 30 hours of flight. But although the physical distances between nations have been eliminated, many prejudices still divide the peoples of the world. The banner of the United Nations has, alas, already been unfurled on the battlefield. May that banner flutter only over the seat of conferences devoted to the achievement of friendly co-operation between the nations in the cause of peace, culture and human welfare.

(91) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Mr. Sommerfelt, Head of the delegation of Norway.

(92) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway): Mr. President, fellow delegates, it is a great experience for a citizen of a northern State to visit this country, which is so distant from his own geographically, but which is akin to it in democratic spirit. Our stay in Montevideo will remain a memorable event in the life of each one of us and also in the history of Unesco.
(93) Unesco is now holding the eighth session of its General Conference. For one who has taken part in its activities from the beginning, it is a satisfaction to see how the work has been gradually getting into shape. On the whole, the Norwegian Government has no serious criticism of the programme for 1955-56. There may, of course, be items on the importance of which we are of a different opinion from that of the programme and budget document, and others which we think might be dropped altogether. But such items are few. The number of Member States having increased, the Norwegian Government thinks that a cautious expansion of the programme is justified. We are whole-heartedly behind the help to the so-called underdeveloped countries and we are of the opinion that the programme of fundamental education is of particular moment in that respect. But we must not forget that Unesco has also other tasks, the task of promoting collaboration between the creative forces in education, science and culture. Unesco must draw these forces into its orbit to a greater extent than hitherto.
(94) I am thinking especially of the great international non-governmental organizations like ICSU, CIPSH, the Theatre Institute, the International Association of Plastic Arts, and others. These institutions, which are planned by experts, must be called upon to do all such work as Unesco's Secretariat can only do less well and more expensively. Unesco's policy of subventions and contracts is therefore, in the view of the Norwegian Government, of very great importance. Both subventions and contracts should be used freely, but only for well specified purposes and under strict control.
(95) As regards staffing policy, the Norwegian Government has followed recent developments with some concern. In our country we have strong traditions of individual liberty, and our civil servants are protected by law against undue influence. It seems to us that freedom of conscience must be safeguarded at all costs, and we hope that an arrangement will be found by which this freedom, which is one of Unesco's ruling concepts, will not be endangered.
(96) Unesco must not become a political organization. It was never conceived as such when we prepared for it in London and drew up its Constitution. Unesco has to work for peace in the realm of the spirit.

(97) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the representative of Thailand.

(98) Mrs. Pin MALAKUL (Thailand): Mr. President, I am very pleased to be at a Unesco General Conference once again, and it is a great honour to have the opportunity to address this distinguished gathering. My first thoughts go to the Uruguayan Government who kindly invited us to this wonderful city, and allowed us meet in this splendid palace. In the name of the Thai delegation, I should like to express our thanks. Apart from that, I have to thank my fellow delegates for doing us the great honour of nominating Thailand a Vice-President of the Conference.
(99) As far as I know, our delegation will have made the longest journey to Montevideo, covering a distance of approximately fifteen thousand miles. During that long journey, we visited the countries of many Member States of Unesco, and we learned a great deal from them. To Thailand, Latin American countries are practically at the opposite end of the world, yet we have many problems in common - similar problems in different settings.
(100) On our way, we saw a number of Unesco projects in operation - the most exciting of which was that at Patzcuaro. Talking about fundamental education, I am pleased to note that, during the period under review in the Director-General's Report a Second Regional Centre was opened in Egypt, and that it is doing well. I am happy to report, too, that under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, Thailand has opened a Fundamental Education Centre at Ubol. The Thai Government has spent no less than half a million dollars on the project.
(101) I would like to thank Unesco for the assistance given to Thailand, especially on two major projects - the fundamental education project at Ubol just mentioned and the Chachoengsao project, where we are attempting to improve the standard of education at all levels within a limited area. As you know, this Chachoengsao project is now approaching its fifth year. But, as the Director-General himself has said in the report, in the spheres which are the particular concern of Unesco, nothing is ever completed. I hope that this Chachoengsao project is a particular concern of Unesco, and that Unesco will continue to give it assistance. That is to say, I hope that assistance from Unesco will not cease at the end of 1955, as stated in a chapter in the proposed Programme and Budget of Technical Assistance.
(102) Now, I should like to say a few words about the experts sent to work on projects. We cannot complain when you sent us such eminent persons as Sir Charles Darwin and Dr. Huxley. But experts often get short-term contracts, too short to be of real service to the projects. I happen to be on our National Commission and, every time we meet,

there are reports of experts going and coming. I expect this is the case in many countries. I really hope that, in the future, experts will be given more time to do their work.

(103) Referring to the report of the Director-General now before us, I should like to congratulate Dr. Evans on this his first report to the General Conference. It is in a form easy to read and will be very useful as a reference document. Its substance shows, in a few words, that Unesco is driving towards concentration of effort on work already started. This is also our policy in carrying out Unesco projects in Thailand.

(104) I am pleased to notice that under Cultural Activities, there are continuing efforts in the fields of libraries, museums and fine arts. I was much interested in reading the chapter about the Brussels Conference on the Rôle and Place of Music in Education, and look forward to reading its proceedings when they are published. This, because at the present time we in Thailand are trying to introduce music into schools more seriously than before. As you know, the Brussels Conference was crowned by the "Canticle of Hope", specially composed for the occasion. I was pleased to hear that symphonic work in Montevideo, sung so beautifully at the opening of our Conference last Friday.

(105) Before concluding, I should like to express my thanks, on behalf of Thailand, to the Director-General and the Chairman of the Executive Board for their visit to my country early this year, as mentioned in the supplementary report. During their visit they spent half an hour at our new Broadcasting Station, which is devoted entirely to education, science and culture. Since their visit, this Broadcasting Station has been giving Unesco news very regularly, with the result that teachers, students and the public in general are becoming more Unesco-minded. The Director-General said on Saturday that he was trying to create confidence, so important was the attitude of the world towards Unesco. I am pleased to inform him that, in my opinion, his task in Thailand is no longer a difficult one.

(106) That our people are taking greater interest in Unesco is obvious from the fact that they are more and more joining our United Nations Association. This Association, with a woman as its President, celebrated United Nations Day in Bangkok, last month, by giving a performance illustrating the work of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. Residents of many nationalities in Bangkok took part in this programme, which, I have just heard from home, was a great success.

(107) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Mr. Paik, Head of the delegation of Korea.

(108) Mr. PAIK (Korea): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the Korean delegation, at the outset, wishes to thank the Uruguayan Government and people for their hospitality in receiving the Conference in their beautiful country and also for their generous participation in the emergency relief programme in Korea. We are grateful, too, to the Executive Board, to our wise Director-General and his colleagues for their successful conduct of the work of the Organization since the last Conference.

(109) The Korean delegation wishes also to express to the distinguished members of this Conference its profound appreciation of the constructive efforts made to rehabilitate our war-devastated country. We have seen, during the past two years, the completion of the textbook printing plant with the timely assistance of $100,000 from this august body and $140,000 from the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. This printing plant, with its up-to-date equipment, stands as a landmark in the progress of the permanent rehabilitation of Korea, concrete evidence of the collective system for world progress. We have also been placed under a great debt of gratitude by the steps taken to implement the fundamental education recommendations of the 1953 Unesco-UNKRA Education Planning Mission to Korea, by the flow of goodwill from all parts of the world to our schools through gift coupons, by the continuation of the technical assistance programme - its amount reduced but its quality improved - and by the opportunity given for the training of the Secretary of our National Commission at Unesco headquarters in Paris.

(110) The National Commission of Korea was finally inaugurated in January 1954, and its headquarters established and staffed for the more vigorous prosecution of the multiple activities of Unesco. We have found, like other Member States of the Organization, that, through the work of the National Commission and the assistance given to our rehabilitation programme, the aims and ideals of Unesco are becoming better known to increasing numbers of our people. But there is much room for further development. We cannot afford to disappoint people who are expecting much from the programme of this Organization. In this connexion, we hope that the time will soon come when our National Commission will be given the benefit of the wisdom and experience of a headquarters staff member, for our Unesco work in Korea.

(111) In Unesco documents, a programme for rebuilding the Korean educational system figures under the head of emergency assistance. An emergency should be a case which requires immediate remedial action. If collective efforts are delayed, the case will become a chronic one. The time has now come for immediate action for rehabilitation in all phases of work that is to ensure freedom and progress. Our Government wishes further and wider implementation of the Five Year Plan recommended by the Educational Planning Mission. It will be recalled that the Mission devoted most of its attention to a reorientation of the content and methods of education. We believe the content of the new education and the methods of teaching in our schools would be very greatly improved if more were known about curricula and teaching methods abroad. Fellowships for foreign study should be provided to established teachers and administrators who have proved their capacity for leadership in education. Technical assistance for scientific and technical teaching and research is greatly needed in Korea for improving the conditions of life. We cannot and must not deny to the war-torn people of Korea the blessings that modern inventions in science and technology have brought to human well-being and happiness. In a less industrialized country, like Korea, a programme for mass communication provides important educational media. Instructional films, audio-visual and technical

aids in development of mass communication, are eagerly sought in order to increase international contacts and the discovery of fresh knowledge. Cultural relics and the works of art created in the course of our long history have been found and preserved. But the same systematic collection, careful preservation and widespread use must be extended to our national treasures in the field of education. Creative writers, artists, playwrights and other cultural groups must enjoy conditions conducive to the production of works of beauty and truth. The recent organization of the Korean Branch of the International PEN Club should receive the attention of similar bodies in other Member States, both for its own sake and for the sake of the exchange of ideas.

(112) I should be guilty of concealing the truth if I refrained from reiterating the need of the physical rehabilitation of our school buildings and equipment. This need has received priority attention from Member States and several United Nations agencies and organizations have done much to meet it. But when we compare the extent of those needs with the actual work done, we must confess that we are still at the beginning. Tens of thousands of classrooms have yet to be provided, if possible with a modern type of architecture better adapted to the Korean setting and natural environment. Teaching materials, laboratory instruments, apparatus, supplies and extra-curricula equipment must be brought in from abroad not only to restore the original conditions, but to meet increasing needs due to the natural growth of the school population. Thus, we should mobilize all resources to restore the educational, scientific and cultural institutions devastated by the war. At the same time we must not lose sight of the long-term objectives of Unesco, the establishment of world peace through the meeting of minds.

(113) The war in Korea has stopped. But it has stopped, only to legalize and perpetuate the most unnatural division of the country. Power politics have disregarded the fact of the unity of the Korean people. A divided Korea is a sorry symbol of the failure of the United Nations thus far to fulfil the requirements of its Charter and the hopes of mankind. Korea is the touchstone of the ability of nations to solve their problems without committing mass suicide. From the point of view of world peace and security, the reunification and independence of Korea are indispensable. We, the Korean people, north and south, confidently and impatiently demand that the free will of the people be allowed expression in an election controlled by the United Nations.

(114) We of this age are eagerly seeking peace and security, but we know that peace and security will not come through denial of the sanctity of the human personality and disregard of human rights. These human ideals can only be realized through devotion to the concept and activation of collective security and through our determination to preserve the peace and honour of all nations, small or large, over-industrialized or less industrialized. Conflicts and tensions in the present-day world are only outward manifestations of man's inner conflict and anguish. Unesco is the moral and spiritual expression of the United Nations. May the work of this year's great Assembly chart a new road towards the fuller realization of justice and freedom.

(115) Before I close, I wish to make a remark or two on the Director-General's Report. I wish that there could have been more frequent and closer contacts between Unesco and the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency in the implementation of the Five Year Plan. Such co-ordination between the two bodies and constant consultation with our Government would have enabled these agencies to accomplish more. I also note with regret that the small subvention to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession has been reduced in the proposed budget. We who are engaged in teaching cannot but feel that the subvention to that world confederation should be restored to its previous amount at least. In closing, I wish to congratulate Dr. Luther Evans, our eminent Director-General, on the magnitude of his accomplishments within the time allowed him.

(116) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(117, Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the delegation of the Soviet Union has asked me to greet the delegates and guests at the eighth General Conference of Unesco and to express the hope that all the participants of the Conference will direct their efforts to making the work of our session constructive and in the highest degree conducive to the fulfilment of the tasks with which workers in the spheres of culture and science have to cope in serving the cause of peace and strengthening cooperation between the peoples.

(118) Among the questions on the agenda of the General Conference there is the question of preparing a history of mankind in the field of science and culture. Soviet scientists are prepared to take an active part in this important, interesting and valuable undertaking of Unesco.

(119) The history of mankind in the field of science and culture is an inexhaustible source of wisdom and knowledge. It is a generally recognized conclusion of history that, if science, culture and education are to be successfully and thoroughly developed, care must be taken constantly and persistently to see that the peaceful development of the human intellect is not interrupted by such odious episodes as wars waged for the sake of profit or for the enslavement of one people by another.

(120) The history of mankind has no record of scientists deeply concerned for the future of science who would at the same time advocate the idea of war. History proves the contrary. Eminent figures in the fields of science, literature and art everywhere were humanists because of their scientific studies and of their works, which have become part and parcel of the heritage of the civilized world. They called men and women to follow the path of freedom, peace and peaceful constructive work. Such leaders of science and culture, whatever their nationality, are immensely respected and beloved by the Soviet people. All men of learning who advance the cause of science have always been united by the great humanitarian purpose of serving their people and by working for the welfare of humanity.

(121) Contemporary workers in the spheres of science and culture in all countries and among all peoples,

correctly reflecting the aspirations of their peoples, are also active supporters of the ideas of peace. It is for them an indisputable fact that the idea of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is historically justified and should be a guiding principle in relations between peoples. Anyone who nowadays asserts that the difference in social systems is a cause of present international tension and a potential cause of a new world war is, intentionally or otherwise, defying the lessons of history and playing into the hands of the warmongers. Scientific and cultural workers in the Soviet Union are convinced that, if the principle of the equality of all peoples is honestly and consistently obeyed, if attempts to impose decisions in international relations are completely abandoned, if national sovereignty is mutually respected and if countries refrain from interfering in the affairs of other countries, it is quite possible in present-day international affairs to achieve a further relaxation of international tensions and preserve peace on earth.

(122) The solution of the controversial or outstanding issues in international life by means of negotiation is, in our opinion, the most humanitarian of all the ideals which were ever developed and defended by great humanists throughout the history of mankind.

(123) The aim of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, as stated in its Constitution, is to contribute to the diffusion of science, culture and education, to contribute to the strengthening of cultural ties between the nations and in this way to work for peace. Surely, the work of our Organization can only be successful if it uses all the means at its disposal to popularize the idea of a peaceful settlement of all controversial issues in international life.

(124) The seventh session of the General Conference of Unesco adopted a resolution calling upon all Member States to further the objectives of international peace, mutual understanding and the common welfare of mankind. We readily join in this appeal. But every appeal calls for concrete action. If the proclamation of a particular idea is not followed by deeds, practical actions, then the idea may become an empty sham. An idea that is not backed by practical deeds is dead.

(125) If we want to give effect to this decision, we must take practical action against disseminating the ideas of war. Propaganda in favour of the ideas of war, ideas of enmity between peoples is utterly inconsistent with the principles proclaimed in the Constitution of our Organization. In this connexion the Soviet delegation attaches great importance to steps being taken to prevent the utilization of mass communication for the propaganda of war and all other propaganda which tends to sow enmity and hatred among the peoples. Books, songs, films, pictures and radio - all these forms of culture should serve the aims of strengthening cultural ties between the peoples, and of spreading the idea of friendship between peoples, the ideas of peace.

(126) As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the idea of war as a means of settling controversies or differences between peoples is utterly rejected by our people. As an expression of our people's inflexible resolve for peace the Soviet Government has enacted legislation condemning all kinds of war propaganda as a heinous crime. In the Soviet newspapers and books, on film screens and in radio broadcasts, in our songs and on the stage, nowhere will you find a call to war, or a glorification of the forces of death and destruction. The intelligentsia of the Soviet Union is the foremost, unbending adversary of war and thus the foremost, irreconcilable adversary of using cultural resources for propaganda in favour of war. This is the spirit in which Soviet intellectuals are bringing up the younger generation in the Soviet Union.

(127) The great October Socialist Revolution brought about radical social changes in our country. These changes formed the basis on which the Soviet people have achieved successes in the development of science, culture and education. The October Revolution liberated the manual and scientific workers, ensured the full development of the creative forces and abilities of all the people. As a result, science, culture and education are developing in our country with ever greater rapidity.

(128) The Soviet Government is constantly devoting all its attention to the development of science, culture and education. This year, more than one-fourth of the enormous State budget of the Soviet Union has been appropriated for education and for satisfying the social and cultural needs of the population. Our country has for a long time past had universal compulsory and free education covering seven years. At the present time the task of introducing a universal ten-year course of education is being successfully accomplished. In the USSR today more than 57 million people are catered for by the various systems of education. This means that one-fourth of all Soviet citizens are at school. They have more than 380,000 public libraries at their disposal.

(129) In pre-revolutionary Russia there were only 92 higher educational institutions with 112,000 students. Today the USSR has about 900 higher educational institutions. In 1954, 1,706,000 students were studying in them. In 1953 about 90,000 scientific workers - professors, lecturers and assistants - were employed in the Soviet higher educational system.

(130) Access to the universities and high schools of our country is freely available to all young people without distinction of sex, nationality, race, religious beliefs or property. Personal ability and personal skill - these are the only criteria applied in selecting young people for higher education.

(131) The development of higher education and education at all other levels exercises an extremely favourable influence on the development of all the national cultures of the peoples of the Soviet Union. The Soviet peoples, by fostering the best traditions established in the literature and art of the Russian nation and of the other nations of former Russia, have created their own new literature, new theatre, music, cinema, painting, architecture and sculpture.

(132) The various forms of culture in the Soviet Union, including education, are being developed in each Republic in the specific forms peculiar to the national character of each people. Quite naturally, therefore, the Soviet Union has a very great variety of cultural activities. This variety, as our experience proves, not only enriches the culture but also contributes to its successful development. Thus, the talents of each nationality are afforded the fullest opportunities for expansion in every direction.

(133) The further development of our Soviet society towards progress, towards the comprehensive and

complete satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of everyone, demands the all-round development of its every nation, every people, and every single individual. We would consider any social system that existed in our country to be pointless and retrograde if it did not offer a solution of these tasks. That is why our State is constantly striving to ensure the all-round development of the abilities, talents and personal qualities of every individual.

(134) The national cultures of the Soviet Union, varied though they are, have something in common. This is the fact that all our various cultures are bringing people up in a spirit of love for peace, love for peaceful, creative labour, in a spirit of friendship and co-operation among the peoples of one and the same nation, in a spirit of friendship and co-operation between all nations. Such an upbringing, such an education moulds optimists out of people, who look towards their future boldly and confidently.

(135) In this great era of the discovery of atomic energy, feelings of pessimism have sprung up and are becoming widespread in certain sections of representatives of intellectual workers in the West: why, they wonder, has science discovered nuclear energy, which can be used as a monstrous weapon for the mass annihilation of peoples? Such pessimism is alien to the Soviet people, to the Soviet intelligentsia. The Soviet peoples rejoice at every conquest achieved by science, including the discovery of nuclear energy. They rejoice because their Government is steadily fighting for the unconditional prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The Soviet people, too, are confident that nuclear energy will be used only in the service of peace. The Soviet delegation considers that our Organization - Unesco - has every chance of playing a great and noble rôle in the solution of this humanitarian problem.

(136) The Soviet Union has acquired great experience in the development of science, culture and education in the service of the peace and prosperity of its 200 million multi-national inhabitants. Soviet men of science, culture and education are willing to share their experience with those nations who desire it. With this aim in view we are prepared to take an active part in the series of international meetings and conferences suggested in the proposed programme of Unesco.

(137) The high level of university education in the Soviet Union enables us to lend assistance in this field to those countries which request it. A considerable number of students and graduates from several countries are being taught in our higher educational institutions. The Soviet Government is prepared to give favourable consideration to the question of awarding university scholarships in institutions of higher education to students from underdeveloped countries out of the Soviet contributions to the UN Technical Assistance Fund.

(138) Soviet workers in science, culture and education have never confined their activities within the boundaries of their own country. They have always sought to assimilate the valuable experience of other nations and States and to put it at the service of their people. USSR publishing houses are doing a very extensive and comprehensive job in creating the necessary conditions for enabling the Soviet people to become acquainted with the achievements of world science and culture. In this connexion I would like to cite some figures. For the period from 1918 to 1954, USSR publishing houses translated into Russian and the other national languages of the USSR the works of 1,658 foreign authors. The total number of books by these authors which have been translated in our country during this period amounts to 13,500. Not only are the works of European and American authors widely published in the Soviet Union, but also those of authors from other parts of the world. In particular, books by Chinese, Indian, Persian, Korean, Japanese authors, as well as authors of other Asian countries, are being more and more widely published. The situation is similar as regards books on science, philosophy and current affairs. The Soviet Union daily receives a great number of foreign publications. Thus, in 1954, the Soviet higher educational institutions alone acquired 2,500 scientific magazines of various kinds.

(139) The Soviet people are greatly interested in the development of the national cultures of the countries of Asia. Some time ago a Festival of Indian films was held in all the cities of the USSR with great success. The Soviet people gave a warm welcome to the performances of artists from India. The recent visit to our country of Indian university professors and students aroused great interest amongst the professors and students of our universities. Comprehensive cultural co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic is growing stronger from year to year. And the Soviet people view with great satisfaction China's enormous progress in the development of science, culture and education. The Soviet people are greatly interested in and sympathetic towards the development of the culture of all the Asian peoples, and are prepared to render them every possible assistance in this great cause.

(140) The Soviet Union displays an unfailing and comprehensive interest in the development of the culture of other regions of the world, as is proved by the expansion and consolidation of its cultural relations with other countries. During the first nine months of 1954 alone, over 300 delegations of Soviet scientific, cultural and educational workers paid visits to other countries. In the same period we welcomed in the Soviet Union delegations of scientific, cultural and educational workers from 72 countries.

(141) The Soviet delegation is confident that the all-round expansion of cultural bonds between nations will contribute to the improvement of mutual understanding between the peoples and to the consolidation of universal peace, which in its turn corresponds to the fundamental interests of all nations.

(142) The Soviet Union is prepared to make its own contribution towards the further consolidation and broadening of the cultural ties between peoples, and trusts that all participants in the General Conference will make every effort to the same end, so that Unesco may be enabled successfully to fulfil the tasks laid down in its Constitution.

(143) In conclusion, Mr. President, allow me to express our gratitude to the Government of Uruguay for the great trouble it has taken in organizing and holding the present session of the General Conference of Unesco in the city of Montevideo.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

# SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 4.30 p.m.*

*President* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Discussion of the Director-General's Report (continued) : Speeches by the delegates of Pakistan, Ceylon, Byelorussia, Canada, Switzerland, Australia, Indonesia, Egypt, Uruguay and the representative of the Organization of American States . . . . . 82

**DISCUSSION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**
(continued)

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Pakistan.

(2) Mr. HUSAIN QURESHI (Pakistan). Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, my delegation fully shares the feelings of gratitude expressed by other delegations to the Government and people of Uruguay for having invited Unesco to hold its eighth session of the General Conference in this beautiful city of Montevideo. It is a source of inspiration to be in the capital of a country which, during the short period of its existence, has succeeded in laying the foundations of a welfare State whose social legislation and liberal traditions have earned admiration, whose educational and social programme is a remarkable testimony to the patriotism of its administrators and where the motto of the Government is that in the advancement and progress of the entire population lies the greatness of the country. In this progress, Mr. President, you have cause for personal pride, since, as Minister for Education, you are responsible for the cultural progress of your country. We are, therefore, proud to have you as our President this term, and we are also grateful to you for what your Ministry and Government have done to make a success of this session. I would also like to express my delegation's appreciation of the part played by Professor Secco Ellauri in having invited the General Conference to Montevideo.

(3) The progress which has been outlined in the Report of the Director-General and the programme contained in it have the fullest support of my delegation. It is gratifying to see that the needs of Member States are being taken into consideration. The Director-General's tour of various countries has been of great importance. We welcomed the visit by the Chairman of the Executive Board, the Director-General and Professor Secco Ellauri to my country, where we had an opportunity of discussing our needs with the team and explaining to them our problems. It gave an opportunity, not only to the members of the Government and the officials concerned, but also to our intellectuals to get acquainted with the programme of Unesco and to have a better understanding of the means by which we can get the utmost benefit from it. I very much hope that such tours will be a regular feature of the activities of this Organization, the more so because the new programme is based upon the idea of greater service to the member nations.

(4) As was pointed out by the retiring President of the General Conference, the emergence of the Asiatic nations as free and independent members of a world community is the outstanding result of the last world war. These nations possess great potential power for good and evil; it is in the interests of the world community that their problems should be properly understood. They should be helped to direct their exuberant energy into constructive channels and to contribute to the welfare of man. In many respects they have to catch up with the progress made by more advanced countries and unless they are able to do so they will not be able to make a beneficial contribution to the progress of humanity. More than anything else these nations need technical advice and help to utilize their resources for raising the deplorably low standard of living of their vast populations and to remove the terrible burden of ignorance and illiteracy. These nations are inheritors of great cultures, the traditions of their civilization often fade into the immemorial past. Those traditions are still alive and potent; they have given a wealth of latent wisdom and philosophy to these peoples. My own country attained a high level of civilization 5,000 years before Christ, the remains of which, revealed by the spade of the archaeologists at Mohenjodaro and elsewhere, astonish the modern historian and layman alike. Still older sites await excavation. The fertile valley of the Indus has witnessed many a flourishing culture, the achievements of which are woven into the texture of the consciousness of our people. Through another source - Islam - we are inheritors of a long tradition created by cultures

which throve in the lands of Iran, Arabia, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome. The complexity of these sources has given the culture of my country a depth and a catholicity of which any people can be proud; and yet, when I look upon the large number of men and women who have to be rescued from illiteracy, I share the impatience of my people who yearn to recover their ancient and glorious tradition. I believe that such must be the feelings of other Asiatic nations as well, who are proud of their cultural traditions, and who, today, find themselves lagging behind younger nations in educational and scientific progress.

(5) But impatience can be a blessing or a curse. It is a blessing if it inspires the people to greater effort, it is a curse if it leads to frustration. At present the Asiatic nations are buoyant and hopeful; it would be a tragedy of the first magnitude if their hopes were to be shattered by their lack of material resources in spite of their great reservoirs of spiritual strength. This may happen if they do not get help and advice from the world community. It will be disastrous if they lose heart and if their buoyancy is turned into frustration; for there is no greater ally of the Devil than the curse of frustration.

(6) I should, however, sound a note of warning. It would be a mistake to think that the vast millions living in Asia are a single mass of people; their cultures, their outlooks on life, the stages of their development all vary and, therefore, their needs and requirements differ widely. An assembly of intellectuals like this needs no reminding that the population of single countries in Asia sometimes outnumbers the entire population of other continents. Asiatic nations should be treated singly. It would be a fallacy to think in terms of regionalism where such masses of people with such vast differences are concentrated. The central source of the idealism of Unesco is universality, and any decentralization of its organization on a regional basis will injure the very purpose of its existence. It is the firm conviction of my Government, fully shared by my people, that there should be no concentration of Unesco agencies away from headquarters, even though they may be merely the instruments for the dissemination of information, in any single country. Unesco deals with various disciplines; an agency which disseminates information regarding a particular discipline could be located in a single country and thus various agencies of information could be equitably distributed over an entire region. This will keep many countries actively interested in the activities of the Organization and the benefits from its various programmes will be distributed more widely.

(7) My delegation attaches the greatest importance to projecting the salient features of different cultures to the entire world. I am aware of the work that has already been done in this connexion, but may I submit that this aspect of the programme needs strengthening? A great deal of misunderstanding, fear and hostility have arisen in the course of history from prejudice and ignorance. Today, when closer communications have made the world so small, it is necessary for the creation of world-mindedness that we should understand the cultures we have hitherto treated not only as foreign to our ideas but also sometimes with hostility. Many an erroneous idea propagated by interested parties has tended to divide the world and to create division and hatred, where nothing but amity and co-operation should have existed. I will take one example: the issues raised by the Crusades and the conflicts between Muslim and Christian powers are no longer live issues. In the world of today, there is no strife between Christians and Muslims as such, but the misunderstandings continue to be as strong and potent as ever. If the peace of the world depends upon the mental attitude of peoples, is it not necessary that Unesco should try, without, of course, going into questions of religious dogma and beliefs, to bring about a better cultural understanding between the followers of all faiths? Such an endeavour will do more than merely create a friendly atmosphere, though that in itself would be no mean achievement. Cultures were created by the efforts of many a great mind, whose contributions should not be lost to the rest of the world, especially when science has brought humanity into such close proximity. More effort should be directed towards the translation of the classics of various countries and the interpretation of their cultural achievements, so that the entire world may be the beneficiary.

(8) Underdeveloped countries are finding it more and more difficult to meet the ever-growing demand for education. Countries like Pakistan which have fast-developing economies can look forward to a future when these demands will be fully met, but, during the period of transition, the shortage of material resources tends to hamper the expansion of educational facilities even to the barest minimum requirements. It would be a fruitful source of investigation to find out if the expenditure on education in economically poorer countries can be reduced without materially affecting its efficiency. This is a problem of the first importance to most of the Asiatic and African countries, and I suggest that it engage the attention of the experts of the world under Unesco's auspices.

(9) My country has taken the fullest advantage of such facilities as have been extended to us. With the help of Unesco we established a training and research centre for geophysics at Quetta. This centre, I am glad to report, has made such satisfactory progress that today we are able to receive trainees from other countries and give them excellent training. In the realm of fundamental education we have started to implement some of the recommendations made by a team of experts sent us by Unesco. Our Village Aid Programme is a major experiment in fundamental education and it has now been extended to the greater part of our country. In addition to personnel trained in Pakistan, a team of ten teachers is now in training at the Unesco Centre for Fundamental Education in Mexico. When it returns, more trainees will be sent. These persons will work at our own training centres. Another team has done excellent work in the suburbs of Karachi and is now extending its activities to the city itself. We have a large population of uprooted refugees, whose physical rehabilitation is to be followed by educational and social resuscitation. The extension of this programme to the refugees, who form a substantial proportion of the population, will be a great help in the arduous task of rehabilitation.

(10) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Ceylon.

(11) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to preface my remarks by

associating my delegation with the numerous tributes that have been paid to the Government of Uruguay for the arrangements made for our reception and for the hospitality that has been shown to us. The impressive ceremony at the opening of the General Conference and the warm welcome we received from the citizens of this town, in particular from the thousands of schoolchildren who were assembled on this occasion, have touched our hearts. Wherever we have been - in the streets, in shops and restaurants - we have met with the same cordiality.

(12) I should like, first of all, to congratulate the Director-General, both on the form and the content of his report. It has been extremely helpful to my Ministry - the Ministry of Education - in the study of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 and in the briefing of the delegation from Ceylon.

(13) Any assessment of the work of Unesco, should, in my opinion, be viewed from two aspects. In the first place, it is very necessary, particularly at a time when the work of Unesco is expanding, when more and more new projects are being included in the programme, to see how far the aims and ideals of Unesco and its purposes and functions as laid down in the Preamble and in Article I of its Constitution are reflected in the actual execution of its programme. It is possible that after such an examination we may find that a complete reorientation of the programme, perhaps a greater emphasis on certain aspects of work and less emphasis on other aspects, will be necessary.

(14) In the second place, the work that has been achieved, as indicated in the Director-General's Report, can represent only a part of the activities of Unesco. The work done by the governments of Member States and the National Commissions is of equal importance, and, as the Chairman of the Executive Board rightly pointed out, there cannot be a true evaluation of the work of Unesco without considering the work done by and through the Member States. I propose therefore in my brief remarks to deal with the report from these two aspects, with special reference to my own country. Owing to limitations of time, I can only touch on some of the more important projects that are of special concern to Ceylon.

(15) The programme of education for living in a world community, with its emphasis on the promotion of teaching about the United Nations and human rights, and the improvement of curricula, textbooks and methods with a view to the development of international understanding, is undoubtedly of very great importance. Extremely useful documents have been published embodying the results of careful study by specialists or the findings of seminars. This work is certainly in full accord with the oft-quoted words in the Preamble of the Constitution that: "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed", and that consequently there should be "free exchange of ideas and knowledge", that we should "increase the means of communication" between the peoples of the world and "employ these means for the purposes of mutual understanding".

(16) If the influence of Unesco is to permeate the masses, the mere publication of texts in the three official languages of Unesco will not help us to achieve our aims and ideals - certainly so far as the peoples of Asia are concerned. This, I think, is a matter that has not been fully appreciated. Take my own country. Only some 20% of the pupils in schools have, in the past, received what one might call an English education, and in recent years the national languages, i.e. Sinhalese and Tamil, have been the media of instruction in all schools. From next year, all pupils up to and inclusive of the ninth year of schooling will receive their education through the medium of the national languages, with English as a compulsory second language from the fourth year. At the present time, 71% of the pupils of school age, viz. from five to fourteen, are at school. Our total enrolment is nearly one-and-a-half millions. But, and the fact is often forgotten, the vast majority of the pupils receive their education entirely through the medium of the national languages. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not for one moment suggesting that Unesco should publish its documents in the national languages of Ceylon. The reason why I referred to the need for the publication of at least a few of the documents of Unesco in the national languages is because there is already a project whereby the Director-General is authorized to arrange for the translation and adaptation into languages other than the official languages of Unesco, of reports and documents which the National Commission wishes to be published. The reference is on page 29, paragraph 4 of Chapter I - "Relations with Member States". The Report goes on to say: "The credits allotted to this resolution have not made it possible to meet all these requests which have reached the Secretariat".

(17) That is rather disappointing. Ceylon itself has been extremely modest in its requirements. The reference to our request will be found on page 57 of the Reports of Member States. We asked for the translation of two documents which we thought would be very useful to teachers of national language schools because of the important decision taken by Ceylon to include teaching about the United Nations in the curriculum of all our schools. I would therefore, on this occasion, strongly urge that more funds be provided for this project, and as early as possible.

(18) In the Reports of Member States, page 56, there is a reference to what we are attempting to do ourselves in the matter of teaching about the United Nations and the observance of Human Rights Week in all our schools.

(19) As you are aware, Ceylon is not yet a member of the United Nations. We have been kept out of this Organization for reasons we do not quite understand, but let me assure you that we are in full accord with the aims and ideals of the United Nations and, through our association with Unesco and other Specialized Agencies, we are, I submit, in all humility striving to do what we can to foster international understanding and friendship, and we feel that it is in our schools that education for living in a world community should begin. I should like at this point to supplement what appears in the Reports of Member States. There has been a further development of International Relations Clubs in Ceylon. We have started such clubs as an experiment in nine of our more important schools of collegiate status, mainly for the benefit of students in University Entrance Classes.

(20) I referred a little while ago to the fact that Ceylon has recently made English a compulsory second language in all our schools. We were therefore

naturally interested in the Seminar on the Teaching of Modern Languages and we are grateful that Unesco held this Seminar in Ceylon. An account of it appears on page 80 of the Director-General's Report. I should like to congratulate the Education Department of Unesco on the excellent planning of this Seminar and the valuable working papers that were prepared. I should also like to pay a tribute to Professor Andersson of Yale University, who was the Director of the Seminar, and to Mr. Felix Walter of the Unesco Secretariat. This Seminar pin-pointed specific language problems of the Asian Member States and the need for follow-up work. We therefore welcome the provision made in the programme for 1955-56 for the establishment of an information and research centre in Asia. I submit that it is in the interests of Unesco itself to encourage development in the teaching of a modern language such as English or French in Asian countries; it means that in years to come there will be far less need for translation of documents into languages other than the official languages of Unesco.

(21) Another important Unesco seminar to which I should like to refer was the one on the teaching of social sciences held in New Delhi early this year. A reference to this seminar will be found in the Supplementary Report of the Director-General. Its findings will be of great value to Ceylon at a time when we are engaged in the revision of our curricula and syllabuses. A Committee has been recently appointed by the Minister of Education to investigate the curricula of schools both at primary and secondary level. We are also glad to find that provision has been made in the draft programme and budget for the establishment of an International Advisory Committee on school curricula. The findings of our National Committee, which is expected to complete its task in the course of next year, would, we trust, be of some value to the International Advisory Committee.

(22) I should like to invite the attention of the Conference to the cultural activities referred to in the Ceylon Report on pages 56 and 57 of the Reports of Member States. Two noteworthy activities undertaken by the National Commission are: the annual and island-wide competition in folk songs and dances for schools and the International Exhibition of Child Art, at which we had exhibits from seven countries. We have also sent a number of exhibits of child art to other Member States such as Australia, Italy, Japan and the United States of America. We would greatly welcome exhibits of child art from other countries so that an International Section might form a regular feature of the Annual Exhibitions of Child Art in Ceylon.

(23) My comments on the Director-General's Report will not be complete without a reference to the fundamental education project at Minneriya, which will be taken over by the Government of Ceylon in the course of next year. I should like to record our appreciation of the good work done by Dr. Hatch and his team of experts. There is not the least doubt that this centre will play a very important part in the rural development of Ceylon. The adult education centres will serve as models to the numerous centres of a similar nature that have been started by the Education Department, and also to the Community Centres organized by the Local Government Department.

(24) There is a reference in the Report to the delay in the appointment of Sinhalese officers to the centre. This delay is no doubt unfortunate, but unavoidable. It was found necessary that, for a project which would ultimately concern several Ministries and Government Departments, the machinery for ensuring close liaison and co-ordination between the centre as such and the various Departments of Education, Health, Agriculture and so on should first be established, and this matter had naturally to be considered at Cabinet level. A co-ordinating committee consisting of Permanent Secretaries has been formed, and is now functioning. The actual project will be under the general control of the Director of Rural Development. The necessary staff has been appointed with the exception of the officer in charge of the project, who will rank as an Assistant Director in the Department of Rural Development. It is expected that this appointment too will be made before the year is out. Furthermore, my Government is anxious that the correct type of officer shall be appointed, and this factor too has contributed to the delay.

(25) Now that Unesco's participation in the project is coming to a close, I should like to make two comments, not in a spirit of criticism but rather as observations which should be valuable to the Technical Assistance Department of Unesco when similar projects are started in other countries. It is essential that, when experts or specialists are sent on projects of this nature, they shall know the language of the people with whom they have to work. The method of working with the aid of interpreters, in undeveloped rural areas, is not always very satisfactory, particularly when one has first to win the confidence of the people with whom one has to work. This lesson has, I think, been brought out very clearly in the experiment in Ceylon. The only officer who was able to secure quick results was the one who succeeded in acquiring a good knowledge of Sinhalese within eleven months of his arrival in Ceylon, a highly creditable achievement. It may be that, in future projects, the field work will have to be done through nationals of the country who have first received a course of training.

(26) The second point I wish to stress is that experts and specialists must make useful contacts with officers in the national governments, particularly with those who are engaged in similar work. Such contacts and exchanges of views between experts and specialists can be of benefit to both parties and would certainly secure a larger measure of co-operation and assistance in the work of the project itself.

(27) I have attempted, within the short time at my disposal, to deal with some of the main features in the Report. There are many problems, particularly in regard to the development of the work of our National Commission, which need closer investigation, and therefore, in conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the Director-General may find it possible to pay a visit to Ceylon in the very near future.

(28) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

(29) Mr. UMREIKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, gentlemen, allow me first of all, on behalf of my

country's delegation, to thank the Government of Uruguay for its hospitality, and for affording us all the opportunity of assembling in this beautiful city to discuss and settle problems connected with the development of international co-operation in the realm of education, science and culture.

(30) The aim of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in joining Unesco was to contribute in every possible way to the fulfilment of the noble aims of this Organization, as proclaimed in Article I, 1 of the Constitution.

(31) We believe that Unesco's work in strengthening international co-operation in the realm of education, science and culture will be more effective if all States, regardless of their social structure, adhere to lofty principles and strive for the adoption of concerted decisions designed to consolidate peace, develop international relations, strengthen friendship and mutual understanding and carry out practical measures for improving the situation in the three fields.

(32) The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that all Unesco's practical activities should contribute towards the solution of problems affecting the vital interests of all States - such as questions of international security, of improving economic conditions, of developing culture and education. This aim can be achieved if the basic material resources of all States are devoted not to the production of armaments and the forging of military blocs, but to education, science and culture. Unesco's activities in this field will help to relax international tension and strengthen peace and friendship between the peoples and will create in all States favourable conditions for carrying out an extensive programme of educational, scientific and cultural development. Of course, these vital tasks can only be successfully achieved provided all countries intensify their co-operation with Unesco. In this connexion it is essential to the success of Unesco's work that the People's Republic of China, that great peace-loving power with a rich, centuries-old culture, should participate in that work.

(33) It must be pointed out also that the adoption of such unjust decisions as the decision to postpone consideration of the question of admitting Rumania and Bulgaria to membership of Unesco is prejudicial to the Organization's prestige.

(34) The Director-General, in his Report, has rightly stressed the importance of Unesco's relations with other international organizations, and of associating them with Unesco's work. Nevertheless, we should like to draw attention to the fact that Unesco should not disregard but should associate in its work and extend and strengthen her ties with certain truly democratic international organizations which are working for the defence of peace and for educational progress.

(35) As regards the practical aspect of Unesco's work, the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that Unesco should pay attention to the question of giving assistance to economically underdeveloped countries, which are experiencing great difficulties. In extending such assistance, it is essential to adhere strictly to the principle that economic aid to underdeveloped countries should never be made dependent on a demand for privileges for the countries and organizations granting such assistance.

(36) Unesco must, in expending its budget funds, strive to reduce administrative expenditure to the minimum and so increase the sums available for direct expenditure on progress in the fields of education, science and culture.

(37) The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that attention should also be drawn to the need for more purposeful and concentrated utilization of funds for the direct fulfilment of first priority needs, such as the elimination of illiteracy by organizing teaching in the vernacular, the development of national cultures, and the exchange of experience, steps being taken to spread a knowledge of the favourable results achieved in those countries which have already made marked progress in this domain.

(38) I would like to dwell for a moment on the progress achieved by the people of my Republic in the matter of education and culture. A comparatively short time ago, some forty years or so, our country was culturally backward; education was the prerogative of the wealthy; 80% of the population were illiterate, and there was not a single higher educational institution throughout the whole of Byelorussia. Today Byelorussia has changed, culturally speaking, out of all recognition. To give an idea of the extent of our country's cultural progress, it is enough to mention that there are operating in Byelorussia, in the 1954-55 educational year, 11,600 ordinary schools, including 1,350 secondary schools, and that the total number of pupils attending these schools alone is over 1,300,000, whereas, before the October Revolution of 1917, there were only 250,000 pupils attending all the schools in the Republic. We have had to expend a considerable amount of money and effort on rebuilding our network of schools and educational establishments, a large proportion of which were destroyed by the Hitlerite invaders during the second world war.

(39) We are at present carrying through a programme of transition from universal seven-year primary schooling to universal secondary schooling in regional centres and large industrial towns; and we are laying the foundations for completing the transition during the next five-year plan to universal secondary schooling in all districts as well. In the Republic as a whole, 85% of young people, after completing the seven-year school course, go on to study at ordinary secondary and technical secondary schools. For the benefit of young people who were prevented by the war from completing a seven-year or secondary school course, 1,266 evening seven-year and secondary schools have been set up.

(40) The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic has a broad network of scientific research establishments. The centre of activity is the Byelorussian Academy of Science. There are at present in operation in the Republic 27 higher educational establishments, including the University, 9 scientific research institutes, and a whole series of experimental and selection stations and other research establishments.

(41) Byelorussian scientists are concentrating on studying and exploiting the country's natural resources and expanding productivity with a view to continuing to improve the economic situation of the Byelrussian Soviet Socialist Republic and satisfying more fully the ever-growing material and cultural needs of our people. Byelorussian scientists have also achieved

significant progress in the social sciences. 1954, for example, saw the publication of the standard work "The History of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic", the outcome of years of painstaking preparation on the part of Byelorussian historians.
(42) There have also been great successes in Byelorussian literature. The works of Byelorussian writers and poets such as Yanka Kupala, Yakub Kolas, Krapiva, Kuleshov, etc. have received wide recognition not only in Byelorussia and the other Republics of the Soviet Union but in foreign countries as well. At the same time, a whole series of outstanding works by writers both of the other Republics of the Soviet Union and of foreign countries have been translated into the Byelorussian language. The work of Cervantes, Molière, Schiller, Shakespeare, Byron, Mark Twain, Maupassant etc. are being studied in the schools. Our literary scholars have carried out research into the history of Byelorussian literature. The publishing of books is developing successfully. In 1953 alone the Byelorussian State Publishing House published 639 different books totalling 17 million copies in all, or more than 80 times the number of books published in 1913.
(43) The culture of the Byelorussian people is rich and diverse. Opera and ballet with a repertory including Russian and world classics as well as Byelorussian operas and ballets, enjoy great popularity in the Republic. There are also a large number of playhouses, a State philharmonic society, a music-hall, several choirs and dance troupes and a wide network of amateur entertainment companies. For the training of professionals there is a college of dramatic art, a musical academy, and a number of other colleges and schools. The Republic is working actively on expanding the network of public libraries, museums and clubs. We now have 7,552 public libraries, containing a total of over 12 million volumes and about 4,500 cultural-educational establishments.
(44) The entire cultural-educational system in our Republic, as well as all the teaching and scientific establishments, propagate peace and friendship between peoples. These ideas correspond to the vital interests of our people, who bore the brunt of the recent war and made an important contribution to the destruction of the Hitlerite invaders.
(45) The year 1954 has been marked by the extension of international cultural ties. There is no doubt that the extension of cultural ties between the peoples contributes to mutual understanding and the strengthening of peaceful neighbourly relations between the nations of the world.
(46) We hope that our joint efforts at this Conference will lead to the consolidation and development of cultural ties and will constitute an important contribution to the struggle of the peoples to reduce international tension and consolidate peace throughout the world.

(47) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Canada.

(48) Mr. PIERCE (Canada) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, no better site could have been chosen for our Conference than the splendid city of Montevideo. The Canadian Government, which I have the honour to represent, wishes to express its heartiest thanks to the Government of Uruguay for its kind hospitality. We are all keenly appreciative of the innumerable kindnesses and delicate attentions shown us. In this great city of Montevideo, we have everything we need - a warm-hearted and generous people who are living exemplars of a magnificent spirit of co-operation, sunshine and a healthy climate which are a helpful stimulus to our deliberations. Nor is inspiration lacking, and that is an essential element for our task of directing the powerful forces of education, science and culture towards true international understanding.
(49) Mr. President, I have opened my address in French in recognition of the fact that Canada's two official languages and two cultures - French and English - are part of the essence of our country and our national heritage. Allow me now to continue my remarks in English.
(50) During the two years since the last Unesco General Conference the international climate has improved considerably. Some of the storms have subsided and the clouds on the horizon are not quite so dark or foreboding. There has been a lessening of the suspicions that contribute to world tension. We have removed or surmounted a few of the barriers to the dissemination of culture and knowledge conducive to better understanding and mutual respect.
(51) It is a better climate than we have known for years for the fruitful pursuit of our principles. New members and associate members have swollen our ranks and, if all of us, old and new, discharge the duty laid upon us by the Constitution in the spirit required of us by the Constitution, we shall be stronger in achievement as well as in numbers.
(52) This Conference has another special feature: we are holding it when Unesco is eight years old. Eight years is a sufficiently long period in the history of an international organization in which to build up a measure of experience which can serve as some guide to the future. From here, from a review of our past activities, we can envisage the form if not the features of our future. We can now say with better justification than ever before that it is promising; and we have it in our hands, to an extent never before possible, to shape our destiny. This is perhaps the first Unesco Conference at which we can call upon the facts of our past to give substance to the visions of our future.
(53) It is well that the climate is better and that we have experience to draw on and new additions to our strength, because in the next few weeks we shall have to decide upon the fundamental structure of Unesco. We approach our task with the help of the Director, members of the Executive Board and of the Secretariat, who have recognized and analysed our most serious problems and have laid down the lines for their solution.
(54) They will excuse me, I hope, if I say that we were disappointed in a matter of presentation. The inclusion of many urgent and important activities - notably technical aid to the underdeveloped countries - in the "higher budgetary level" created an unfortunate impression that, unless the budget were increased, the programme could not be remodelled and we could not concentrate on tasks of major importance. Happily, we have been assured that such an impression is inaccurate.
(55) After that aside, I emphasize that our delegation thinks the work of the Director-General, the Board and

the Secretariat was, on the whole, soundly based and ably executed. We appreciate in particular their help in indicating solutions to our problems that will allow us not only to achieve our aims but which hold promise of new usefulness for Unesco in the service of mankind.

(56) The most critical of these problems is, we believe, the remodelling of the programme. We hope that from the report before us will emerge a resolution which will incorporate the main proposals of the report and, better, that it will restate them in even stronger and more positive terms.

(57) We consider it essential that the programme be remodelled in such a way as to ensure that we devote our resources intensively to the most pressing international problems and to the most urgent needs of underdeveloped countries. That will require us to answer not only the question: What problems are the most pressing and what needs the most urgent? but also this: What projects can we abandon if there is not room enough for all of them?

(58) And when we succeed, as I am sure we shall, in charting our course, it would be wise for us to lay down at least some general lines of guidance to those who will have to hold Unesco to its new course. We must hope that the guidance would urge the inclusion, whenever possible, of time-tables for stages of execution; the adoption of procedures for appraising projects, for their selection, and for their evaluation. In appraisal and evaluation, we think it would be of great value to strive for an objective viewpoint, to strive to bring to bear a judgment not necessarily independent of the Organization but independent of sponsor and executor.

(59) We would hope, too, that we could provide the Director-General and the Secretariat between conferences with the best available financial guidance and advice on programme activities. Such help could best come, we believe, from representatives who are not only competent in their own fields but who are responsible to their governments.

(60) Somewhere along this road we may, if we follow it, come to a point where we need no longer plead for the support and confidence of governments and peoples. We shall have earned them. I am optimistic enough to expect, too, that a time may come when we need not plead for bigger budgets - at least not as persistently and as plaintively. I think we can hasten that day if we rely less on promises or forecasts of what we could do if we had more money, and if we rely more on the record of what we have done with the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us.

(61) The expansion of Unesco can and should be the consequence of effective achievement. We had this heartening experience in Canada: we found that, if an international organization demonstrates that it can do effective work, the public demands that it receive the support it needs. Last year, Canada nearly doubled her contribution to the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance; and it did so in direct response to public sympathy and public support. Unesco, too, will advance best and fastest not on prophecy but on performance.

(62) We have one month in which to determine the course Unesco is to follow during the next two years. Our delegation feels that we at this Conference have an opportunity, if we make good use of the experience of the past eight years and of the help offered us by those devoted to the Organization and dedicated to the cause, to strengthen Unesco beyond effective challenge and enable it to contribute fully to the welfare of man.

(63) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Switzerland.

(64) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Swiss delegation I have some remarks to make about the Director-General's Report and his programme for 1955-56. May I say first of all that the presentation of these documents strikes me as well conceived. The general introduction and the individual introductions to the chapters devoted to each department provide us this year with a general perspective which was sometimes lacking in earlier reports; and the budget estimates are clear and well arranged.

(65) The main improvement, however, is a satisfactory staggering of all work. This is the first time, since we adopted the two-year work period, that it has been possible really to design and present the programme on that basis. The present document is not simply two annual programmes strung together: while retaining the valuable heritage of the past, it opens up new short- and long-term prospects.

(66) Last, but not least, on the initiative of the Executive Board, the Director-General is putting before the Conference, concurrently with his Report and programme, the principles which he suggests should be followed in the planning of future programmes: I refer to document PRG/13, which introduces a logical and constructive distinction between general and continuing activities on the one hand and special activities on the other. If I may be permitted a metaphor borrowed from motoring, while so far we have been driving with sidelights we are now switching on powerful fog-piercing headlights, lighting up the road well beyond the stretch immediately ahead, right up to the distant bends of the hill we have to climb.

(67) These well-assorted documents are a happy and significant indication of the close co-operation between the Director-General and the Executive Board under the "sound constitution" the latter has so far enjoyed and, we hope, will continue to enjoy in future.

(68) The Swiss delegation considers that the true solution lies, not in compromise, but in balance: the great permanent general services started by Unesco - from which we are gathering or are about to gather the first harvest - must be maintained as our Constitution requires. But at the same time we must continue to be ready, alertly and realistically, to apply our Organization's efforts at the new points and unforeseen stages where they may be needed.

(69) To put it another way, simultaneously with serving the values of a civilization which is our glory, the programme must leave room for remedying evils which are the all too grave and frequent "accidents", the scourge and, on occasion, the shame of our age.

(70) The so-called "developed" countries must consider what they, too, need in the way of education and the wider spreading of knowledge, in spite or because of the qualities we readily concede them, in spite or because of their privileges or their luck. And I mean education in its most advanced and modern forms, for instance, education for living in a world community;

it must begin in the schools, be carried on in the universities and flourish for and with the help of the whole adult population.

(71) Without anticipating the discussions of the Programme Commission, the Swiss delegation thinks that they will be less restricted and more fruitful if what is called the higher budgetary level is accepted as the ideal target from the beginning.

(72) Among the reasons why the programme we are considering must commend itself to us are certain new projects of which the importance and immediacy have been recognized in good time. I will give only one example, leaving it to my delegation to deal with other problems at the appropriate juncture. The example I have in mind is this: the Director-General, on the initiative of the Executive Board, is proposing to seek the best means of co-ordinating and promoting the research being undertaken by scientists throughout the world in order to combat the scourge of cancer. Some projects launched by Unesco - for instance the European Centre for Nuclear Research - have been realized in a remarkably short time. But these projects were limited in scope. Here, however, is a project - dealing with cancer - of concern to the whole world, to every people, to leaders and masses alike, to developed and underdeveloped countries, whatever the hemisphere in which they lie and whatever the ideology they profess; and this project would not have the fullest chances of success on any narrower basis than that which our Organization provides.

(73) May I also draw your attention to the wise way in which this project is presented: if we agree that scientific research in general is within Unesco's terms of reference, and that the practical application of such research is the province of other Specialized Agencies, we see and applaud in this Unesco project the determination to co-operate, from the earliest stage of the research, with the World Health Organization. All countries rightly concerned for the development of closer co-operation between world organizations of experts will rejoice with us and - my delegation hopes - will support an enterprise of such great humanitarian significance, which will show the peoples of the world that the will to co-operate is not an empty phrase.

(74) This programme must also commend itself to us inasmuch as it proves that the Director-General has borne in mind certain lessons of the past. Here again I will confine myself to stressing one point, among many, by way of example. The Director-General has grasped that "mass communication" is a complex concept and that it should be made up of two related but distinct parts.

(75) It means, firstly, developing all the media available to men, States, institutions and associations for the exchange of information and news among themselves. That is mass communication as a programme auxiliary.

(76) Secondly, on pain of having its noblest intentions and finest endeavours overlooked, misjudged and stultified - as happens all too often - our Organization, backed by governments and National Commissions, must make its aims, methods, plans and hopes - and of course the successes it has already achieved - better known throughout the world. That is mass communication in the other sense; the sense of intelligent propaganda.

(77) My delegation is glad to acknowledge the considerable services rendered by the Secretariat, which, if I may be pardoned another motoring metaphor, is always getting better run in. Among other things, we are pleased with a recent promotion giving formal recognition to the work of a high official of Unesco as an authority on the co-ordination of programme activities. This step will undoubtedly help the Director-General to carry out his policy of making personal contacts, which are as necessary in the Secretariat at the Paris headquarters as in the Member States to which he has paid and will continue to pay his much appreciated visits.

(78) In conclusion, the Swiss delegation would ask the Director-General and the Secretariat to find the best way of informing Member States more systematically about the implementation of certain measures. Cases in point are the great international conventions, such as that on the free flow of cultural materials, now signed and ratified by a number of governments and parliaments. If there are any shortcomings in the implementation of these agreements, if there is any delay, let us be told: let us be given the reasons and shown how the situation can be remedied. I wonder if there are many Member States whose consciences are absolutely clear in this respect, who have nothing with which to reproach their governments. Which of us would dare to make that claim? Let the Director-General have no fear of telling us what he knows and what he feels. We are not asking him to accuse anyone, but simply to give us advice which we feel sure will be constructive and tactful.

(79) Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have given you a few of the considerations and ideas to which the Swiss delegation attaches importance. Before leaving this rostrum I should like to pay tribute, first and foremost to the Government and people of Uruguay whose welcome has been a happy augury. A mass demonstration such as we saw last Friday, at once planned and spontaneous, the masterly expression of a lofty culture, enabled us to sense the heartbeat of a people, a people with faith in Unesco. We shall never forget it. Next, I should like to pay tribute to the nobly inspired utterance of Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan in his presidential address and of the charges he laid upon us. We of the Swiss delegation find in his words a source of strength and confidence in our present and future labours. Those labours will be the more fruitful in that we have here an unmatched opportunity to tackle them together, as part of an enlarged team and in a world spirit which must remain free from any tincture of politics.

(80) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Australia.

(81) Mr. PRATT (Australia): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like, on behalf of the Australian Government, and of my colleagues who represent that Government at this Conference, to express to the Director-General and his colleagues our appreciation of his Report on the activities of the Organization. The Report is a comprehensive one, and reflects the very wide range of activities stimulated and brought about by the existence of Unesco. The Director-General touches also on a number of problems vital to the future of Unesco, as well as on potential fields for future action.

(82) Our view is that Unesco will make a significant contribution to the promotion of peace and international co-operation by doing a limited number of really important things and doing them well. It is generally agreed that the programme of the United Nations and the individual programmes of the Specialized Agencies should be stabilized. By this my delegation understands that it is not reasonable to expect the Director-General and his staff to cope with more than a given volume of work in a year or in two years. This is not merely a matter of money. It is a matter, also, of other resources, of planning, of organization and of the availability of men and women. I do not think this point of view is inconsistent with the notion of decentralization which the Director-General referred to very briefly on Saturday afternoon last.

(83) So our programme should be limited. We should try to do the most important things, and to do them well. To our tests of importance must be added tests of practicability and of appropriateness. Let us profit from experience in applying these tests. After more than eight years of operation we have found that some things, though undoubtedly important, are not at present practicable for an Organization such as ours. Some years ago a session of the General Conference adopted a programme including a project of very great importance - the development of the Hylean Amazon. Little progress was made. The project, in the form adopted, was important, but it was not practicable. It may not have been appropriate. With this experience behind us our approach to another important problem - that of the arid zones - has been different. But we must always watch, with a project such as the arid zone one, that its development by Unesco is appropriate to Unesco's interest; that, for example, we do not attempt developments which are really matters for the World Health Organization or for the Food and Agriculture Organization.

(84) Importance, practicability and appropriateness. Each one of these limits the range of acceptable projects. Let us consider practicability. To be successfully developed a project must, in our opinion, not only have the support of the General Conference and the hard work of the Director-General and his staff, but also the active co-operation of those Member States that will be most closely concerned. We appreciate the work of the Director-General and his staff as reflected in his Report, and we appreciate their efforts to carry out whatever programme is approved by the Conference. But we realize that on occasions, although the Director-General and his colleagues do all they can to launch and foster a project, there may be little support for it from Member States. In our opinion, the Director-General, after consultation with the Executive Board, should be encouraged to abandon such projects. We believe that the only successful Unesco projects are those which influence, and change in a favourable way, conditions in Member States.

(85) We go further: we believe that the really important activities for Unesco are not only those which influence Member States, but those which will secure active co-operation in Member States. This oversimplifies the matter and I do not overlook the importance of international non-governmental organizations and of the many devoted and distinguished persons who have contributed to Unesco's programme.

(86) Nor for one moment do I wish to detract from the key position which the Director-General and his staff occupy. All I would do is to urge that this General Conference encourage the Director-General and his colleagues so to act that they will, by their organization and planning and by their approach to the items in the programme, use these items to evoke in Member States action which will achieve Unesco's objects.

(87) I said at the beginning that it has been generally agreed that the programme of the United Nations and of the Specialized Agencies should be stabilized. This does not mean that we believe Unesco's programme should be frozen. Far from it. But in our view Unesco's programme is not what the Secretariat does - that is only a part of it. The important part is what is done in and by Member States. And by Member States I mean governments. If Unesco is to lead to developments in education, science and culture, developments which will promote peace and international understanding and will enhance for men and women the quality and joy of living, then this will not be done by a few people in Paris, nor yet by international or national non-governmental organizations, important though they be. Let us take the field of education. In this, the Director-General has a staff of about a hundred in addition to another hundred technical assistant experts - altogether about the staff of two large teachers colleges in Australia. The Director-General's educational staff can only be effective if they can influence the government authorities (national, provincial or local) who determine educational policies and carry those policies out. This is a slow and strenuous business. It is a job that needs the support of teachers organizations - national and international - and of universities and of interested groups of parents and citizens. But let us make no mistake: Unesco's work has hardly started when we adopt a programme. It only starts when that programme is accepted by Member States and begins to influence educational policy and practices. Real progress comes when it affects pupils!

(88) It is of great interest to us that the Director-General and the Executive Board have, during the past year, devoted special attention to the reorganization of Unesco's programme. The Australian Government believes that the programme should be re-examined. We believe that too much has been said about what Unesco is doing and that relatively too little has been done. We believe that too little has been done because too much has been attempted and limited resources have been overstrained. We hope, therefore, that this General Conference will encourage the Director-General and the Executive Board to continue to concentrate the programme of the Organization so that we shall attempt fewer things, and only things that we can do well and that are best worth doing. We hope that the Director-General and his staff will carefully review their permanent services, not only in preparation for a conference, but week by week during the year. We hope they will be prepared to say to some requests that these are beyond their resources.

(89) Finally, to return to the most difficult problem of all, I mentioned in my opening words that it is easy for any delegation to list items for a Unesco programme. What is difficult for us is to agree on a few items which are important, practicable and appropriate. Yet this is what we must do if Unesco is to succeed. Look

around our meeting, and see our differences - of physique, of colour, of customs, of languages, of ideas. But let us look again, not at the differences, but at the common features. These are far greater than our differences. For we are all men, sharing for a time life on this planet, enjoying literature, music and the pursuit of intellectual life in the company of our fellows. Surely as men we can agree on a programme which will let us together do a few things well and in doing them show that Unesco does mean international co-operation and does promote peace.

(90) This session has started well. Our host country has provided excellent facilities. Our Director-General has provided a clear Report and first-class working documents. Ours is the responsibility to see that this Conference leads to sound decisions and effective action.

(91) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Indonesia.

(92) Mr. SUDJONO (Indonesia): Mr. President and fellow delegates, first of all, on behalf of my delegation and in the name of the Government of Indonesia, I should like to express our gratitude to the Government of Uruguay for extending to all of us warm hospitality and a cordial welcome to their great country and to this beautiful city of Montevideo. Coming from a distant part of another continent, the Indonesian delegation feels especially pleased and privileged to be in a country which can feel rightly proud of its culture and of its civilized way of life.

93) The Government and people of Indonesia have always had the highest regard for the principles of peace, freedom and mutual understanding, for which Unesco stands. Indeed, we regard Unesco as the most vital and basic organization for building up all systems and habits of co-operation between nations. In the things of the mind and spirit we can all share in abundance, and in the field of education, science and culture there should be no prejudices to divide man from man. For this reason we welcome new Member States to this family of nations; the more universal the membership of Unesco, the greater are the chances of lessening tensions and for the growth of tolerance and goodwill in the world of today. We fervently hope that our deliberations will not be marred by political dissensions and by all the ill will and ugliness which such conflicts breed.

(94) The Indonesian delegation is pleased with the achievements of Unesco as described in the Report of the Director-General. After eight years, Unesco has erected an impressive structure of international co-operation, upon which greater achievements can be built quickly and confidently. The Government of Indonesia is grateful to Unesco for valuable assistance received in the fields of primary education, library development, science teaching, audio-visual aids and textbook production. During the coming years we hope to receive its assistance in various fields, among which the most important are the teaching of natural and social sciences at university level, the establishment of a Terminological Bureau, preservation of cultural property, development of museums, education through arts and crafts, and the award of fellowships and scholarships. In the field of technical assistance, we should like to receive experts for longer terms than is the practice at present; unless an expert has at least two years in a specific job, his usefulness is limited, and there is a certain amount of waste.

(95) There is another question to which I refer somewhat reluctantly. This is the better geographical distribution of posts in the Secretaria.. It is a pity that, with its population of eighty millions and its rich and unique cultural heritage, Indonesia has never been represented on the professional staff of Unesco. Such representation is essential, not so much for the sake of Indonesia, which can ill spare its qualified personnel, but for the sake of Unesco, which should have a Secretariat fully representative of the main geographical and cultural areas of the world. In the case of Asian and African candidates, who have no roots in European culture, the language qualification for recruitment should be relaxed. Europeans and North Americans, especially those whose mother tongue is English or French, have a special advantage over the others, especially over Asians or Africans, who have to learn their own languages and among whom there are very few possessing a knowledge of the working languages of Unesco. We feel that the work of the Secretariat could be so organized as to utilize the services of persons who have a first-hand knowledge of educational and cultural conditions in a particular region, without necessarily possessing the highest linguistic qualifications. I hope that the Director-General will consider my suggestion, even if it implies a slight increase of staff. Unesco service rightly demands the highest standards of efficiency, but efficiency does not mean linguistic proficiency alone, or conformity to the administrative methods or standards of the West; more important than these factors are first-hand knowledge of an important culture, personal integrity, complete freedom from prejudice or partiality, and a burning faith in internationalism.

(96) The Indonesian delegation will comment on the draft programme and budget for 1955-56 when this document is examined by the appropriate bodies. At present, I only wish to congratulate the Director-General and the Executive Board on having prepared an excellent programme, which is a very great improvement on the past. The increased provision of assistance to Member States, especially in the field of culture, which was sadly neglected by the United Nations Programme of Technical Assistance, is most commendable. Member States in the economically less developed countries require assistance in establishing and developing libraries and museums, preserving and protecting cultural property, improving education through the arts and the crafts, and producing cultural material like books, art reproductions and films. The dissemination of culture is, indeed, as important as formal education in school, and we hope that Unesco will increase its programme in this field, which is also the best way of increasing international understanding.

(97) My delegation is especially pleased with the project for the production of reading material for new literates and for the study of traditional culture in communities of South East Asia undergoing rapid technological changes; both these projects are of the greatest significance to Indonesia, indeed to all Asian and African countries. Larger resources are needed for these and other items of the programme, if even a

fraction of the needs is to be met. If the seventy-two Member States of Unesco have a strong enough faith in the ideals of peace and the brotherhood of man, these needs can surely be satisfied by diverting sterile and wasteful expenditure on armaments to constructive tasks in the service of humanity.

(98) Unesco can contribute immensely to the improvement of international understanding by an effective programme of cultural understanding, and especially by making the East and the West better known to each other. We must also find a place for the spread of moral and spiritual values, of tolerance, goodwill and humanism through the programme of Unesco. In our obsession with material comfort through science and technology, we must not forget the education of the heart - the inculcation of a belief in the Supreme Being - which is the true culture of the individual and of society - and which is also the highest aim of Unesco.

(99) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Egypt.

(100) Mr. AWAD (Egypt): Mr. President and fellow delegates, although this discussion is concerned with the Report of the Director-General of Unesco, it is not inappropriate that I should begin by expressing my gratitude at this, my second visit to the South American continent. My first was in 1936. My mission at that time was a Unesco-like assignment; I was representing Egypt at a congress of PEN Clubs, at Buenos Aires. I travelled then by steamer. This time I travelled by air, for some 42 hours, to enjoy again the hospitality of the great "República Oriental del Uruguay", the great welfare State, which in many respects reflects our conception of a true modern democracy. I have the pleasure and the honour to bring to this great and young democracy the greetings and the most cordial wishes of the ancient, though perhaps still quite young people of Egypt.

(101) The people of Egypt as well as those of all Arabic-speaking countries feel a strong affinity with the peoples of the Iberian peninsula and of Latin America, and we feel a certain amount of pride in their great achievements, and to wish them continuing success, not only in their national undertakings but also in their international activities; for it is gratifying to see the young democracies of the Western Hemisphere playing a leading rôle in international relations, and helping to demonstrate the essential unity of mankind. The Atlantic is fast becoming a narrow ditch. Soon the Pacific will go the same way.

(102) I must now turn to the Report of our Director-General. It is a good document, consisting of two parts, both full of clear and lucid information. I do not intend in this brief commentary to criticize or even to refer to any individual project except by way of illustration. My desire is simply to make a few observations of a general nature, concerning the major aspects of Unesco's work.

(103) My first remark concerns the multiplicity of our activities. The sole object of Unesco is to work for peace among the nations through collaboration and mutual assistance in the fields of education, science and culture. It may safely be said that all aspects of cultural co-operation are bound in some measure to promote peace. Some activities, however, are more directly concerned with the promotion of peace than others. In our enthusiasm for some pet project, we are liable to forget this important criterion. The problem of peace is the greatest problem the world is facing and Unesco should be one of the most effective instruments for tackling it. The point cannot be overemphasized, and I feel sure that it will always be borne in mind by our Executive Board in guiding and planning our activities.

(104) Unesco is said in some quarters to be trying to carry out projects which fall within the domain of other organizations or Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. It might, of course, be the other way round: other organizations may be engaging in what are legitimate Unesco activities. If such is the case, Unesco might well allow this task to rest on the shoulders of some sister organization. I am sure that our Executive Board will see to it that we do not tread upon the tender feet of other agencies, and we shall always wish them every success in their endeavours.

(105) I wish also to refer to an aspect of our programme which I should like to see maintained. It seems that there is a tendency at this stage to confer upon the programme of Unesco a certain fixity or rigidity. I can well imagine this to be possible or even desirable in some other organizations. But Unesco is concerned with the "Mind of Man", whose broad horizon and wide scope are not compatible with limitations or restrictions, especially at the present stage, when Unesco is still very young and in process of development. It is quite possible that mistakes will be made. But no blame can be attached to Unesco on their account, for only those who do nothing at all can avoid mistakes.

(106) The Egyptian delegation feels that much has to be done to make the world Unesco-conscious. This applies not only to all countries, but also to the different sections of the population of each country. The need, we feel, is equally great in the advanced and in the underdeveloped countries. The technique to be employed in making the world more Unesco-conscious will probably differ in different countries. For certain advanced countries films and publications may prove effective. In my own country nothing has proved so effective in educating the general public concerning Unesco as the establishment of the Arab States Fundamental Education Centre. This centre, which began to function about two years ago, is the ideal Unesco project from many points of view. Its cost to Unesco is not large, it brings Unesco into direct and intimate contact with the people. The host country bears a large share of the expense. The project serves a group of countries with identical cultural backgrounds. Its programme of work represents an attempt to meet all the conditions of fundamental education as set out on pages 41 and 42 of the Director-General's Report. I had the good fortune when I was Minister of Education to preside at the first graduation ceremony towards the end of August, and to hand their diplomas to the first group of young men and women graduates from the different Arab countries. I also paid visits, after the ceremony, to two of the villages where the students were doing their practical work, or rather where they were inducing the villagers to do the work themselves. This work covered such a wide range of activities as sanitation, agriculture, domestic economy, health, as well as the usual literacy campaign. The centre continues to develop and to progress, and its new dormitory for 150 persons will permit other

parts of the older building to be used for other activities. We were fortunate in having the new building inaugurated last September by our Director-General himself, who managed to pay a flying visit for the purpose in spite of the pressure of work at headquarters and elsewhere. We cannot thank him enough for this visit, though it was far too short to enable him to look properly at other activities of great interest to Unesco, such as educational work for the Arab refugees and the interesting archaeological activities, in which Unesco takes a special interest.

(107) Egypt continues to be an almost inexhaustible treasure ground for records of ancient times; and the zeal of the archaeologist continues to uncover unexpected relics of the past. Only last spring, great interest was aroused by the discovery, near the southern side of the Great Pyramid, of what seemed to be two funerary boats, apparently intact, which have been lying there for some 48 centuries. The universal interest aroused in this find is an indication of the human value of all relics of the past, which are not merely a legacy of the country where they are found but of the entire world. Surely, then, Unesco is justified in sending a special expert to assist in photographing and cataloguing pictures and drawings and bas-reliefs, which are in danger of being destroyed by the perennial irrigation of modern times and other factors.

(108) Egypt is a country which lies at the junction of the continents, and at the cross-roads of all the routes and highways of the world. It is perhaps the least isolated country in the world. This is probably best reflected in its activities in the field of cultural interchange. We have hundreds of Egyptian students studying abroad. We have over 5,000 foreign students from 35 countries studying in Egypt. Some 1,500 Egyptian teachers are now teaching in neighbouring countries and, as regards foreign teachers working in Egypt, we cannot get as many as we would like because the rate of pay in Egypt is not as high as it should be. Thus in cultural exchange the position of Egypt is quite satisfactory; its development is limited only by the financial resources of the country.

(109) The Egyptian delegation was greatly gratified at the admission as Associate Members of several countries from the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, and particularly from Africa. It is a most welcome development, indicating Unesco's interest in the liquidation of colonialism, a most worthy objective. There are many ways in which countries can learn to be independent; the best of these perhaps is the practice of independence itself.

(110) I must conclude by expressing the pleasure that we all felt in Egypt at the appointment of our new Director-General. He and I have worked together as delegates at several conferences and I have had ample occasion to admire his wisdom and integrity. Recently, however, I have had reason to bear him a grudge. In his travels he has been crossing the Atlantic too often, the Mediterranean very little. This course must now be reversed. After all, the Mediterranean is the father of the Atlantic Ocean.

(111) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the representative of the Organization of American States.

(112) Mr. NANNETTI (Representative of the Organization of American States) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, ladies and gentlemen, before discussing the Director-General's Report I should like to bring you another report - from a village schoolmaster in the Republic of Panama. What I am going to read to you is of great significance for Unesco. Unesco, as its Constitution proclaims, is to construct the defences of peace in the minds of men. But how is it to get its ideal into those minds if there are millions who cannot read and millions with nothing to read? How are we to convert Unesco's ideals into convictions, standards of conduct and ways of behaviour? What I am going to read to you lights up one path whereby those ideals of Unesco can reach the minds, not of the men of the cities, who have at their disposal modern means for exchanging ideas, but the men of the countryside, who have not received their portion of our cultural heritage.

(113) This is one of thousands of communications reaching the Latin American Fundamental Education Press set up by the Organization of American States and Unesco to produce reading material for Latin America. The writer is the schoolmaster at Macaracas, the very type of all the "forgotten villages" of Latin America. His letter reads as follows: "So far the booklets from which we have got the best results are 'La Casa Rural' (Country Housing), 'Ayuda a tu Pueblo' (Help your Village) and those on co-operatives. With 'La Casa Rural' for guide, the villagers are making notable improvements in their dwellings and 'Ayuda a tu Pueblo' has got the peasants working in teams to improve the roads and the school. What is more, another booklet, 'Crédito Agrícola' (Agricultural Credit Systems) has lately led us to establish a credit co-operative which so far as we know is the first of its kind to be opened in the Isthmus".

(114) This letter from a village schoolmaster is of profound significance. Firstly, it shows up the value of books in the spreading of ideas. Again, the United Nations, Unesco and the Organization of American States are preaching a gospel of peace and human dignity; the letter shows that this gospel has found missionaries and won converts. It mentions only a few out of a million booklets on fundamental education distributed by the Organization of American States among the villages of America.

(115) The letter points a way for Unesco to get its ideal into the minds of men. It shows, too, the possibilities of the popular libraries established by the Organization of American States, of which it is intended to set up a hundred thousand in Latin America on the same lines as the one started in our "forgotten village" in Panama.

(116) We sometimes hear of the hundred essential books which everyone should read. On similar lines the Organization of American States is compiling the hundred essential booklets for the village dweller. These booklets bring the villager the elementary knowledge offered in the primary school: his mother tongue, the rudiments of arithmetic and of natural and social science. In them he will also find something about civics, health, agriculture, work, economics, social questions and leisure reading. The reading material is graded for new literates, as a result of a painstaking investigation into content, vocabulary, syntax, format and presentation.

(117) Every month, with each new booklet, a new message comes to the Popular Library - from an educator, from a writer or poet, from a scientist or doctor from an agricultural expert or an economist. Thus, the Popular Library keeps the village audience constantly in touch with science, literature and technology. This movement throws light on another unexplored point - the place of reading in fundamental education.

(118) It has been said, with truth, that educating people is not merely teaching them to read. It is equally true, however, that people cannot be educated unless they are taught to read. This means that reading must occupy a strategic place in fundamental education. Nothing can improve on the silent dialogue between books and men. All other means of communication are ephemeral: only books have the virtue of permanence.

(119) In fundamental education, reading must be functionally related to daily life. Books must give the answer to the spiritual and practical problems of life both in the higher sense and in that of everyday existence. This is the work to which the Popular Libraries, whose task it is to carry out the idea of functional reading in relation to the immediate problems of the community and the individual, are giving priority.

(120) Let me repeat: the Organization of American States plans to open one hundred thousand Popular Libraries, supplied with fundamental educational material, in rural communities, trade union premises, co-operatives, country schools and other centres where support should be sought for the education of the masses

(121) I want to draw the special attention of the Conference to this achievement in the sphere of Latin American fundamental education because it is directly due to co-operation between the Organization of American States and Unesco.

(122) Another sector in which they co-operate is in the training of teachers for fundamental education; the Regional Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America has been able to count on the financial support of the Organization of American States.

(123) The present task of fundamental education is to seek principles and specific objectives as a basis for promoting definite plans of action. Fundamental education should be a medium whereby the social services of the State reach the local communities. The local community is where the State comes into direct contact with the people and is also the first school of democracy.

(124) Democracy is ever improving its methods for assessing public needs and analysing public affairs. In that analysis, the people must be informed, and they must be given a hearing. Thus, fundamental education is the basis for a new method of democratic government. State undertakings for social improvement should be discussed and analysed in fundamental education centres. The work of persuasion should be headed by the teachers, backed by the citizens and by government experts. In this way, mere demagogic discussion is replaced by honest, intelligent and informed examination of common problems, with persuasion instead of blind submission or blind revolt. Hence, in Latin America, governing means educating.

(125) The teacher must call in the help of State experts, particularly health and agricultural experts. Unless education, health and agriculture form the three sides of the triangle, no enduring work can be done in the rural areas. Only the school, as the centre of the community, can give organic unity to these activities of the State. The problems of the community are interrelated, being all different aspects of life as a whole. The problem of economics cannot be kept apart from the problem of education, nor can either be divorced from the problem of public health, and all three must be taken in conjunction with problems of citizenship and of home life.

(126) If fundamental education is to succeed, specialists and social workers, who have hitherto worked in watertight compartments, must realize that the community's problems form a single whole, and must be prepared to work together to find a solution. That should be the task of fundamental education centres.

(127) Up to now, the centres founded by Unesco in Mexico and Egypt have drawn their students from the education services. But fundamental education transcends the official province of Ministries of Education and the students sent to the training centres should also be drawn from all the various bodies, such as the Ministries of Agriculture, Labour and Social Welfare, which are equally fitted to carry on fundamental education work.

(128) In Latin America, fundamental education needs, moreover, a base of operations, and this is to be found in the rural school, which is the nerve centre of the local community. What is needed is to draw one hundred thousand rural school teachers into the movement and thereby mobilize legions of agents for the spread of sound practices in health and agriculture and the extension of social welfare. All this demands revision of the existing plans and the conclusion of new agreements between Unesco and countries interested in the development of fundamental education.

(129) Hence the importance of the recent agreement between the Organization of American States and Unesco, under which a Joint Commission is to be set up for the promotion of fundamental education in America. I venture to suggest that the Conference give the widest possible directives, to enable the Joint Commission on Fundamental Education to work effectively. There is much that we must reconsider, much that we must rectify and much that we need to do.

(130) The significance of this Conference must be measured against the aims which the Constitution lays down for Unesco and against the scale of the crisis through which mankind is passing today. Unesco is one expression of the moral conscience of mankind. To Unesco has been entrusted the task of building peace in the minds and hearts of men. Twentieth-century man is athirst for moral principles which will enable him to live as an individual and with his fellows.

(131) The doctrines profferred for man's acceptance today echo through the world as never before. Arguments on either side flash in seconds across continents and seas. Man listens to the voices calling him from the opposing camps and looks for light.

(132) The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is the banner set up to rally humanity today in one brotherhood. Individual and collective effort to make that Declaration a reality will establish justice and freedom for all and thereby ensure world peace.

(133) To the crusade for peace, Unesco must summon all the spiritual forces of mankind. One of the great

forces for peace is the Organization of American States, the legal and corporate expression of America's solidarity. The Constitution of the Organization of American States, like that of Unesco, is based on a humanist concept: namely, that "the historic mission of America is to offer man a land of freedom". Our Constitution also defines American solidarity and a good-neighbour policy as meaning the establishment in this continent and in a framework of democratic institutions a régime of personal liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man. The American nations thereby adopted a Charter of the human rights by which the Universal Declaration is inspired.

(134) Unesco can rest assured that its work for peace is already accomplished in the American continent and that, with peace secured, the way is opened for men to rise through culture. The identity of aims between Unesco and the Organization of American States makes them natural allies. Their work together has begun with fundamental education. That is logical because fundamental education is the cement of human rights; it is an act of faith in man. The Organization of American States is prepared to co-operate yet more fully with Unesco in other sectors of education, science and culture.

(135) As representative of the Organization of American States I deem it an honour to confirm the will to co-operate, here in this land of Uruguay, which, as the Charter of the Organization of American States requires, respects the dignity of man and offers him a land of freedom.

(136) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Uruguay.

(137) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) (Translation from the Spanish): Ladies and gentlemen, the present duty of our delegation, as of those which have already spoken, is to comment on the general tenor of the Report submitted by the Director-General on Unesco's activities to date.

(138) Of course our judgment on the Report cannot be based on ideal standards but must be by reference to the immediate antecedents, that is, to the 1952 Conference. The form Unesco's activities should take in 1953 and 1954 was fixed by the seventh General Conference of our Organization, held in Paris in 1952. At that time, Unesco was faced with something of a crisis and the Organization then underwent a process of revision which affected it deeply. The crisis consisted essentially in the imposition of a standstill on financial contributions to Unesco; and it will be clear, on reflection, that, with a programme geared for a high speed advance, putting a financial brake on its execution meant, in fact, not simply marking time but losing ground.

(139) The effects of this crisis or semi-crisis were aggravated on the administrative side by the resignation of the then Director-General and the unavoidable slowness, caused by innumerable difficulties, with which we had to proceed over the appointment of his successor. As a result Unesco's activities inevitably took the form of readaptation and readjustment. The process of readjustment was accomplished by the simultaneous and convergent action of Unesco's three essential organs - the Executive Board, the Secretariat and the Director-General. I call them essential in the sense that in the two-year interval between Conferences it is they who act. I am happy to say that in our view the results of the readaptation are excellent and it is a pleasure to convey our congratulations on them to the Director-General. The readjustment is apparent in many features of the Report, of which I will single out a few. It is to be seen, for instance, in the case of subventions. Here the situation has been regulated in accordance with the principle that there must be a contractual element, i.e. that a subvention, generally speaking, must be justified, to the extent that the organization receiving the subvention is carrying out a function which Unesco itself could not carry out so well nor so cheaply.

(140) Moreover - but here we are only at the beginning - there is a careful check, as may be seen from the Report, to make sure that the organization receiving the subvention is genuinely international not only in its aims but also in its structure and membership; it is not enough for it to be, say, a European or other "continental" organization serving the world as a whole; it must consist of people from all over the world, and its representation must be world wide. Another respect in which things have appreciably improved is in Unesco's relations with Member States, where contacts have been increased both with governments and with the National Commissions. The question of the National Commissions is one of Unesco's tender spots. The Constitution regards the National Commissions as one of Unesco's essential organs. In practice, however, we can all see that in our respective countries, with the exception of those blessed with considerable means and resources, the National Commissions - and we must admit it with regret - have not yet achieved the results which the founders of Unesco expected of them. The reason may be lack of money, or that the idea of working through National Commissions has not yet been assimilated in all countries, or that, in several, there is no adequate secretariat, or that the question of relations with the Organization's headquarters in Paris has not yet been satisfactorily solved. Or it may be, in many cases, a combination of all these things.

(141) Another notable point in the Report, to which only brief reference is made, but which nevertheless I feel to be of great importance, is the practice begun by the Executive Board eighteen months ago of setting aside one of its meetings, not for working through an agenda dealing mainly with administrative matters, but for the general discussion of the broad permanent problems with which the Organization as a whole is faced. This practice began at Gif-sur-Yvette near Paris at the suggestion of Mr. Veronese, a member of the Executive Board. The idea was enthusiastically accepted by the other members and in this way has begun what in my view is a most useful practice. Without it, the Board, which meets only three or four times a year, might fall into a mechanical routine of attending only to the problems put before it, and never have time to get to the bottom of permanent problems which are not questions of the day or hour but ones with which the Organization is always at grips.

(142) The Report also informs us - and this seems to me a matter of vital importance - that the Courier has been reprieved. The Courier is one of Unesco's essential publications. It has been of outstanding

importance and is destined to give a rich return. At one point it was on the brink of extinction, that would have been unmerited and would have deprived Unesco of one of its most effective organs of publicity and of an excellent instrument for acting on the minds of men.
(143) To sum up, the readjustment effected has conformed to two principles concentration of action and the establishment of priorities. This raises in my mind certain reflections and doubts which I would like to share with you. When we speak of "concentration" and "priorities", we may be running into danger; we may be on the verge of falling into mortal sin, of committing the grave mistake of thinking that one activity should take absolute precedence over others - of thinking, for instance - and I have heard it said on occasion - that the essential, the really important thing for Unesco is fundamental education and technical aid.
(144) No one can ignore the importance of that obligation. As we were eloquently reminded here the other day, we have to fight against the tyranny of ignorance. This my country has done, we think, successfully, and we take pride in it. Here the principle of free education at all levels, primary, secondary technical and higher, is embodied in the Constitution. The university capitation fee has vanished; examination entrance fees are no more. Here education is absolutely free. You will have seen the other day, at the opening of the Conference that the files of boys and girls marching past the Palace were all dressed alike in white overalls, for we have the excellent practice of dressing schoolchildren so that their minds will not be scarred with a sense of poverty and inferiority because of differences in their attire. We have built up a good all round primary school system; we have fought illiteracy to such effect that today illiterates represent no more than about 6% of the population. We have also introduced an extremely interesting practice into the schools: every Uruguayan school can and should be named after a foreign country. All the countries in the world have a school named after them in Uruguay and this is more than a formal compliment because it produces in each school a special admiration and feeling for the friendly nation which acts as godmother; its anthems are sung, its literature studied, its customs are made known and the citizens who come from its distant shores are honoured as representatives of that fatherland. All this started many years ago and I would ask you if that is not Unesco in action. It is in the very spirit of Unesco to begin the pursuit of sympathy and understanding on the benches of the primary schools. We are therefore bound to feel the importance of that cause.
(145) *It is vital that there should be a world-wide campaign against basic ignorance and the disease it* inevitably brings in its train. But that is not the only enemy. Downright ignorance is not the only breeding ground of hates and rancours and passions. The fruits of intolerance, hatred, incomprehension and fanaticism are not found among the ignorant alone, but among the cultured too, and sometimes culture serves only to strengthen them - then they are felt with a force and power of conviction which today are usually alien to the uncultured. Hence, combating ignorance is in itself no antidote to rancour and intolerance. We must maintain the pursuit of a free culture in which all truths have their place, following the precept: seek "the truth that shall make you free" - and I would add "even if you do not find it".
(146) To put it briefly, if we are to cultivate freedom, we must fight for freedom to cultivate our minds and we must uphold the principle of the free exchange of ideas, which includes thought, books, information, and the results of congresses. In other words, we must never let the mind of man grow torpid; we must keep it constantly on the alert with a ceaseless challenge to examine and re-examine its own ideas, not becoming the slave of any single doctrine or dogma but acquainted with them all. At bottom, tolerance is our power to shift to other points of view, to avoid becoming fossilized in any attitude, on occasion, to doubt. That is the spiritual tonic which Unesco must put into its message to the world and to do that it cannot dissociate itself from concern with other things beyond the primary school. It must cherish the principle of the free circulation of ideas, books and persons, all of which are trammelled in our days.
(147) To conclude: Unesco is perhaps the most hopeful phenomenon which has emerged in our troubled world. That is why, when this session of the General Conference was opened the other day, we did not turn to the traditional procedure of falling back on the Ninth Symphony. We could have greeted you with the strains of Schiller's chorus with its invitation to human brotherhood. Instead we chose the Canticle of Hope as a symbol - because Unesco is hope, a great hope, rich in ideals. The debate on a report is not the right moment to enlarge on those ideals. Thinking too much about ideals may even, sometimes, be a little barren.
(148) See how the countryman goes about his business: when his fields are ripe for the harvent, he sets to work without raising his eyes to the horizon, looking only at the corn under his sickle. That is how we must work. We have before us now a series of detailed problems relating to the programmes for 1955-56. We are ready to tackle them with enthusiasm, from the viewpoint of our individual ideals and hopes.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

# SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

*16 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Appointment of Chairman of Headquarters Committee and his replacement as Vice-President of the Conference . . . . . 97
Discussion of the Director-General's Report (continued): Speeches by the delegates of Ecuador, Belgium, Hungary, Spain, India, Netherlands, United States of America, Denmark, Guatemala, Yugoslavia . . . . . 97

**APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE AND HIS REPLACEMENT AS VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE**

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I have to inform delegates that it is not going to be possible to conclude the discussion of the Director-General's Report today; there are still 30 speakers on the paper, so we shall have to devote another meeting to this item. Even so the General Committee asks delegates to keep strictly to the time-limit for speeches and so enable us to bring the debate to a conclusion.
(2) I call on the Chairman of the Nominations Committee to present the report he was asked to produce by the plenary meeting.

(3) Mr. KABIR (India) (Chairman of the Nominations Committee): Mr. President and fellow delegates, as the delegation of Venezuela is not present, there is a vacancy for the post of Chairman of the Headquarters Committee. On the suggestion of the Nominations Committee, the Headquarters Committee elected yesterday the delegate of Brazil, who will act as Chairman of the Headquarters Committee for the duration of this Conference. The delegate of Brazil accordingly resigned from his office of Vice-President of the General Conference and the Nominations Comittee suggests for your consideration the election of the delegate of Chile as one of the Vice-Presidents of the General Conference in place of the delegate of Brazil. (Applause.)

(4) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): In view of the obvious sense of the Conference, the Chair deems the delegate of Brazil to have been elected to the Headquarters Committee and the delegate of Chile to the Vice-Presidency of the General Conference by acclamation.

**DISCUSSION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S REPORT (continued)**

(5) I now call on the delegate of Ecuador.

(6) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in this world of unleashed passions, apparently dominated by a mystique of violence and a gospel of hate, where selfish forces seek to endanger the lofty moral values which ennoble the soul and are the true essence of human personality, where the possibilities of scientific progress - for good or perhaps for evil - wrack us with anxiety, this summons to men of culture to meet in Uruguay, this noble country which is an ornament and a source of pride to our continent, to talk over matters and achieve better mutual comprehension and to feel their common brotherhood in the quest for truth or the solution of common problems, is of extraordinary significance.
(7) Situated on the earth's equator, my country of plains and mountains, continually battling with geography to exploit its natural resources, is an impassioned devotee of culture and of freedom. It elects to office its finest thinkers; it reveres its writers and artists; it sets aside great sums to support a House of Culture - that institution so well known throughout the American continent - and for years past it has lived its life in an atmosphere of unrestricted freedom, opening its frontiers to all ideas and all peoples with no discrimination, political, racial or religious.
(8) For that reason, because we have dedicated our lives to peace and culture and because nothing and nobody can deflect us from that glorious course, we feel ourselves at one with Unesco; we regard it as the spiritual nexus of the whole juridical machinery devised in the post-war period. In our view peace must be worked for and pursued patiently in schools and centres of culture rather than in the Chancelleries if it

is to become an endur ng thing, for we all know that political understandings secure no more than a precarious balance.

(9) Reading the Reports of the Director-General and the Executive Board, we have rejoiced to observe the gradual headway made by Unesco as it assembles the diverse and potent forces of our times. A distinguished English thinker, Huxley, first erected a fine juridical framework; next an eminent Mexican, Jaime Torres Bodet, brought dedicated vision and today, as a sign of our age's co-operation, an element of friendliness and human warmth is injected by one of our own continent's educators, Dr. Luther Evans, a man of action and achievement.

(10) The international bodies working with governments for the be.ter exploitation of the natural resources of their countries are many; only one is concerned with the greatest capital asset any country can have, its human capital. Hence the urgent need for Unesco, without neglecting its lofty charge as the vigilant guardian of unending intellectual progress and of the universal heritage of culture, to keep its feet planted firmly on the ground and continue as an Organization soundly administered, ever preoccupied with the problem of man, the synthesis of all creation.

(11) We have viewed with approval Dr. Evans' visits to various Member States: personal contact will have enabled him to acquaint himself with those countries' cultural needs. We unreservedly applaud his concern that Unesco's already inadequate resources should not be reduced and we feel that the Organization should be strengthened by financial aid from all countries according to their abilities, considering that this can be the most constructive of all investments; for cultivating the minds of this generation and of the generations to come may well show us the sure path to peace and human brotherhood.

(12) Because we believe that Unesco should be world wide, we have welcomed the admission here, with the unanimous approval of our Conference, of countries not as yet fully self-governing.

(13) We have been glad to see the tightening of Unesco's relations with the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies. In the Economic and Social Council this country warmly defends the policy of concerted action, of closer co-operation between all the agencies of the United Nations; in this working together lies our hope of achieving efficiency and co-ordination of effort.

(14) We believe that Unesco's essential task should be to co-operate with governments in the noble work of shaping men. In his last message to our Congress, the President of my country, himself a distinguished university teacher, said: "The basic concern of the State should be the expansion of culture in towns and in the countryside, which means deepening the personality, heightening the awareness and increasing the mental powers, moral sense and working capacity of every individual".

(15) As long as the possibility of attending school is not open to every individual, as long as there remain some who cannot even write the name of their own mother or their own country and who have never been given the rudiments of all-round education, the most grievous of the problems afflicting half the human race will remain unsolved. We therefore support enthusiastically the proposal of the delegation of Uruguay for a campaign for compulsory free education.

(16) In the last few years we ourselves have accomplished a gigantic effort to bring the alphabet to thousands. In the most isolated and inhospitable spots in our mountain lands or backwoods we have built small schools and left a teacher to train the children to think more of their communities than of themselves. Hundreds of schools have been built with every educational facility, airy and sunny, so that our children can be educated in cheerful and healthy surroundings. We have raised the status of the schoolmaster, improving his situation in every respect and providing him with proper training for the prosecution of his great calling.

(17) Today, we are getting ready to explore the divers paths of fundamental education. We are glad to observe how the regional centres, particularly that at Patzcuaro, are training teachers for community education. We should like to see others added to those which already exist. My country deems it a privilege to offer Unesco every possible facility to enable it to include work in fundamental education, in a centre which could perhaps be opened in Ecuador, in the combined project for the rehabilitation of the Indian to be undertaken in the Andes area by a number of Specialized Agencies.

(18) As the journalists in Ecuador have the best means of mass communication at their disposal and as it is their task to bring culture and truth to the minds of all, it is to them that we have entrusted the campaign against adult illiteracy, providing them with the necessary resources for the execution of their task. The results have been satisfactory and the index of illiteracy has fallen markedly. It would be a great satisfaction to us to have Unesco participate in this campaign.

(19) As regards the Expanded Technical Assistance Programme, my country has observed with approval the steps taken for greater correlation of the ordinary programme and this expanded programme. In the Economic and Social Council, Ecuador has argued that the planning of technical assistance should be the commitment of the governments concerned. We judge that technical assistance is the most practical and effective action so far launched by the international agencies and we therefore feel that all countries, large and small, are under a moral obligation to co-operate in it. Ecuador earnestly trusts that national contributions for 1955 will be greater and that, in general, the expanded programme will acquire the features of progressive evolution and continuity required to make it more nearly commensurate with the magnitude of the task ahead. Our understanding is that the reduction in the numbers of experts and of fellowships over the last two years has been the result of financial limitations. This is a situation which we must make a joint effort to remedy.

(20) We are also anxious that, in the selection of the Organization's officials and technicians, due attention be given to geographical distribution and that all the countries in the world be enabled to arrange for their finest intellectual representatives to collaborate in achieving the lofty objectives of Unesco. We suggest to those in charge in Unesco that, in the selection of experts, consideration be given to the degree of affinity which should obtain between the expert and the human milieu in which he is to work and we have noted

with satisfaction the unreserved praise bestowed by the Assistant Director-General of Unesco on the work of the Latin American technicians working in this continent.

(21) We share the desire of other delegations that Unesco's programme shall concentrate on a few essential items. It is better to do little and do it well than try to do much and do it sketchily.

(22) We cherish the hope that the Ecuadorean motion for the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board, which is supported by the Board itself, may be approved by this General Conference. The tongue in which the discovery of a new continent was universally proclaimed and in which Don Quixote was given to the world deserves that honour - the more so in that Spanish America, whose influence in the international order is beneficent, nourishes no ambitions to anyone's despite and aspires only to establish more firmly its own well-being and to play its part in raising the standard of life throughout the world.

(23) Montevideo is holy ground for the men of America. Hither we come ever and again as pilgrims of culture to strengthen our souls with the teaching of one of the Olympians of American thought - Rodó. Today we come here to declare from this rostrum - where the ideas and aspirations of all the peoples of the earth can be proclaimed in freedom and democracy, Ecuador's belief that these crusades of culture are the only means whereby true international solidarity can be established on unshakable foundations, and to pledge our faith in the future of Unesco.

(24) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Belgium.

(25) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): As my first words in this debate may I re-echo the remarks of Mr. Andres Martinez Trueba, President of the National Council of Government of Uruguay, in his address of welcome to us. We have been touched by the singular warmth of our reception by the Government and people of Uruguay, struck by their deep interest in all the things of the mind and deeply moved by the lovely Canticle of Hope sung by the young people of your schools. May that Canticle, sung first at Brussels two years ago, drown the war songs and start the great dance of peace in which the peoples of all the world will join hands together.

(26) The Director-General's Report will certainly impress any unprejudiced person who takes the trouble to read it, and I want to pay tribute to the conscientiousness and intelligence of its author, who has been so ably seconded by the staff of the Secretariat.

(27) The Belgian delegation is glad to note the progress made in concentrating activities and improving methods, since it attaches the utmost importance to continued efforts to avoid dispersion of energy and make the best use of resources.

(28) It is particularly gratified by the Director-General's tribute of thanks to the Executive Board for the help rendered and the invaluable counsel given. This tribute deserves emphasis at the very moment when the Commissions are starting to study a number of proposals for drastic changes in the Board's membership. In this connexion, Belgium attaches the utmost importance to full respect for the basic principle enshrined in Article V of the Constitution, which stipulates that the members of the Board shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the General Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole and not as representatives of their respective governments. What this implies is that, just like the General Conference, of which it is an emanation, the Board represents primarily the people in every country who are professionally concerned with education, science and culture, as well as the institutions set up on their initiative and the National Commissions they have helped to establish.

(29) Now these champions of the mind, more than other men, are worried about the danger of which Dr. Radhakrishnan warned us so eloquently in his opening speech. I hope I do not misrepresent his views in saying that, briefly, he maintains that even democratic governments are becoming daily more centralist, more interfering, more authoritarian and more intrusive in their control of thought and opinion. It is from fear of this danger that the Belgium delegation attaches such great importance to the members of the Executive Board being independent.

(30) In Part IV of the Report, Chapters II and III engrossed our attention most.

(31) We particularly appreciate what has been done in the sphere of international scientific co-operation and of international co-operation between social scientists.

(32) We must, however, insist once more on the absolute necessity of action by Unesco continuing to be supplementary to national action. Article I of the Constitution names among the chief purposes and functions of Unesco the promotion of collaboration among the nations and lays it down that Unesco shall collaborate, provide an impulse, and maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge, without putting itself in the place of national governments. Article XI, on relations with governmental and non-governmental organizations and institutions, is drafted on similar lines.

(33) Any attempt to do direct what States and private organizations are doing just as well, runs counter to Unesco's mission and alienates the sympathies and cuts off the aid of which Unesco stands most in need.

(34) We hope it will be possible for Unesco to continue its financial help to the non-governmental institutions and organizations doing its work and theirs in such a variety of fields and that it will continue to encourage the foundation of organizations which, like those that already owe their existence to it, will play their part in carrying out its programme.

(35) With no less interest we have perused the chapters on such forms of practical help as fundamental and adult education, assistance in general education and the dissemination of science and culture and lastly, the Expanded Technical Assistance Programme. The progress achieved in these various spheres shows that Unesco is fully conscious of the crying urgency of spreading knowledge in a world where millions of men are still sunk in ignorance.

(36) The interest Belgium attaches to this practical work is eloquently proved by the report of the Belgian National Commission on the vast effort put forth in this domain in Belgium and the Belgian Congo.

(37) To conclude my remarks on the Reports of the Director-General and the Executive Board, my delegation wishes to record its satisfaction with the

progress made and to recall that the success of the work undertaken depends not only on observance of the principles to which I earlier drew attention but, just as much, on the maintenance of a correct balance between the objectives concerned with research and those concerned with the dissemination of knowledge. To spread the life-giving waters of science, education and culture more abundantly through the channels of technical assistance, we must at the same time increase the flow from the source, the work of scientists, educators and artists. The two objectives are but parts of a single whole and inflation is no less harmful in the sphere of knowledge than in that of currencies. May Unesco never yield to the temptation to dissipate its "gold reserve" for, if it does, sooner or later the result will be a debasement of the values of the mind.

(38) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Hungary.

(39) Mrs. JOBORU (Hungary): Mr. President, fellow delegates, may I first of all be permitted to extend on behalf of the Hungarian delegation our sincere greetings to Uruguay and her beautiful capital and express our gratitude for the magnificent spirit of hospitality which, manifested on our arrival, has been attending us ever since. We are very glad indeed that through Unesco we have the privilege of getting acquainted with Uruguay, whose people share with us many happy pursuits and noble endeavours.
(40) The Hungarian Government, animated by the principle of peaceful coexistence and collaboration of countries with different systems of government, attributes great importance to the development of cultural contacts between the nations. We are sure that nations that have imbibed each other's culture find it easier to foster mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence in all matters.
(41) The Hungarian Government has amply demonstrated the importance it attaches to the strengthening of international cultural relations, to the meetings and international conferences of representatives of science, education, literature and arts. In the first ten months of this year alone, we took part in 60 scientific conferences, among them the Paris-Nice Botanical Congress and the meeting of the World Power Conference in Brazil.
(42) Unesco, as an intergovernmental body, has an especially important part to play in organizing closer co-operation among nations and in encouraging the forging of cultural links in the interest of peaceful coexistence. The Hungarian Government is fully aware of this commitment. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, in June this year, advised the Director-General of Unesco that the Hungarian Government, accepting the invitation of the General Conference, wished to return to active participation within the Organization. Its decision was prompted by the hope that in this period of international détente Unesco would come closer to its original objectives as laid down in the Constitution, working with genuine devotion in the service of peace and progress. We appreciate the reference in the Report of the Director-General to Hungary's step, ranking it among the factors that contribute effectively to the achievement of Unesco's objectives.
(43) Hungary was already participating in the more important of Unesco's recent conferences. We sent a delegation to the Hague Conference, resulting in an international agreement for the protection of cultural values in war time, which was among others signed by the representative of the Hungarian Government. We also took part in the International Educational Conference in Geneva organized by Unesco and IBE.
(44) We have studied with great interest the material prepared for the present Conference, especially the Report of the Director-General, and came to this Conference with high expectations. The Report, which we consider a thorough and excellent one, acquaints us with many aspects of Unesco's achievements and fields of activity, which meet with the fullest approval of our Government and people. The fight against illiteracy, facilities for education in the native language, extension of primary education, admission of women to all levels of education in many countries, provisions for adult education, imbuing young people with the spirit of international understanding, the international discussion of all kinds of scientific and artistic questions - these are all tasks of the greatest importance. The facilities of the coupon system, to which we wholeheartedly adhere, is to our mind, a very suitable medium for the exchange of various cultural products.
(45) An important part of the task of the Hungarian Government is to continue to raise the cultural level of the people. Education, literature, arts and science have progressed tremendously in the past eight or nine years and are about to embark on a still more promising period. School attendance is free and compulsory up to the age of 14 and secondary schools and institutes of higher education, museums, theatres and concert halls are wide open to all.
(46) In the field of culture, prime importance is attached to fostering the spirit of international co-operation. In the schools the pupils, besides studying extensively the culture of their homeland, are made acquainted with the classics of other nations. (Shakespeare, Cervantes and living authors are studied along with the works of Bach, Mozart, Mussorgski, Leonardo da Vinci, Velasquez etc.)
(47) In order to appreciate the culture of other nations more directly, students are studying foreign languages, Russian, French, German, English, Italian and Latin languages especially.
(48) Our theatres play to packed houses the works of the great classical authors - Shakespeare, Gogol, Molière, Schiller, Gorki, Shaw, Lope de Vega - as well as plays by Turkish, Chinese and French writers.
(49) Publications include the masterpieces of world literature as well as contemporary works. The books of such Spanish-American authors as Pablo Neruda, Revueltas, Jorge Amado, Jorge Icaza are known all over the country. Books reach their readers even in the remotest villages through the facilities of the well-stocked people's libraries. A number of world classics have been sold in several hundred thousand copies.
(50) Cinemas are to be found in the smallest places, showing the best films produced in the Soviet Union, France, China, Italy and Mexico, and I have special pleasure in referring to a film acquired recently from Uruguay (A Thief of Dreams), which figures in the programme of the largest Budapest cinema.

(51) Our actors and film directors have attended international festivals at Carlsbad, Cannes, Mar del Plata, New Delhi, etc. We have organized art and folklore exhibitions in Paris, Peking, Berlin, Moscow, London, and next year we are planning an exhibition in India. Recently we have had exhibitions in Budapest of Soviet, Chinese and Bulgarian folk art, and of French and Italian painting.

(52) We need not dwell upon our international record in sport, for this aspect has been sedulously cared for by the press.

(53) Through all these activities, the Hungarian Government has given, I think, clear indication of the importance it attaches to encouraging international cultural relations, a better understanding among nations and the peaceful coexistence of different social systems. For this reason we welcome and wholeheartedly support all Unesco activity which aims at this end.

(54) We have to place on record, however, that to our mind the work of Unesco reveals certain important defects. We believe that Unesco should utilize, to a much greater extent, the possibilities at its command for mutual understanding among the nations. We think that we may state, without fear of contradiction, that counter-forces are at work against this better understanding. There is an armaments race in many countries, racial hatred is being stirred up by venomous propaganda. We hold that Unesco is in a unique position to establish contacts between nations on more normal lines.

(55) The Hungarian delegation wholeheartedly supports the proposal brought forward by the Indian delegation inviting Unesco to make its full contribution towards securing peaceful coexistence among nations with different political or social systems, to raise its voice in the cause of the peaceful utilization of atomic energy and to take its stand against racial discrimination.

(56) We cannot, however, pass over without comment the bad impression created in our delegation by the events of the first days of the Conference - the refusal to admit the representatives of 600 million Chinese with their rich cultural heritage and the postponed admission of Rumania and Bulgaria to Unesco, two good friends of Hungary, each with a flourishing culture and marching in the vanguard of progress.

(57) Allow me to express the hope that the work of Unesco, which has contributed so much towards strengthening mutual understanding between nations, shall in the future expand and, through the active participation of its Member States, assure the triumph of a cause so important to all humanity.

(58) In this great endeavour Unesco can always rely on the active participation of the Hungarian Government and people.

(59) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Spain.

(60) Mr. RUIZ JIMENEZ (Spain) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this is the first time that Spain has taken part as a full member in an ordinary General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. It was about two years ago that, at another session like this, in Paris, a clear-cut majority of Member States, following the promptings of justice, admitted my country's right to become a member of this body and invited us to place our energies at the service of the lofty aims enshrined in the Constitution.

(61) Those same aims have ever been the star which has guided our path through history. Only a few hours ago, in this very hall, we of the Spanish delegation were thrilled by a passage in the virile greeting addressed by the delegate of Sierra Leone to this august Conference. In it he paid a glowing tribute to the memory of two of our greatest theologians, Vitoria and Suarez, who, on the threshold of the modern age, planted the seed from which has sprung the true law of nations. This they did by enunciating the principle that all men and all peoples are fundamentally equal, whatever their race or social rank, because they share a common origin and the same immortal destiny, so that all the nations are bound together in a great community which is more than the mere sum of them and links them as it were in a mystical body whose life is the conjoined lives of all its members.

(62) The reason why we appreciate the aptness of the adhesion to what is finest in our doctrinal tradition made by the delegate of Sierra Leone is that today we realize we are marching steadily along the self-same road; it is because we still believe, with those great thinkers, in the "natural amity" between all peoples and we feel as irrevocably ours - bone of our bone - the ambition to work without respite for the establishment of peace in justice. In contrast to the old aphorism "si vis pacem para bellum", we of Spain - who have no fear of war, when there is a need to defend our liberties or the liberties of other peoples - would fain proclaim to all the world a nobler and more urgent challenge, "Si vis pacem para jus gentium", or better still, if we truly and honestly want peace, let us together prepare the way for the rule of those lofty values of the spirit which are the most potent levers to uplift the soul of nations and secure for them a peaceful destiny.

(63) To help towards the triumph of these ideals throughout the world, one effective way is that opened up by Unesco. Accordingly, Spain cannot but express her joy at being now within that brotherhood nor do other than apply all her energies to co-operating in Unesco's undertakings. May I take this opportunity to repeat that my country, prompt to forget offences when the claim of a higher cause commands or counsels it, but is ever mindful of kindnesses received, wishes through my intermediary to renew its thanks to all the nations scattered over the five continents, which on the former occasion honoured us by casting their votes for our admission, and more particularly to the peoples of the great Arab family with whom we are linked by many centuries of cultural exchange, a recurring motif as it were in the tapestry of a chivalrous and almost legendary past. We wish also specially to thank the peoples of the vast and close-knit family of Spanish America where men speak and pray in Spanish, where love, labour and death reflect the vigorous impulse derived from one and the same stock, springing up again, as though by a miracle of the spirit, thousands of miles away on the eastern confines of the Pacific and on the rude but kindly soil of the Philippine Islands.

(64) And while I am speaking of the sister peoples of Spanish America, it is but simple justice that I - like other delegates before me - should have a special word for the member of that vigorous family on whose fruitful soil we stand today - Uruguay, youthful and adventurous, which offers us the dazzling spectacle of its wide expanse of sky and sea expressive, as it were, of a yearning for universality, a country which will make all of us here realize the nobility of its descent by offering every delegate to this Conference, regardless of political ideologies or the whims of circumstance, not only the gracious hospitality which is customary and appropriate in cultured nations but also the warm-hearted friendship of peoples of Castilian stock.

(65) And now that I have expressed the natural affection of our hearts to all these nations of our own blood, it behoves me to extend a cordial greeting to all the representatives of the other peoples met together here. With them - transcending differences of ideology - we have to share the labours and toils of a weary road towards those difficult but necessary goals, the cultural uplift of all sections of society, the surmounting of misunderstanding, hates and egoisms and the tightening of the links of understanding and friendship between all mankind. These are quests not unworthy of that wandering knight of La Mancha whose revolt against all error, all excess, against all meanness of spirit and all injustice might well typify the inner flame of this Organization, which seeks to bring a little light and harmony to the tortured humanity of our age.

(66) Precisely because we of present-day Spain feel the glow of that flame in our own hearts, we have engaged ourselves in Unesco's spiritual war, fully conscious of our responsibilities. In submitting his Report on the Organization's activities, the Director-General, whom we also wish to congratulate on the success and impartiality of his work - asked for a spirit of pure loyalty to prevail in the Organization. It was in that spirit that we crossed Unesco's threshold with the honest aim of giving rather than receiving. Now we are of the household and in it we will fight at Unesco's side for the full achievement of its aims.

(67) May I for the sake of brevity take it that this spirit of loyalty and service can be regarded under three main aspects: firstly, the aspect of our relations with the Organization as such; secondly, the aspect of our dealings with other Member States and thirdly, the aspect of our fundamental beliefs.

(68) As to our attitude to Unesco itself and to its specific work, I need only say that Spain, in the very short interval that has elapsed since she was admitted to this Organization has gone a long way to bringing herself up to date in the matter of administrative organization and in this respect recover all the time lost against her will.

(69) The most eminent figures in science, education and culture - the historian Don Ramon Menéndez y Pidal, Professor Gregorio Marañón, Don Julio Palacios, Don Julio Rey Pastor and Don José María Otero, famous in research and teaching, Father Ramírez, the great theologian, and other men of eminence have agreed to join our National Commission for co-operation with Unesco; which, thus reinforced, completed a substantial volume of work. In the light of its guidance and with the effective co-operation of the Directors and the members of the Secretariat, the Executive Committee of the National Commission under the chairmanship of Dr. Laín Entralgo, Rector of the University of Madrid, has contrived in a few months' time to arouse an interest in Unesco's aims among the Spanish public and set the requisite services in motion. In this first year even the specialized working parties for the several sections of Unesco's programme have gone into action: exhibitions have been arranged with material from Unesco; its publications have been widely distributed; and on Human Rights Day lectures and ceremonies were held in all cultural and teaching centres, for which we drew on the rich treasure of Spanish philosophical, legal and general literature, classical and modern; for Spanish thought has ever been hostile to the slightest suggestion of human servitude and sees man - as it ever has - as the focus of social and political life in virtue of his being the vehicle of eternal values and the possessor of a soul free to choose damnation or salvation.

(70) The Spanish National Commission has likewise managed to contribute effectively towards the most characteristic of Unesco's immediate and material objectives, for which purpose a large increase is being made in the number of fellowships and scholarships open to foreign teachers and students in Spain and to Spaniards abroad - of the latter a number were specially commissioned to study questions falling within Unesco's particular province at its headquarters and regional offices. There has also been a sharp rise in the number of visits by members of our National Commission Secretariat to Unesco meetings and of highly esteemed visitors from Unesco to Spain, such as Dr. Evans, whose keen understanding and sound decisions deeply impressed us.

(71) Further, Spain has taken steps to speed up her ratification of all the conventions promoted by Unesco, more particularly the Universal Copyright Convention and the Agreement on the free circulation of educational, scientific and cultural materials; and our publishing facilities have been put at Unesco's disposal for the easier and more economical production of the Spanish versions of the Organization's official publications, a step which should have the further effect of enabling us to make fuller use of the book coupon system as desired by our universities, academies and senior cultural institutions.

(72) The experience of the first months of our active membership and a careful and constructive perusal of the future programme and budget, the general lines of which we regard as satisfactory in principle, have led us to certain conclusions which we will submit to the Commissions and Committees of this General Conference. For the time being I shall merely indicate in broad outline that our own aspirations and objectives are the following:

(73) First, we want the Organization's energies concentrated on a limited number of tasks, graded according to importance and urgency, and all possible simplification of the administrative machinery, not merely to reduce the proportion of common service costs but also to speed up the handling of business and reduce to the simplest possible form the complex system of questionnaires and consultations which pour down on Member States. Consideration should be given to the problem of how Member States could be given greater assistance for their National Commissions,

so that the latter could organize more efficiently services of their own. This would undoubtedly relieve headquarters of some of the routine work and enable National Commissions to take a more effective part in the work of the Organization. Unesco's future is largely bound up with the degree of interest taken in its activities by public opinion in the Member States, and there is no better way of achieving this than by having National Commissions, with increased resources and prestige, play an effective part in the practical execution of the directives issued by the central authorities of the Organization.

(74) Secondly - and still with the same object of increasing efficiency - the Spanish delegation wishes to indicate its support of the tendency already apparent among other delegations to follow a policy of cautious redeployment, a logical delegation of functions to groups of countries linked by language and cultural affinity. Unesco cannot renounce its quality of an organization for all the peoples, wherever they dwell, whatever their language and whatever their type of culture, but it will only succeed in drawing its members together more effectively if, in the first place, it increases co-operation, mutual understanding and exchanges of educational information among those families of nations between which there already exist natural affinities either through a common language or through the identity of the fundamental beliefs which shape their cultural personality.

(75) The Director-General of Unesco, with the assistance of a Deputy or Assistant Director to take charge of each of the main linguistic and cultural sectors, would be able to maintain the universality of Unesco and at the same time by working through decentralized organs to secure greater concentration of effort in an atmosphere of greater institutional and psychological homogeneity.

(76) My third point is closely linked with what I have just said and involves the principles of fair shares and of recognition of the inherent equality of all Member States: it is important that the number of nationalities represented both in the senior posts and the administrative personnel of Unesco should be related to the number of countries belonging to the Organization. This proportional redistribution of policy-making and administrative posts and the observance of norms which will ensure that complete impartiality and loyalty prevail among all members of Unesco staff will create the atmosphere of mutual confidence between all Member States necessary for the most effective achievement of Unesco's basic aims.

(77) So much for our views, in brief outline, about the structure of the Organization. I should now like to say a few words about our relations with the other countries which are our fellow members in Unesco and more particularly about the concrete achievements in teaching and scientific research which Spain can proffer for their consideration.

(78) I am not proposing here to cite statistics to illustrate the greatly increased efforts made in Spain, both by the population and by the State, for the promotion of culture. I could have done this by comparing the figures of the budget of the Ministry of Education, which were 345 million pesetas in 1935 and amount to 2,400 million pesetas in 1954, an enormous increase even if allowance is made for the difference in the purchasing power of the peseta. Or again I could have taken the falling curve of illiteracy, which went down from about 26% in 1930 to 14.24% in 1950, with an appreciable further reduction in the last four years as the result of a strictly enforced scheme of adult education and a large-scale programme for building modern schools with all the requisite amenities and educational facilities. Or again I could have instanced the efforts made to modernize our universities, institutes and technical schools, the increase in the number of libraries, etc.

(79) However, we prefer to have the visitors who honour us with their presence in Spain note these facts for themselves. More than 2 million foreigners have crossed our frontiers and travelled all over our country since 1 January last. They included a large number of scientists attending international congresses of every type. Spain has made a special point in the last ten years of opening her doors to intellectuals, scientists and teachers from all kinds of countries, without distinction of race or creed, wishing to visit us or give us valuable lessons in the field of scientific or technical research or new methods of vocational and pedagogic training. Let them testify to what they have seen. We are also glad to extend similar invitations to all the distinguished delegates here present who decide on returning home to visit us, that they may without any interference, and in full knowledge of the facts, judge for themselves the real extent of the effort in the sphere of education, science and culture which is being made in Spain today.

(80) The same spirit of loyalty moves us to the view that Unesco should be broad-minded in accepting the co-operation of other peoples. Like the founder of the Uruguayan nation, that great gentleman José Artigas, we should proclaim that we regard as our enemies only those who are the enemies of the community's well-being. Let us set no bounds to co-operation with other States save the condition that they respect our independence and our inalienable spiritual convictions.

(81) This could be the appropriate time, before concluding my remarks, to voice Spain's earnest hope that the time may not be far off when certain nations not now members of Unesco will be able and eager to join, as, for instance, the only Spanish-American nation not yet a member, Paraguay, or Portugal and Ireland in Europe, whose great services to universal culture would make them excellent and distinguished partners in this Organization.

(82) My last general remark would be to say that, while a "spirit of loyalty" should prevail within Unesco - in the Organization itself and in its member countries individually - there must also be a loyal belief that the fundamental convictions of the several groups of peoples making up the Organization will be respected. This should be reflected more particularly by the way in which we lay stress on one or other of the Organization's activities.

(83) I would like simply to make special mention of the three following points: firstly, the social uplift of the classes in all countries which are economically most under-privileged. If we really wish for peace, we must deliver the millions still living in oppressive darkness from serfdom and ignorance. Our own Saavedra Fajardo has said that there are some people who fear virtues in men because it makes them kings and prefer vice because it makes them slaves. Our

hope is that Unesco may contribute to the growth of a genuine spiritual noblesse among all peoples by the enthronement of virtue in their minds and hearts.
(84) Secondly, we look for a strengthening of the natural links between the peoples, and nothing is better calculated to achieve that purpose than mutual acquaintanceship between intellectuals. We are therefore glad to see that in the proposed programme and budget there is an increase in the total appropriations for fellowships, scholarships and exchanges of books and publications.
(85) Lastly, we should like Unesco to contribute even more towards the moral and spiritual training of the peoples. While naturally respecting the consciences of others, we must harness the spiritual energies of all our peoples for the ends of peace and justice for which Unesco was created. The people in whose name I speak is one which hold God to be the author and the supreme guarantor of human freedom and free will, which believes in the primacy of spirit over matter, which believes that service for the well-being of the community can smooth man's path to his immortal destiny. And we are confident that Unesco will play its part in seeing that the requisite conditions obtain which will enable this moral training to be given to men all over the world, more particularly in those countries where there are traditionally large communities loyal to these supreme beliefs.
(86) If we hold firmly to this policy of loyal co-operation between us; if we promote, within this Organization, the improvement of its organs, and above all, if we acquire the inner conviction that it is in our hearts and minds that we must build peace between the peoples, we shall not fail of victory. In the same Spanish classic that I quoted earlier there is a passage to the effect that battles fought with the sword alone are doubtful but that victory is certain in those fought with the head. Let us win the battle of peace with the weapons of our minds, for it is a war against error, ignorance and incomprehension. For this war of peace which will bring light to the mind, solace to the heart and justice to all peoples inside and outside Unesco we, the people of Spain, stand armed and ready.

(87) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of India.

(88) Mr. KABIR (India): Mr. President and fellow delegates, I have great pleasure in adding the voice of India to the felicitations offered to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay on the generous hospitality with which this country, small in population but great in heart, has welcomed delegates from all corners of the globe to this eighth General Conference of Unesco. We were particularly happy to learn from you, Mr. President, that Uruguay imposes no barriers to thought and extends an equally warm welcome to men and women of all races, colours and creeds. Toleration of differences and charity towards all have also been characteristic of the country to which I have the honour to belong, and we are particularly happy that this session - when we have for the first time members representing the rival world outlooks which claim the allegiance of modern man - meets in the friendly and tolerant atmosphere of this beautiful land.
(89) I would also like to congratulate Dr. Evans on his first Report as Director-General of Unesco. I agree with the delegate who said that Unesco is not the Ministry of Education of a super-State, but we may rightly claim that it should be the keeper of the enlightened conscience of the world. The work of education, science and culture must no doubt be carried out by the Member States themselves, but Unesco should offer them the opportunity of co-operation and collaboration in a task which concerns each as much as it concerns all. It must be one of the chief aims of Unesco to make all members realize that each is responsible to and for the rest, that human welfare is an indissoluble whole and that no State, however powerful or prosperous, can maintain its achievements unless it shares them with the rest of the world.
(90) I am glad to find that the Director-General and the Executive Board have taken note of the friendly suggestions from Member States and are taking steps to concentrate and simplify the programme of Unesco. The less fortunate areas of the world want education for the masses, want technical assistance, and I think you will all agree that these two should be first priorities in the programme. It is India's desire that Unesco should direct all its energy to the task of eradicating illiteracy from among half the population of mankind. These are points which India has pressed time and again, and we are happy to find that Unesco proposes to launch a world-wide campaign of publicity for an International Educational Development Fund. Such a reorientation of its programme will win for Unesco the support of intellectuals as well as of the masses in all countries.
(91) Talking of the need for concentration and simplification, may I suggest that the process start with the documentation provided us by the Secretariat? I am sure all delegates are duly impressed by the quality as well as the quantity of the papers that come to us, but may not their purpose be defeated by their very volume? When papers are too many and the time is all too brief, they may not be read. Also, I have at times wondered if all this volume of paper is really necessary. I am reminded of a story, so true in spirit, if not in fact, that I cannot resist the temptation of repeating it. It is said that President Roosevelt, when asked to make a five-minute speech, declined on the ground that it would take too long to prepare. Asked again how then he could find time to prepare addresses running to two hours or more, the President is reported to have said that he was ready to deliver a two-hour speech on any subject right away.
(92) I also warmly support the proposal of the Director-General that the programme of Unesco shall conform more and more to the views of Member States. The Chairman of the Executive Board also referred to the need for closer consultation with National Commissions and governments. I earnestly hope that this will be done on an increasing scale, for, in the past, this salutary principle has not always been observed. To take only one example. In the draft programme before us, there is a proposal to close down or reduce the scale of the Science Co-operation Office at New Delhi and to transfer some of its functions elsewhere. May I ask if there was any previous consultation with the National Commission or the Government concerned? At the first conference of the permanent Indian National Commission, fraternal delegates from neighbouring countries expressed the wish that this office might develop into a centre to provide enlarged services

to all the countries of this region. I hope that there will be no repetition of such a lapse, and I am happy to say that, as a result of our discussions with the National Commission and the Government of Indonesia, we have, with their support, given notice of a resolution for the establishment of a Nucleus Office which may provide fuller and more satisfactory service to all the countries of South East Asia. I will not discuss this point in further detail, as my distinguished colleague and friend, Dr. Mudaliar, will be placing a resolution on this subject before the Conference.

(93) I would here like to dwell for a moment on a point which is at times not fully appreciated. We talk of developed and undeveloped countries and sometimes think of the relation between them as a one-way traffic, in which the so-called developed countries are the donors and the so-called undeveloped countries the recipients. Can we, however, be sure that the categories apply generally? Should we not confine them to a specific aspect of human development? There is no question that, in industrial progress, in the application of science to crafts, and in the standard of material civilization, countries of Europe and America are far more advanced than those of Asia and Africa, but can it be said with equal confidence that they are more developed spiritually and morally? Simplicity, contentment and goodwill are values which do not necessarily accompany material progress. Happiness is an elusive thing, but can one equate it with comfort and luxury? Can we even be sure that countries and peoples which use the gadgets of science are necessarily more scientific in their attitude and outlook?

(94) I would not be misunderstood. We are entirely in favour of using science for raising the standard of life of the people. Material comforts are necessary to liberate the spirit from over-much concern with material things. That is why India and other countries of the East are today engaged in a gigantic effort to reconstruct the economic bases of life, to make education universal and free, and to transform our existing economy of poverty and want into an economy of wealth and plenty. Simultaneously, we are striving to preserve the spiritual values which we consider to be man's most cherished heritage and are ready and indeed anxious to share them with all. We therefore feel that Unesco should in its programme place a special emphasis on the exchange of the different gifts which different peoples have to offer. While some regions, and I am thinking primarily of Asia and Africa, can benefit by the techniques and the crafts, the spirit of enquiry and the spirit of adventure of others, these others, and I am thinking primarily of Europe and America, can with equal profit imbibe some of the spiritual values developed in other regions of the world. Unesco's programme of translation of the classics of different lands is a welcome step in this direction.

(95) It is because of our recognition of the need for greater co-operation and exchange between peoples and countries that we wish to place before this Conference two related resolutions on universality of membership and decentralization of Unesco's programmes. We are in favour of making the Organization truly global, for we believe that the modern world, knit into one compact unit by science and technology, must be united in thought and spirit if it is to survive. Further, we believe that each region has something of value to contribute to the rest. Some people may be lacking in material goods, some in individual liberty and personal freedom, others in social security and still others in a sense of human brotherhood, but the only way of making good the deficiency of each is to bring it into contact with another which may be rich in a particular element while lacking some other element of equal value. In this way alone can each gain by learning from others for our common human good. We are therefore sorry that this Conference did not extend a warm and cordial welcome to Bulgaria and Rumania, which sought to join the brotherhood of Unesco. We would go further and say that Unesco should open its doors to any country which wants to come regardless of its political or economic attitudes. We are sorrier still that the Executive Board which sponsored their application did not act more vigorously in their behalf.

(96) Global membership carries with it one other implication. The Director-General has rightly stressed the need of co-operation in different fields through the machinery of specialized international agencies. We would only add that it is necessary to ensure that these agencies are truly universal and representative of the main regions of the world. At present many of them are concentrated in Europe and America. I would urge that at least the organizations set up under Unesco's auspices or with contributions granted by Unesco should be located in different areas of the world so that they are more representative of the world as a whole and so that the claims and needs of Asia and Africa may not be overlooked.

(97) Global membership of Unesco and decentralization of the programme are, as I have said, closely linked in our minds. As the Organization becomes more and more widely spread, it will become increasingly difficult for a central Secretariat to frame programmes to suit the needs of all. I am therefore happy to learn that the Director-General himself is anxious to discuss with Member States programmes at the formative stage. Two points, I think, must be kept in mind in all such discussions. The first I have already mentioned in some detail: there must be no sense of superiority or spirit of condescension but a recognition that we are all fellow workers in a common task. The second point arises out of this. It is that the regions themselves must be able to decide what shape the programme shall take. There is often a temptation - fortunately Unesco has been largely free from it - for a central organization to try to decide what is good for its members. The real needs of a region can, however, be best solved if the programmes for that region are framed in the region itself, by people with intimate knowledge of and feeling for the locality. I have used the term "feeling" deliberately, for knowledge is not always enough and without feeling, without a sense of identification with the people and the country, it is almost impossible to frame a programme that will best serve their interests. This is also the essence of democracy, for democracy is not merely a political concept, but a way of life, where every individual and every people have a right to determine their destiny for themselves.

(98) I would like very briefly to inform fellow delegates of what we are trying to do to expand the work of education, science and culture in India. Ours is a

vast country. The number of children between 6 and 11 is over fifty million, much larger than the population of France. In the last seven years, the number of those in this age group who go to school has risen from less than fifteen to over twenty millions. An increase of over five million in elementary schools alone in seven years is, you will agree, no small achievement. The number of high schools has increased from less than four thousand in 1947 to about ten thousand in 1953-54 and the number of secondary school pupils from less than three millions to about six millions, again, perhaps more than the population of certain countries from which we have very distinguished colleagues at this Conference. Our governmental expenditure on education has been raised from less than 45 million dollars in 1947 to over 200 million dollars in 1953 and the figure for 1954 will be considerably higher. Taking the Central Ministry of Education alone, it has increased almost tenfold in the last seven years. The total national expenditure on education increased from about 100 million in 1947-48 to over 300 million in 1953. This progress has been achieved in spite of natural calamities, partition of the country, the movement of population on an unprecedented scale and all the aftermath of war and famine. Nevertheless our achievement is still far short of our aspirations and of what we must provide for the people of our country.

(99) I would have liked to discuss other aspects of the programme and especially to acknowledge with thanks the services received by us under the various programmes of Unesco. Time does not permit me to dwell on all of them, but I would like to refer to the Delhi Public Library and to the generous help we have received under the various technical assistance programmes. If, at times, my remarks have been critical, it is because India is and will always be the friend of Unesco. A friend criticizes and warns, while an enemy strikes. We shall always criticize and warn, but our hands will be the first to be raised in defence of Unesco whenever an enemy seeks to strike at it. As one of the founder members of the Organization, we expect much from it, for we believe that human welfare can be realized only when the minds and hearts of men are attuned to the Unesco cause.

(100) Before I conclude, it is my pleasant duty to repeat, on behalf of my country, our cordial invitation to hold the ninth General Conference of Unesco in India. In my letter to the Director-General, I have mentioned some of the reasons why the next Conference should be held in India and I do not wish to repeat the arguments, but I would like to place special stress on one point. No conference of Unesco has yet been held in this part of the world, though Eastern and Southern Asia contain more than half the entire population of the world. It is an area which, for historical and other reasons, is in the greatest need of education and science. It is also a region which has newly awakened from the torpor of centuries. The masses are stirring and a new world is taking shape before our eyes. This ancient arena of the world is again the battleground of conflicting ideas, ideals and world outlooks. On the outcome of this battle depends the future of the world. If this region, where more than half of mankind live, decides to follow the path of militarism, aggrandizement and exploitation, the fate of Homo Sapiens is sealed. If, on the other hand, it remains true to its ancient tradition and adopts the way of democracy and peace, we can look forward to an era when the ideals of Unesco will be realized. It is therefore Unesco's duty at this critical juncture to bring as vividly as possible to all peoples of this region the ideals inscribed in its Constitution: the ideal of liberty, equality, dignity and social justice for all, realized through a programme of free exchange of ideas and knowledge which will remove the basic causes of misunderstanding and distrust among all peoples and countries of the world. And what more vivid way of doing so than to hold the next Conference in the region itself?

(101) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the Netherlands.

(102) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, I should like to begin by thanking the Government of the Republic of Uruguay for the warm-hearted hospitality we are receiving in this fascinating city of Montevideo.

(103) In the address I had the honour to deliver at the opening of the last General Conference in Paris in 1952, I was able to say that the Netherlands delegation recognized with gratitude that Unesco's programme for the year 1951-52 had done most beneficial service to educational, scientific and cultural life in the Netherlands. No one could have thought then that only a few months later the same services were to be renewed on an even greater scale, but in circumstances a thousand times more tragic. You remember, I am sure, that in the night of 31 January/1 February 1953, the raging waters of the North Sea broke through and flooded part of our country. The outburst of practical compassion which this catastrophe produced throughout the world could not, of course, undo the tragedy which had struck at what so many families held most dear, but it produced immediate and abundant material help and, above all, it gave the Netherlands people the psychological tonic they so badly needed. I account it not only a debt of honour but a true pleasure to express from this rostrum the deep and enduring gratitude of the Netherlands people towards everyone - governments, private bodies and ordinary individuals - who gave proof of their practical goodwill to us in that tragic hour. A point worth stressing is the great part played by educational circles in that assistance. From all over the world we received funds and material expressly earmarked for the reconstruction of damaged schools and youth centres. Here I am glad to offer our most heartfelt thanks, firstly to the individual members of the Unesco Secretariat who set aside a proportion of their own salaries to aid us, but also to the Unesco authorities - and I would specially name Dr. John Taylor, the then Deputy Director-General - who used the system of Unesco gift coupons to singularly good effect to facilitate the despatch of immediate help even from the most distant countries. We are also most deeply grateful to all the Member States who so generously responded to Unesco's appeal. This concrete and tangible expression of the international understanding and co-operation about which we talk so much at our meetings has given us further proof - if proof were needed - of the usefulness and worth of our Organization

and has powerfully encouraged our whole country to strengthen its co-operation with Unesco.

(104) Without going into details of the part played by the Kingdom of the Netherlands in the execution of Unesco's programme during the two years since the last General Conference, and without enlarging on the undoubted benefits this programme has conferred on education, science and culture in my country, I should like to single out as the most striking, and probably also the most important item in our work with Unesco, the joint organization by Unesco and the Netherlands Government of an intergovernmental conference for the drafting and signature of an International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. The present General Conference will have before it a report drawn up by the Secretariat on the meeting. On our side I should like to stress the Netherlands Government's satisfaction that the conference, held in the Peace Palace at The Hague, achieved such positive and encouraging success. I should also like to mention the effective and cordial co-operation achieved in this connexion between the Unesco officials concerned and the Netherlands Government. The conference itself, and the Director-General's visit to our country in connexion with it, have undoubtedly done a great service to Unesco's cause in the Netherlands.

(105) The Hague conference was marked by another event which may have consequences much more important and, we sincerely hope, much more positive for the achievement of our Organization's aims than the signature of the Convention then adopted. This conference was, actually, the first occasion when the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and a number of other States of Eastern Europe showed a desire to co-operate with our Organization, and in their presence at this General Conference we see evidence of their wish to establish that co-operation on a permanent and positive basis. We rejoice at their decision, not merely because it gives our Organization the universality we have wanted for it since its foundation, but also because it is a step towards expanding international co-operation in education, science and culture with countries which have themselves a centuries-old scientific and cultural tradition. A free exchange of ideas and publications and free personal contacts with the men of science and culture in those countries, if it could be effected, would be an important step towards the establishment of an enduring peace and of fruitful international co-operation. We await with eagerness, and will study with the liveliest interest, the measures which the new Member States propose to adopt for putting into effect the lofty principles incorporated in the Constitution which is the basis of Unesco's activities.

(106) I shall not take up the time of the Conference at this stage with the comments my delegation would like to make on certain items of the programme before us for the years 1955-56. I should simply like to say that we whole-heartedly approve the general lines of the programme and that we are grateful to the Executive Board, the Director-General and his colleagues for producing a proposed programme centring more or less on a limited number of activities which are genuinely within the Organization's province. This Conference will, of course, have to take decisions on certain changes of structure but, important though these may be, we should not like the discussion to be so concentrated on technical and administrative matters that the actual programme items, which have a great importance of their own, are overlooked.

(107) The programme for 1955-56 and the general line proposed for the development of the activities to be pursued in 1957-58 are evidence of a remarkable effort of creative imagination by the Executive Board, the Director-General and the Secretariat. The result of these efforts is to be found in certain paragraphs of the Director-General's introduction to the proposed programme and budget, in the Executive Board's introduction to the same document and in the document on the remodelling of future Unesco programmes. In our view these documents contain suggestions of the greatest interest and we hope that the Programme and Budget Commission will be able to carry out a really comprehensive exchange of views on the various proposals.

(108) Nevertheless, we think it absolutely necessary to ask for a further explanation of the general sense of the document on the remodelling of future Unesco programmes. It might be thought that the large proportion of the available funds to be set aside for what the document calls "special activities" means that an increasingly large proportion of the Organization's activities will, in future, be directed to providing technical assistance for underdeveloped Member States. The distinctions made in the document between technical assistance proper and special activities undertaken at the request of a Member State have not succeeded in allaying this fear. Our own belief is that the passage in question seeks only to distinguish between "general activities", i.e. without fixed limits in time and space, and "special activities" i.e. activities of limited duration and involving only one Member State or group of Member States. If our interpretation is incorrect and the former interpretation the right one, we should not be prepared to accept this passage. While we recognize the absolute necessity in the world of today for a wide programme of technical assistance to underdeveloped States - and the relatively very large contribution of the Netherlands to the Technical Assistance Programme of the United Nations proves that we pay more than lip service to the idea - we are strongly of the opinion that assistance proper is one thing, but that world-wide intellectual co-operation between the competent individuals and organizations in the sphere of education, science and culture is quite another and it was for the latter purpose that Unesco was primarily set up. We hope that the General Conference now meeting will succeed in reaching an absolutely clear-cut ruling on this point.

(109) Another subject which warrants a full-scale discussion is the composition of the Executive Board. We believe that the lines of reasoning leading to the two competing propositions are not basically different; they simply represent different points of approach. Actually, one party holds strictly to the meaning of the term "Executive Board" and of its functions as given in Article V, paragraph B, of the present Constitution. They lay special emphasis on the fact that the Executive Board, acting under authority from the General Conference, is responsible to the Conference for the execution of the programme adopted by the

latter and that, accordingly, these supervisory functions, exercised on behalf of the Member States, can be better carried out by persons expressly delegated by them. The other party, while not denying or seeking to lessen the importance of this duty of the Executive Board, would prefer the Board to consist of individuals representing the world's various cultures and to be the adviser par excellence of the Director-General, with the task of working out with him the general lines on which international co-operation is to be developed in the spheres of education, science and culture - and I feel I am not misrepresenting the views of the first group in pointing out that they too admit that this is one aspect of the Executive Board's task. At the last General Conference, where this question was previously discussed, my delegation did not dissemble its opinion that, from the point of view of the needs incidental to the Organization's own work, the governments of Member States already had adequate powers, in the shape of representation at the General Conference, to maintain their control of the Organization's activities and that the Executive Board would therefore do well to concentrate on the positive aspects of its task. The views both of my delegation and of the Netherlands National Commission for Unesco have certainly not changed. We are, however, forced to admit that circumstances external to the Organization and arising rather out of current political developments in the world make it desirable that, in the immediate future at any rate, the Executive Board should be made up of representatives of governments. We should, however, like to draw most emphatic attention to paragraph 2 of Article V, Section A, which, incidentally, has not been changed by draft amendments. This paragraph provides that the General Conference shall take special care to include in the Executive Board distinguished figures of special authority in the spheres of art, letters, science, education and communication of thought. We are confident that all Member States will make a point of bearing this specific provision of the Constitution in mind so that, while securing the advantages of having accredited representatives of States on the Executive Board, we may still have the advantage of the collaboration in education, science and culture, of people who are pre-eminently qualified to give a lead in these fields.

(110) The present General Conference is undoubtedly of special importance for the future of our Organization. My delegation, which has the honour to represent here the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands West Indies, the three autonomous divisions of the Kingdom, has every confidence in that future.

(111) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the United States of America.

(112) Mr. NUFER (United States of America): Mr. President, fellow delegates, the selection by Unesco of Montevideo as the seat of the eighth session of the General Conference constitutes an appropriate recognition of the contribution Latin America has made to the ideals and objectives of the Organization. Uruguay has been a pioneer in cultural, political and social development. It has traced bold new patterns which have aroused the interest of the entire world. These patterns, moreover, have been conceived in a framework of freedom and liberty. The generous welcome Uruguay has extended to the peoples of all nations who have come here to enjoy the climate of peace, equality of opportunity, and racial and religious freedom, is one more indication of its devotion to the principle of the fundamental dignity of man.

(113) Before presenting the views of the United States delegation to the Conference, I should like to refer briefly to what in our opinion is the most significant development in Unesco since the seventh Conference. This is the proposal to remodel the programme. We believe that this eighth Conference will go down in Unesco annals as an historic one if it accepts and implements the proposal.

(114) The Executive Board has rendered a great service in its development of this basic idea, including the division of the programme into general and special activities. These special activities afford great promise for the future in that they would take advantage of the lessons of the past and would envisage major projects which will clearly show Unesco to be a progressive and dynamic force in the world.

(115) In this spirit the Secretariat, acting at the suggestion of the Executive Board, has proceeded to revise the 1955-56 programme. The Director-General and the staff have demonstrated a sound understanding of the concept set forth for their guidance.

(116) The tenth anniversary of Unesco in 1956 will be an appropriate time for celebration. It would be fitting to observe that notable occasion by charting a course whose new bearing would reflect the cumulative experience of the past and a clear and realistic vision of the future.

(117) In order to be prepared for a new orientation in 1956, it is important that we give careful thought at this eighth Conference to ways and means of planning the remodelled programme. We must be certain that the ideas of all of the Member States as well as those of the Secretariat are pooled in order that there may be evolved a group of practical and sound projects which will be readily understood by all and which will reflect Unesco ideals in being.

(118) In moving towards such goals, we must retain as our guide and compass the Constitution of Unesco. We must constantly remember the ends for which the programme is but a means. Education for all, the growth and appreciation of knowledge, the diffusion of science and culture, the advancement of respect for human rights, the increase of understanding and co-operation among peoples - these are the great purposes to which specific activities and projects must be related. These purposes advance the prospect of well-being and peace to the extent that they are shared by all.

(119) We, in the United States, are vitally interested in these peaceful purposes. To promote complete freedom of exchange of ideas and information is to make available to all peoples the knowledge that their fellow-men share with them the common desire for a peaceful world. To achieve a better mutual understanding, it is essential that the man-made barriers to communication between peoples be progressively reduced. The very fact that representatives of so many peoples here take counsel together is in itself a contribution to peace. Think, then, of how this contribution will multiply and grow as mutual confidence and the interchange of

ideas flourish through the world-wide activities of Unesco.

(120) The principal recommendations of the United States National Commission for Unesco, which I now wish to lay before you, are in accord with what I have said about the remodelling of the programme.

(121) First, we believe that sustained effort should be directed toward strengthening important and permanent services, such as intellectual co-operation, clearing house activities and the exchange of information and materials in the fields of Unesco's competence. The Organization has a unique responsibility for linking those who are active, the creative workers, in the various fields of knowledge. To these ends more effective use should be made of selected responsible non-governmental agencies. This will avoid spreading Unesco's funds too thinly and should develop greater self-support in these agencies.

(122) Second, Unesco must concentrate its resources on a limited number of major projects. The United States has pressed for this policy at several previous conferences. We have thought that there should be fewer undertakings and that more resources should be devoted to each, so that really significant results could be achieved. We are gratified that the 1955-56 programme represents a forward step in this direction.

(123) Third, we believe that the Unesco programme should reflect, even more clearly than it now does, a concern for the promotion of international understanding and co-operation. We urged at the seventh conference and we urge again that a strong interdepartmental committee be set up in the Secretariat to plan and co-ordinate the activities and projects which bear on this important subject.

(124) Fourth, priority should continue to be given among the major projects to those for fundamental education and the extension of education, particularly elementary education. Each session of the General Conference has recognized the challenging problem presented by the continued existence of mass illiteracy, poverty, hunger and disease. Unesco has a great responsibility, along with such sister agencies as the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labour Organization and the World Health Organization, for tackling these problems. The need for training in literacy, in health, in improvement of agricultural methods, in crafts, in home economics, in community development and civic education is undisputed. In view of this need, much more of Unesco's resources should be devoted to the programme of fundamental education.

(125) Fifth, the United States believes that Unesco should make a greater effort to assess the success or failure of its projects. Considering the complexity of the unexplored field in which Unesco is working, it is only common sense to take frequent bearings in order to determine whether the course of action is effective. We therefore believe that, in the future, major projects should be so planned as to incorporate programmes of evaluation. Thus each stage of the project will proceed with full knowledge of what has been successful, as well as a clear recognition of what has not worked well at a preceding stage.

(126) Another question to which the United States delegation attaches prime importance is the joint proposal sponsored by the Governments of Australia, Brazil, the United Kingdom and the United States to amend Article V of the Unesco Constitution. The object of this proposal is to make members of the Executive Board responsible representatives of their governments. At the same time, of course, they will continue to be responsible to the General Conference and to defer to its wishes. At the seventh General Conference a similar proposal was put forward, but action was postponed until this session. Some objections to this concept have been expressed on the ground that its adoption might lead to a frustration of the ideals which inspired the creation of Unesco and to the destruction of vision and imagination in its leaders. It is our conviction, however, that the future of Unesco and its activities lies in the hands of the governments which comprise it, that its potentialities can be developed only to the extent that its direction inspires the confidence of Member States, and that the first step toward that goal is the assurance that members of the Executive Board are in fact responsive to the views of their governments. It follows also that the decisions of an Executive Board so constituted would carry much greater weight with member governments than is the case at present. It would be the moral responsibility of governments to appoint as their representatives persons of outstanding achievement in the fields of education, science and culture, in full consultation with their National Commissions.

(127) The founding of Unesco was an act of faith - faith in man's ability to recognize truth through the free interchange of information, faith in his ability to improve his lot through common effort. We in the United States have not lost that faith.

(128) The years of Unesco's life have been troubled ones, and many difficulties are still unresolved. Yet we believe that the prospects for peace have recently improved. The United States Government has taken the initiative in submitting to the United Nations, President Eisenhower's imaginative and constructive plan for the peaceful use of atomic energy which will enable all peoples to share its benefits. The partnership of free nations has begun to show positive results. Peace has been restored and old disputes settled in several parts of the world. Every man who truly longs for peace can derive hope from the progress which has been made. Once again it has been demonstrated that men working together in an atmosphere of goodwill, intelligence and perseverance can overcome serious obstacles and achieve substantial results.

(129) These developments encourage and strengthen us in our aspiration for a world of free men, where the will of the people is fully recognized, a world where barriers of fear and prejudice will be replaced by ties of friendship and mutual understanding.

(130) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, I shall ask your leave to add a few words in Spanish - a few words to express the heartfelt thanks of all my colleagues in the United States delegation and of myself for the innumerable attentions we have received from the Government and the people of this country. Uruguayan hospitality is, of course, proverbial, but even so we had expected nothing so kindly and so generous. For us of the United States delegation it is a matter of singular satisfaction that this session of Unesco's General Conference should be held in a country of the Americas. The spiritual, cultural and historic links binding the American Republics together

have made this hemisphere a region of peace and calm with an ever more marked atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding. May God grant that in the near future this same atmosphere of friendship and understanding may prevail, with Unesco's aid, among all the nations of the world.

(131) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Denmark.

(132) Mrs. KOCH (Denmark): Mr President, the Danish delegation associates itself with the expressions of thanks to the Uruguayan Government and people for their very kind and extremely sympathetic hospitality.

(133) Some days ago, as I listened to the noble and inspiring words of the delegate of the Gold Coast, I tore up most of the speech I had meant to make. What does that matter? Most of the problems I had thought to deal with have already been mentioned - and they will be dealt with more profoundly in the respective committees of this Conference. We Danish delegates - few as we are - will do our best to advance our points of view in the appropriate places. Three of us have been at Unesco work from the beginning; I alone am here for the first time. Allow me to talk to you with the freshness of a first meeting with Unesco upon my lips.

(134) I was deeply impressed by the words of the Gold Coast delegate. He told us of the great endeavour of his people, of the many useful things the Government of the Gold Coast intends to teach the population, and, among those things, he mentioned the joy of living.

(135) I have been reading over and over again during the last year some modern African poems in Danish translation, and I saw in a glimpse the wide and wonderful perspective of the work of Unesco.

(136) What have we not to learn from each other? The old, experienced and somewhat weary democracies have much to give, but surely we have still more to learn, as true as we are living democracies. Denmark, now a very small country, but in days long ago a colonial power, treated the Gold Coast in a manner that we prefer not to remember. All of us here are linked together in the process of history. History must take its course. We cannot weaken the sway of power-politics from one day to another, nor from one year to another. That is a long-term task of wise and patient statesmanship.

(137) But here, on the platform of Unesco, we are not bound to schemes of political thinking, if we crave freedom in our hearts. Let me be open with you. When this august assembly refused by a large majority to deal with the problem of Peking China and evaded the question of accepting Rumania and Bulgaria to membership, I felt sad. The act seemed to betoken the lassitude of the old world. Where is the sense of not receiving New China among us in Unesco? New China, with her roots deeper in the ancient history of human civilization than most of our countries, has chosen her own way. It is not our democratic way. We may regret that, but perhaps in a sense we of the Western world are responsible for it. When you meet with a rebuff, your heart hardens. That is a psychological law of human nature, the same in the nurseries as at conference tables.

(138) Let us learn to analyse our own behaviour and to revise some of our conventional ideas. We have a duty to do so, here in Unesco, in the name of truth and the freedom of mankind. We have hitherto acted on the assumption that by far the larger part of our work lies outside the political sphere and is concerned with the needs, hopes and aspirations of all humanity. We want to enlist the forces of science and culture for the founding of a lasting peace on the common heritage of mankind, safe from the uncertainties and vicissitudes of everyday political life.

(139) But enough of this. The Director-General allowed us to talk of the principles of Unesco while debating his Report and my remarks had that purpose only in mind.

(140) As to the Report itself, the Danish delegation finds that that document - as well as the programme and budget - reflects the readiness of the Director-General, his Secretariat and the Executive Board to pay attention to justified and constructive criticism, and to utilize it in a persistent effort to improve Unesco's programme and activities.

(141) Denmark has repeatedly supported the efforts to concentrate Unesco's resources on essential and well-defined tasks, its main effort to be directed towards improving education and science in parts of the world which are economically and socially underdeveloped. I wish to reaffirm our support for such efforts, but at the same time I have to emphasize that a suitable equilibrium must be maintained between such activities and the support to be given to international scientific and cultural co-operation through non-governmental professional organizations.

(142) The work of the international institutes in Germany has been followed with great interest in Denmark. We hope that the Organization may succeed in carrying on and developing these institutes and, as a token of our interest in these problems, the Danish Parliament has appropriated contributions of 35,000 Danish kroner for each of the years 1955 and 1956.

(143) We have noted with satisfaction that valuable work has been carried out on the special problem of women. We should welcome it if substantially more weight were given to the education of women to take their share of responsibility for social development; it is important not only for women, but for the sound growth of democracy itself.

(144) If Unesco is to live and grow in the way that it deserves to, we must reach the broad masses of the people. It is therefore a good thing, we think, that Unesco's programme includes projects which pave the way for active co-operation by the individual citizen and make a direct appeal to the man in the street. I am referring to two projects in particular: Exchange of Workers and Unesco's Gift Coupon Scheme, both of which have been very valuable to us in Denmark. The implementation of these two projects has made a deep impression on Danish minds and has enabled us to dispel in the eyes of the ordinary citizen the abstraction that so easily attaches to international organizations. How can persons not directly engaged in Unesco work identify themselves with the great task for which we have joined forces? I believe that the answer to that question is very important, for, unless the peoples commit themselves sincerely and actively to international work, that work will sooner or later disintegrate.

(145) More than any other of Unesco's initiatives, the Gift Coupon Scheme has assumed concrete form in the minds of the Danish people. It can help people to break away from traditional prejudices and attain a truer sense of values. Indeed the benefits of the coupon scheme to ourselves are so substantial that we have come to look upon the scheme as a gift to us. In the administration of the scheme we in Denmark have endeavoured to give equal weight to its value to recipient countries and to its educational importance for our own people. The coupon scheme has made such a profound appeal to the mind that the Danish youth organizations have joined forces and taken up this work with a realization of its human potentialities and with a keenness no one had dared anticipate. A large share of the work on the coupon scheme has been performed in our schools. There, too, the result has been so encouraging that the non-governmental organization - which the National Commission entrusted with the administration of the scheme - is now framing a school plan. These are, in very brief outline, a few of the thoughts and ideas arising out of our experience of the coupon scheme in Denmark. We want as far as possible to make the scheme a manifestation of human solidarity, a real and true exchange.

(146) And now - speaking of human solidarity - I will add two words on the staff problem submitted for discussion by the Director-General. The Danish delegation finds that the staff regulations are good as they are and we hope that whatever solution is found will safeguard the effective work of the staff without encroaching on the rights of staff members to hold personal opinions in the fields mentioned in the Human Rights Declaration, rights which we in Denmark maintain for our civil servants as a matter of course.

(147) After this general debate, we shall come to grips with the details of our programme. We shall judge each item on its merits according as it advances the well-being of humanity, materially and spiritually; according as it enhances understanding between nations and provides better educational conditions for future generations.

(148) Just as science has no use for national prestige or political prejudice, so in all matters of the mind the indulgence of prejudice and considerations of prestige are short-sighted and sterile. Truth has an inherent strength and this encourages the hope that we shall be able to co-operate, different as we are in ideology and way of life.

(149) With its increased membership, Unesco is faced at this General Conference with new possibilities and they might have been greater still, if we had reached another decision on the admission of certain new members. As things are, let us fact these new possibilities with open-mindedness and courage, with goodwill and patience The Danish delegation pledges its full co-operation at this important juncture.

(150) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Guatemala.

(151) Mr. DIAZ SAMAYOA (Guatemala) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the delegation of Guatemala to the eighth General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has the honour through me to greet the delegations of the other countries met together on this important occasion, and more particularly the Director-General of the Organization.

(152) It is also a matter of the deepest satisfaction to the delegation of Guatemala to have this wonderful opportunity of enjoying the warm and intellectual atmosphere of Uruguay, a cultured and generous-hearted land which has upheld in Spanish America the loftiest ideals of culture and was and is an exemplar of those purest forms of democratic life towards whose attainment the efforts and aspirations of mankind are directed.

(153) This delegation accordingly pays a tribute of admiration, in the distinguished person of the President of the Conference, Mr. Zavala Muniz, to that hospitable nation which today receives our delegations and it is a satisfaction to us at so auspicious a moment of international communion to recall the glowing thought of José Enrique Rodó, the mentor of American youth, who said "In the life of human societies progress is essentially bringing ideals to life. From the pious veneration of the past and the cult of tradition, on the one hand, and from the bold reaching out to the future, on the other, is drawn the noble power which, uplifting the spirit of the community above the limitations of the present, shapes its stirring and vague emotions into an ideal".

(154) A notion very like that so penetratingly expressed by Rodó - one of America's great minds - has inspired the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the distinguished work it has accomplished during its existence, and for that reason the confidence of the peoples within its orbit in its efforts to build a better future for mankind through the gradual extension of the loftiest values of the culture of all ages is firm and unshakable.

(155) With a sure appreciation of the special circumstances of the nations in which it is working Unesco is pursuing the essential aims it professes of progressively elevating the minds of men to lay the solid foundations of permanent peace for distant ages yet unborn. So much is shown by the tasks already partially accomplished - differing indeed but linked in essence by a single intent - in the spheres of scientific research, of the dissemination of culture, of technical assistance, of the teaching of innumerable disciplines and of fundamental education. These tasks of world significance can be seen by all, and the record of them is inscribed in the Report and its supplement submitted by the Director-General and the Executive Board for 1953 and the first half of 1954.

(156) The nature of the work the Organization has accomplished strengthens the idea, already dominant in our age, that humanity, beset by innumerable perils and still tormented by the effects of the late world-wide conflagration, is casting around in search of a way towards the principles of idealism, that it is seeking the path it needs by the light of a revived and spiritualized humanism which promotes the flowering of human personality, champions the basic concept of human dignity and battles to secure the respect and maintenance of that atmosphere of freedom essential for the soul to be able to find its truest and loftiest expression.

(157) This obviously is of primary importance in Unesco's work, but it in no wise means that Unesco forgets that other, material factors have a definite part

in the advancement of those human groups who profit by its work, or underrates those factors. The truth is that in many States, members of the Organization, whole sections of the population are on the borderline of the stage of economic advance achieved by the average man of our age. These groups require priority attention and there can be no doubt that a body such as Unesco will increase the aid it already gives to some of them, fitting them for every aspect of life, with the co-operation of governments, National Commissions or specialized cultural institutions in the countries concerned so that they can attain the enjoyment of the high standard of living to which they are entitled.

(158) It is surely important to repeat that the economic development of these human groups must proceed in close parallel with their spiritual and social uplift, so that the degree of progress thus brought about may fittingly mirror the ideal of the full development of human personality which is the yardstick prescribed by the most advanced educational thought of our epoch. It is only right to provide underdeveloped countries with the material resources they still lack, the specific skills and talents they do not yet possess, so that they may achieve a more rewarding life in the material sense; but what is done will be immensely more laudable if, concurrently and parallel with this, new avenues are opened to their minds by efforts to combat illiteracy and by the training of the intellect.

(159) For these reasons I feel that a word of praise is merited by that section of the Director-General's Report dealing with what Unesco has done in the sphere of fundamental education, supported by organizations and individuals in its Member States; and from the good results secured it would appear that in the future conduct of this line of education it would be well to add to the purely formative subjects the fine arts, in order to continue thereby to awaken to life the full possibilities inherent in human beings.

(160) Guatemala recognizes the successful work accomplished by Unesco in its various activities and through its delegation proclaims its resolve to continue to extend the co-operation merited by the excellence of Unesco's aims. We are convinced that culture is par excellence the medium by which to bring men together on a plane of brotherhood and co-operation and in that belief we are ready to co-operate without reserve in the execution of the projects which Unesco is planning, confident that this will redound to the benefit of mankind and to the cause of justice.

(161) We firmly believe that the same feelings are entertained by the other Member States of this Organization; we are convinced of the ability of those at the head of Unesco, to whose weighty judgment a task as great as it is delicate is committed, and we hope that our own problems regarding the education of people who stand in need of it and regarding the creation of specialist centres for the better exploitation of our natural resources may receive the generous attention from Unesco, from whose services we hope to obtain sure guidance and benevolent support. Only recently our University of San Carlos made the first moves towards the establishment of an institute for the teaching of the social sciences for the specific purpose of research, an example which will be widely followed in the other countries of South America. It has accordingly forwarded a request to Unesco for the provision, as far as possible, of technical assistance in the early formative years of the new cultural institution and hopes for a favourable response.

(162) The delegation of Guatemala believes that Unesco has accomplished invaluable work during the period under examination and extends its warmest felicitations to the leaders who are thus consolidating the existence and prestige of a body which deserves the support of everyone because they benefit from and are ennobled by its work.

(163) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): To conclude the debate for this morning I call upon the delegate of Yugoslavia.

(164) Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the delegation of Yugoslavia has only a few general observations to proffer on the programme and budget and the Director-General's Report. There are many good things in the proposed programme for 1955-56, but we are accustomed to say little about good things since good things speak for themselves. Accordingly, I am going to devote more time to certain observations which should be regarded as suggestions designed to provide some slight assistance towards the improvement of Unesco's work - a thing which I imagine we all desire.

(165) First and foremost, it should be pointed out that in the course of the work done so far Unesco has acquired a rich fund of experience. Year by year the programmes improve but the improvement still does not sufficiently reflect both the positive and the negative lessons of previous years. Sometimes one gets the impression that certain forms of activity pursued by Unesco which have not yielded satisfactory results are continued from year to year simply because Unesco's organs, including the General Conference, are not yet bold enough to liquidate more firmly certain survivals from the earliest years of Unesco's formation and activities when hesitation and experiments were inevitable. On the other hand, the life and activities of Unesco and the evolution of its work are compelling the inception of new kinds of activities which are still not provided for early enough nor exploited to the full.

(166) If we analyse Unesco's programme of work for the next two years on this basis, it will be seen that the programme is more precise and more practical, that it takes into account the experience gained, that it is being resolutely directed towards providing effective aid to the underdeveloped countries, a point I wish especially to comment, but that the old notions of a kind of abstract universalism of the Unesco of the early years still survive in some form in the new programme.

(167) Throughout the programme the tendency is still apparent of trying to combine disparate philosophical ideas, to fuse disparate schools of sociology and even disparate historical methods. We must be clear in our minds that it is no misfortune for contemporary mankind that there should be different philosophical notions, different schools of sociology or different methods of interpreting history and we must realize that these differences cannot be overcome by an artificial synthesis and that all efforts to that end are in vain. I doubt myself whether even the comparative

explanations of the different concepts which are given in publications, as is now being done in the sphere of sociology, can yield positive results.

(168) Secondly, we have seen from the Director-General's and the Executive Board's Reports that Unesco is still not taking proper advantage of the possibilities of National Commissions. The Yugoslav delegation drew attention to this matter as long as three years ago at the sixth General Conference held in Paris, and the heads of certain delegations have mentioned the matter at the present session of the General Conference. I think we are all agreed that, without energetic work by National Commissions and without better integration of their work with that of Unesco, we cannot hope to achieve better results or to succeed in extending and improving the work which is one of Unesco's principal tasks today as in the future.

(169) We fully appreciate the difficulties which Unesco has to cope with in its efforts to cater for culture, education and science in different countries, from the most backward to the most advanced. Clearly, no middle policy can here be found which will satisfy all these different countries nor can Unesco be a world Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. But this difficulty can and must be overcome by fuller co-operation with the National Commissions and by Unesco giving support to the various national schemes. In this last connexion I want to acknowledge with satisfaction the close attention and practical measures of assistance which Unesco has extended to Yugoslavia in such a very interesting undertaking as that of educational reform, the results of which are most important to Yugoslavia, the proposal being to adopt modern teaching methods. There is no doubt that the outcome of this work, which will take some years to accomplish, will also be exceedingly interesting to other countries.

(170) The Yugoslav delegation is accordingly following very closely the efforts of certain other delegations to open up new prospects for Unesco's future work. Here the Indian delegation's proposal drawing attention to the need to allow for the special features of the various parts of the world merits serious consideration.

(171) This brings me to my third point: in the future, interregional co-operation will become much more important. I am glad to be able to point out that scientific, cultural and educational co-operation between Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia has already yielded modest initial results. I am convinced that this form of co-operation is going to increase progressively and I hope that Unesco will give it every support. As I have already said, the trend towards regional co-operation is growing but it should not become self-centred or isolated, although cases of this kind already exist and will continue to do so in the future.

(172) I want to say a word or two on the question of Unesco's Mass Communication Department. As we already know, more than a million dollars is allocated to this Department and its staff work very hard, but it strikes me that the method of working adopted by Unesco is very similar to the methods of centralized governmental propaganda, where all the information is assembled at the centre and thence routed to the places where it is used. On the question whether this is an up-to-date and effective way of working, there are doubts which are borne out by experience. It is obvious that no proper co-operation has been developed with the information services of the other Specialized Agencies and above all with those of the United Nations so that inadequate advantage is taken of all the services available for the dissemination of information or all the possibilities afforded by the United Nations. On this point the delegation of Yugoslavia wishes to enter reservations and trusts that Unesco will take account of these in its future work.

(173) I should like to emphasize that the present international situation justifies a hope that there will develop an atmosphere more favourable to successful work in those spheres of special interest to Unesco. Although Unesco is a non-political organization, we cannot forget that it is an international organization and as such can make a weighty contribution to the future development of international relations, to the growth of international co-operation, to the deepening of understanding between the peoples, to the notion of peaceful coexistence of countries widely unlike in their economic and social systems, in a word, to the fight for peace and for peaceful relations between States. Science, culture and education can exercise an extremely favourable and positive influence on the future development of international relations if in the latter there prevail better understanding and closer co-operation and if many of the prejudices of the past are eliminated.

(174) I should also like, on behalf of the Yugoslav delegation, to express our gratitude to the Director-General and his staff for the progress achieved in Unesco's work. Not long ago, in Belgrade, Dr. Evans and I had occasion to discuss a number of matters relating to Unesco's activities and were glad to find an atmosphere of mutual understanding. As it has done up to now, Yugoslavia will continue to afford effective aid in the common task of achieving Unesco's objectives and carrying out its programme.

(175) Finally, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the heads of other delegations and to offer the people and the Government of Uruguay the hearty thanks of the Yugoslav delegation for the cordial welcome given us and for the immense pains taken to ensure that our stay is as pleasant and our work as fruitful as possible in this lovely land.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

# EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING

*16 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Discussion of the Director-General's Report (continued)
Speeches by the delegates of Brazil, New Zealand, Israel, Colombia, China, Philippines, Union of Burma, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, German Federal Republic, France, United Kingdom and the representative of WHO. . . . . 114

**DISCUSSION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**
(continued)

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Brazil.

(2) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, Unesco, in deciding to meet this year at Montevideo, paid deserved tribute to the civic virtues, international spirit and great cultural achievements of the Uruguayan people.

Nowhere would we have found an intellectual and moral atmosphere more conducive to the accomplishment of our work. Everything around us bears the inspiring and ennobling imprint of freedom. Everything around us holds out the prospect of a happier future for mankind. To the expressions of sympathy and admiration conveyed to the Government of Uruguay by all the members of this assembly, I should like to add the fraternal greetings of my country.

(3) The proposed programme presented to this assembly by the Director-General is, I think, worthy of the highest praise. Slight alterations may, of course, be necessary here and there; and we may even decide, in the light of our discussion, to make certain changes of form or substance. But, taken as a whole, it constitutes an excellent survey of our work plans. The division of each chapter into two parts, one dealing with the services and obligations proposed for Member States as a whole, the other with undertakings related to specific problems affecting certain groups of States, is a most useful innovation. Since the first set of projects are of a permanent nature, the second temporary, this arrangement is an eminently logical one.

(4) I am happy to inform you at the outset, Mr. Director-General, that the Brazilian delegation will support your proposals with the utmost enthusiasm, and approves unreservedly the higher budgetary level you propose. Each of the proposed projects will be studied and analysed in detail, at the appropriate moment, in the various commissions and committees.

(5) I should like to congratulate you also on your excellent report on the activities of the Organization during the eighteen months of your term of office. Those who, like myself, have followed the work and life of Unesco since its inception are in a position to appreciate to the full the intensive work done in 1953 and 1954. The Unesco Secretariat has given yet further proof of its high standard of efficiency and unstinting devotion to duty.

(6) The Executive Board has undoubtedly contributed much to the success of the work accomplished under your administration. May I be permitted to convey my sincere congratulations to my former colleagues on the Board, and to their eminent Chairman, Sir Ronald Adam.

(7) It is unfortunate that, owing to its limited resources, Unesco has not yet been able to match its programme to the needs and aspirations of most of its Member States. The vast disparity between our resources and our aims, instead of decreasing, is growing daily more marked. The further we advance along the road mapped out by our Constitution, the greater are the obstacles we encounter. The arm of our lever is too short, try as we may, to lift the weight of ignorance, lack of understanding and poverty crushing the world. Until such time as we have overcome the forces of apathy paralysing our work, there is no point in our wearing ourselves out in planning and revising programmes, establishing priorities, adopting administrative reforms.

In order to make a muscle contract, the intensity of the nerve impulse must attain the threshold of excitability. Until it reaches this point, though the stimuli are multiplied indefinitely, the muscle will not react. This law of all or nothing applies to social mechanisms as well as to the nervous system. Unesco has not attained the threshold of its efficiency. If it is to exert any influence on the chaotic world

around it, to expand its machinery - its financial resources must be augmented.
(8) I am aware that this is impossible at the present juncture. We must content ourselves, for the moment, with the ten million or so dollars in our annual budget. But we must not despair of better prospects for the future.
(9) The continent whose guests you are at the moment, ladies and gentlemen, invites you to consider the problems of education, science and culture on a scale corresponding to its vast area, its prodigious stores of unexploited wealth and its rapidly growing population. From our fields, our cities, our factories and our schools there arise the strains of the Canticle to Hope which you heard from the lips of the students, the workers and the peasants of Uruguay on the day our proceedings were inaugurated: a song of joy but also a litany laden with the suffering of the humble and the obscure.
(10) South America offers the strange and spectacular contrasts of a world in the making. Its cities are springing up and expanding with breath-taking speed; its population is being doubled from one generation to the next; a new type of man, strong and vigorous, is emerging gradually from the mingling of the races and peoples who have come here from all quarters of the globe, attracted by the riches of its soil and the friendly welcome awaiting them everywhere. South America is destined to become one of the world's largest granaries, and a well-nigh inexhaustible source of vital raw materials for all kinds of industries. But, behind this stupendous upsurge, behind this rich promise for the future, there still remains a mass of men, women and children living in utter destitution, without schools, books or teachers, lacking all access to education and culture, hovering on the fringes of our civilization and our age. In several of our countries, half the population can neither read nor write. It is in the interests of us all, in your interests as well as ours, to help them unstintingly to educate, train and equip themselves, firstly in order to enlist their valuable natural abilities for the service of the human community, and secondly in order to help them to exploit their natural resources.
(11) The same needs and demands exist, I am aware, in many other parts of the world as well - all the more reason for taking them carefully into account when planning for the future.
(12) When we review the most urgent cultural needs of so many peoples and regions and compare them with the scanty services we can give them, we cannot but experience acute disquiet. Indeed, in order to bear real fruit, each of the main projects in our programme would by itself require the whole of our budget resources. The critically minded accuse us of raising hopes which are far beyond our fulfilment, and believe that we are doomed to dally for ever with illusions, with nothing to offer the world but small samples in education, science and culture.
(13) Must we accept so sweeping a verdict and resign ourselves to inaction because the work devolving on us proves too arduous? I am loath to believe it. The loyalty we owe to our Constitution, the responsibilities resting on our shoulders, and the dangers threatening a vast part of the world, defenceless in the face of ignorance and poverty, make it incumbent on us to seek a path of salvation, cost what it may.
(14) A year ago, President Eisenhower, in a speech delivered before the United Nations Assembly, spoke of the deep concern of his country and his Government for the cultural needs of our era. In connexion with the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, he gave us a glimpse of the cultural treasures and abundant wealth which the whole of mankind could enjoy if only the threat hanging over the world were dispelled. The words of the Head of the American State deserve to be recorded in the records of this Conference as a message of cheer and hope.
(15) It is, alas, still too early to think of abolishing our military budget to finance the peaceful cultural work on which we are engaged. But it might already be possible for all countries, East and West alike, to make their contribution to the creation of an International Cultural Fund designed to meet the real needs of the world, as regards education, science, philosophy, arts and letters, technical and industrial training, libraries, books, schools, and travel and study fellowships. A sum equivalent to only one-hundredth part of present-day military budgets would suffice to set up a fund sufficient to provide Unesco with the peaceful tools it needs for the accomplishment of its mission.
(16) Allow me, Mr. President, to remind this assembly of statesmen, educationalists, sociologists and scientists of the solemn warning Artigas one day gave his fellow citizens:

"La causa de los pueblos, no admite, señores, la menor demora".

(The cause of the peoples, gentlemen, brooks no delay). May this General Conference follow the advice of the wise founder of your nation, and proceed forthwith to constructive action.
(17) I wish, with your permission, to place under your august patronage the appeal which I am making to the most favoured Member States of this Assembly. Great power always entails heavy obligations. And I know also that generosity is infectious. We are entitled to hope that those countries, of both East and West, which are in a position to remedy the ills afflicting the great majority of mankind will not refuse their help. It might perhaps be possible to set up immediately, under your auspices, a small working party to study the proposal I have the honour to submit.
(18) We cannot lose the opportunity afforded by this Conference of discussing the core of our problems and embarking on joint action on the strength of this discussion. If this debate is conducted with the goodwill and tolerance befitting our assemblies, I am confident that the Montevideo Conference will constitute the cradle of our renaissance. The creation of an International Cultural Fund would enable us to look forward confidently to a new era of enterprises designed to meet the real needs of mankind. The balance between the forces of good and evil, life and death, hope and despair would thus be restored. Furnished with the necessary implements, we would resume with a surer hand the work of building the world of tomorrow. With but one

hundredth part of the resources hitherto devoted by man in his folly to his own destruction, it would be easy to ensure the triumph of the aims and ideals of our Constitution, and to give millions of outcasts a full spiritual and material life such as, with the wealth of our civilization, we are now able to offer to all alike, without distinction of class, race, religious belief or political ideology.
(19) This victory is within our grasp; we have but to stretch out our hands to pluck it.

(20) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of New Zealand.

(21) Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, may I first say, on behalf of the New Zealand delegation, how grateful we are to be able to spend these few weeks in your lovely and interesting country; a country which, as you so eloquently said in your opening speech, is one where no man can feel a stranger.
(22) I have thought in the last few days more and more that this country reminds me of my own, and there is no greater praise that any man can give to a country that is not his own. We of the New Zealand delegation - the whole two of us - have felt completely at home here. We feel that we have so much in common with this country - our size, our age, our aspirations, our social legislation, our fighting love of freedom, all those things we feel are shared here. If I could for a moment discard all modesty and speak on behalf of the Southern Hemisphere, I should like to welcome Unesco on its first visit to this side of the Equator. It is an experience that will do both Unesco and the Southern Hemisphere a great amount of good.
(23) And now, if I may turn to the programme of Unesco, the New Zealand delegation, and the New Zealand National Commission, of which I am the Chairman, have asked me to congratulate the Director-General on his new programme. We believe it is a better programme than any that we have had and, if you will forgive me for a moment being personal, I would like to break a good rule and refer to one department. Five years ago I was responsible for the Education programme of Unesco; I should like to say to the Director-General that I find it now an infinitely better programme than when I left it.
(24) I should like also to congratulate the Executive Board on its statement on the remodelling of the future programme, with which we found ourselves in general, though not necessarily of course, in full agreement.
(25) We in New Zealand feel some concern about what might be the results if the new programme were carried to extremes. We do believe in the technical assistance programme, in technical aid of all kinds, within the Unesco programme and in the expanded programme, to underdeveloped areas; but we share some of the fears expressed, I understand, by other members, that it might lead to some lack of balance in Unesco's programme. Some of the technical assistance projects have been among our most successful and spectacular. To oppose technical assistance, on the one hand, to international understanding, on the other, would be, I know, to oversimplify. There is not much international understanding in an empty belly or an ignorant mind, and technical assistance may have to provide the conditions under which international understanding can exist. But I feel at times that possible dangers may follow from a misunderstanding of our old Unesco concept of the free flow of ideas.
(26) We sometimes speak as if all you had to do to get ideas to flow in all directions, is to remove barriers. But when you remove barriers, ideas do not flow in all directions any more than water does. If you have water at different levels and remove the barriers, the water flows downhill and so, I think, do ideas. Ideas, if you merely remove barriers, flow downhill, and the downhill, in this case, is descent from the highly technically developed countries to the countries with a low level of technical development, the technological gradient, I might call it, down which flow the motor cars, the refrigerators, the aeroplanes, the fabrics, the tools, the gadgets of modern life. With those material things flow the ways of life and the thoughts of the people who make them. If, on the other hand, people at the lower end of this technological gradient want to get their ideas to flow to the other countries, they must flow uphill, flow against the force of gravity, as it were.
(27) For example, the ideas, the philosophies, the religions of the Far East, and Eastern ways of life generally, have less chance of becoming known in the highly developed technical countries of the world than have ideas flowing in the opposite direction. Now, a mere technical assistance programme could intensify this state of affairs. You can speed up the flow of materials and with them the flow of ideas, down this technological gradient, but you must use the process wisely. What may happen if it is used unwisely? First of all, you may tend to get a flat, level lake of culture throughout the whole world, and the world would be the poorer for losing the turbulence and diversity of the various cultures. On the other hand, you could also arrive at the point when some countries were always givers and other countries always receivers. You run the risk that an international organization like this might gradually become a place where countries that have, meet countries that have not, and hand them out some kind of assistance. I know that this is not what the Executive Board means and I am completely sure that this is not what the Director-General means nor, indeed, what any delegation wants. I know also that everything I am saying now has been said before, ever since our earliest Conferences. But I am not quite sure that we have always seen the practical consequences to our programme that follow from this set of ideas.
(28) Unesco's function, as I see it, is twofold in this respect. In the first place, it must help guide down the gradient certain sets of ideas, particularly in science and in education, that will be of assistance to the people with a lower level of technical development. The other function - just as important - is to help to pump up - if I may continue the analogy - against the force of this gravity, the ideas, philosophies, arts, religions, whatever you like, of the countries that are technologically underdeveloped. That is, the business of Unesco

is to see that there is a circulation of ideas in the two directions. It is easy to exaggerate, to pretend that the only values and philosophies in the world are the ones that came from the East. It does not follow that because a country is underdeveloped it has necessarily better ideas than one which is highly developed. Unesco still has and must go on having the old function of an exchange of ideas between peoples at the same levels. But, my point is this - I know of no other organization in the world, besides Unesco, that can perform this function of helping to pump ideas up against the stream of technological and mechanical products that are flowing down the gradient of which I speak.

(29) Here I see an important and dynamic function for the Cultural Activities Department of Unesco and, in part also, for the Social Science Department. They again will always have to ensure the interchange of ideas between people at the same level, but, above everything, they are concerned with seeing that the countries which have something to give on the cultural and the spiritual side are given the opportunities for their ideas to flow to other countries.

(30) If you see the whole programme from this point of view, you get a new and dynamic conception of the function of these Departments. The Cultural Activities Department is not one that deals with the mere decorative additions to life: it is, and must be, an essential part, for example, of the technical assistance programme. It is not compelled to do the same kind of things that the Science Department and the Education Department should do. It may have to do almost the opposite. Or it can continue to do both, but its functions and its emphasis will be very different from those of the Natural Sciences and Education Departments. We have talked a great deal here of co-ordination within the Secretariat, but co-ordination within the Secretariat does not mean that all departments will necessarily have the same kind of functions. What it means is that the Organization as a whole, with all its internal variety and complexity, will move towards one predetermined goal. What that goal will be, none of us who have been connected with Unesco through the years can have any doubt. Unesco must be dedicated to the one overriding purpose of helping human beings throughout the world to live in such conditions, material and spiritual, that they can understand one another, can share the rich diversity of their common cultures and can learn to live together in peace.

(31) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Israel.

(32) Mr. KUBOVY (Israel) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, Colleagues: I would like to begin by associating myself with all those who have expressed their pleasure at finding themselves in this hospitable country, whose people, last Friday, gave so moving a demonstration of confidence. My delegation is doubly grateful to this country for, in addition to appreciating its hospitality, we cherish the memory of the unforgettable part played by Uruguay during the events leading up to the establishment of the State of Israel.

(33) I would like next to congratulate the Director-General on his report presented to this Conference. It is a very valuable document, firstly because of the projects and activities it describes and, secondly, because it gives a very clear picture both of the trends underlying our work in the past, and of our present policy. The programme, which is based on an overall plan and follows a number of clear-cut lines, constitutes a remarkable survey and a first-class working document.

(34) We have been pleased to welcome to Israel, during the past financial year, the Director-General, Dr. Adiseshiah, then Chief of Technical Assistance (whose promotion we are pleased to note), and Mrs. Myrdal, Director of the Department of Social Sciences. These visits, and the thoroughgoing discussions to which they gave rise, threw invaluable light on our common problems.

(35) To turn now to the work programme before us, I am pleased to be able to say that the delegation of Israel - as well as our National Commission - fully approves the new trends which have been introduced into our Organization, particularly as regards the concentration of our activities and the emphasis on projects undertaken at the national level.

(36) The concentration of activities necessarily involves reducing the number of projects undertaken by our Organization, but that is all to the good. Unesco's field of action is so vast - bounded only by the limits of the human spirit - that there is a natural temptation to cover everything, to fritter away meagre resources on a multitude of activities, instead of concentrating on the major problems - raising the cultural level of the broad masses and creating, through fundamental and adult education, an atmosphere of universal agreement and co-operation. By sponsoring a few major projects serving to dramatize its aims and designed to provide an example and an inspiration for the world at large, Unesco would do more to fulfil the high hopes centred in it than by pursuing a multitude of different projects which, valuable though they unquestionably are, have not succeeded, up till now, in catching the imagination of the general public, so that Unesco, for millions of people, has remained an incomprehensible, mysterious symbol.

(37) We are also, as we have said, in favour of the increased importance attributed to national activities in the planning and execution of programmes, of the system whereby Unesco acts merely as an auxiliary, stepping in when projects have already been initiated at the national level. Unesco's job is to encourage, assist and co-ordinate, but not to be a substitute for the efforts of Member States. This is not merely a question of the budget, although the cuts which have had to be made in certain projects already under way have demonstrated clearly that, in view of our meagre resources, every penny of Unesco's money has to be spent with the utmost care. The main point is that, in order to achieve any lasting results in the fields of education, science and culture, Unesco must recruit and train national workers, for the nationals of a country have a deeper and more vital interest in the work to be done than that stemming from mere expert knowledge; they feel that the people to whom they are dedicating themselves are their own flesh and blood, and regard it as their mission to raise the cultural standard of their fellows and so repay the

debt they owe for the opportunities they themselves have enjoyed.
(38) This method is applicable to all countries, but to the underdeveloped ones in particular. Unesco's aim must be to help them to discover and use the abilities of their own people, and to train a group of leaders from amongst the nationals of the country. There is a risk that the work of even the greatest expert may bear no fruit, or produce only temporary effects, if, when he has completed his mission in a foreign country, he leaves nothing but a report, albeit a model of lucidity. But a less eminent consultant, who leaves behind him disciples fired with the desire to increase their knowledge and to carry on his work, will have done a job of lasting value both for Unesco and for the country concerned.
(39) Let us beware, however. The growing importance of work at the national level and the ensuing decentralization must not be confused with excessive administrative decentralization. The regional centres scheme, for instance, has produced remarkable results in Latin America, owing mainly to the homogeneity of language; but that is a single isolated case, and, I fear, an exceptional one. We are pleased to see that Unesco has dropped the idea of setting up a world network of regional centres, which threatened to sow not goodwill, but discord.
(40) I cannot tell you how deeply the Israeli delegation regrets having to request, from this platform, that Unesco should refrain from setting up any centre or any establishment in regions which, for political, racial, religious or other reasons, are inaccessible to the subjects of other Member States. What is the good of talking solemnly, at our meetings, of the universality of Unesco, and the international community of peoples it constitutes, if this universality is not even respected within Unesco itself? It is not for practical reasons that I am saying this. To try to eliminate Israel from the Middle East is, we feel, as futile as to try to eliminate Mount Sinai or the Mount of Olives from history or geography. But can one speak, in the reports before us, of the success of the Sirs-el-Layyan Centre when this establishment, by the fact of its being virtually inaccessible to the State of Israel and its Arab subjects, bears daily witness to the defeat of the most sacred principles of our Organization?
(41) We are fully aware how difficult it is to translate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into practical international laws; but, if there is one organization where intolerance should be utterly taboo, and where tolerance and the desire for mutual understanding should find a last refuge, that organization is, surely, Unesco.
(42) Israel is a bold undertaking for, as proclaimed by the name it has adopted, my country is striving to realize, in a small patch of territory, all that Israel has represented in the field of culture and human aspirations down through the centuries. My country is a giant laboratory, a melting pot where peoples belonging to every country and every century are blended. The problems raised by education and the need for imparting moral unity to such heterogeneous elements have obliged us to create a sort of national microcosm of Unesco. We know that our first task is physical survival; but we know too - it is an obsession with us - that, unless Israel contributes to the spiritual enrichment of the world, unless it hastens the advent of the Kingdom of God on earth, its resurrection will have been a cruel disappointment both for us and for mankind as a whole. It is in this spirit that we wish to make our contribution to the progress of Unesco, in order that, in the words of the Prophet the earth may be filled with the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea.

(43) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Colombia.

(44) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) (Translation from the Spanish): I wish, as Head of the delegation of Colombia, to take this opportunity, once again, to make a number of comments on various subjects general and detailed, affecting the future of our Organization in varying degrees.
(45) May I be permitted, first of all, to endorse the comments of those distinguished speakers who have praised the report presented by the Director-General, it reflects the profound sense of responsibility and objectivity which have characterized his administration of Unesco.
(46) Although this United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has existed less than a decade, its activities already cover almost the entire globe. The original nucleus of forty-three nations, which signed the Constitution one November day in 1945, has expanded year by year so that, at present, we have seventy-two States assembled under the banner of world solidarity and the generous auspices of this noble city of Montevideo.
(47) This period has sufficed to overcome the first and most difficult stage of Unesco's work - that of laying the foundations of vast projects. This work has been characterized by prudence as well as ambition, by a spirit of co-operation and a keen desire to succeed. Thus Unesco has been able to strengthen cultural relations between peoples through the medium of their governments and university organizations; to encourage scientific research in the natural and social sciences; to facilitate the exchange of persons, books and knowledge. And it has served as a means of communication between organizations all over the world which are striving to attain the lofty ideals of justice, freedom and peace.
(48) One of the most important tasks of Unesco has, perhaps, been to encourage the underdeveloped countries to apply for technical assistance from the culturally advanced ones. Unesco's technical assistance is, fundamentally, nothing but an organized form of the acculturation which is essential to modern progress. Actually, this acculturation operates spontaneously, without being organized, as a result of the migration of human groups. This was what the settled peoples in ancient times achieved in respect of the nomad invaders; what the Greeks received from the Aegeans and the Cretans; what Rome received from the Greeks and what Europe assimilated through the medium of Roman thought. In these South American countries, this process of technical assistance began from the moment when the Spanish conquerors brought the

yoke and the plough to this territory, and thereby drove out the rudimentary methods of aboriginal farming.

(49) Today new forms of acculturation are needed, and it can no longer be left to the spontaneous operation of bygone ages. The evolution of the underdeveloped countries needs to be accelerated by their peoples' receiving education, guidance and advice from experts sent by societies of broad and recognized experience.

(50) Naturally, the chief beneficiaries of Unesco's cultural work are the underdeveloped countries, including most of the countries of this American hemisphere. In this connexion, one of my comments on the report before us would be to call the attention of this assembly to the need to consider more adequate means of reinforcing the technical assistance programme, both economically and from the administrative point of view.

(51) It is particularly heartening to see the attention the Director-General's report devotes to fundamental education. In this field, Unesco is already achieving satisfactory results, with the inauguration of the first centres of a vast network of fundamental education centres planned to extend to all countries having a large proportion of illiterates.

(52) The President of the Republic, in a memorable speech delivered recently to the National Constituent Assembly of Colombia, said that the era of man had arrived; in other words, the time had come to focus official attention primarily on the education of the human being, to whose service all the achievements of technical progress should be subordinated. And he commented, with great wisdom and common sense, on the paradoxical and widespread truth that a peasant who can neither read nor write is quick to learn how to manage an agricultural tractor and other mechanized instruments of modern progress.

(53) Many other points of this report on Unesco's activities might be singled out for mention. Mention should be made of the important place given to the social sciences. The Department of Social Sciences is doing some of the most useful work on sociological research, both by co-ordinating the sociological research done throughout the world in congress and conferences, and by means of its excellent publications.

(54) I would like now to refer briefly to two undertakings which are closely connected with Unesco's cultural work in Latin America. I mean the Sutatenza Educational Radio Project, and the Medellín Public Library Pilot Project. These projects have just been visited by the Director-General of Unesco and the Chairman of the Executive Board, who, in their reports to those bodies, expressed satisfaction with the results obtained.

(55) The Public Library Pilot Project for South America was inaugurated on 24 October, United Nations Day, with a stock of over 10,000 volumes. On the same day the foundation stone of the new building was laid. All these functions bore witness to the interest of the authorities and the enthusiasm of the whole population. That the Library Pilot Project was able to overcome the difficulties of the initial stages was due, mainly, to the work of Mr. Carlos Victor Penna, the Unesco expert, to whom Colombia owes a debt of profound gratitude. The Library is run on the lines laid down by Unesco in its pamphlet: "The Public Library, a living force in popular education". It also has gramophone record library and film and filmstrip services, and its educational work is designed to extend to all sectors of society. But it is essential to see that its mission is fully carried out in the international environment of Latin America.

(56) The lively interest roused by the new experiment in the education of adult peasants now being carried out by the Acción social popular at Sutatenza is fully justified by the results obtained.

(57) From the strictly pedagogical point of view, perhaps, the radio school cannot be regarded as a substitute for the ordinary primary school. It was never intended to be. Mechanical equipment cannot take the place of the teacher, with his personal influence on the pupils. But in backward countries, where the peasant communities are separated by precipitous mountains or vast plains, and where the State educational system is unable to cover the whole of the territory, the radio school is invaluable as an emergency substitute.

(58) This is being demonstrated in Colombia by the powerful network of fundamental education schools which, under the inspired direction of Father Joaquin Salcedo, and with the technical aid of Unesco, is incorporating many thousands of formerly illiterate peasants and country people into the cultural life of the people.

(59) At this moment, when I am about to relinquish the seat on the Executive Board to which the General Conference, at Florence, saw fit to elect me, it gives me particular satisfaction to have had Colombia selected as the site of the Library Pilot Project for Latin America and to have secured Unesco's technical assistance for an educational undertaking on the scale of the Sutatenza educational radio project.

(60) I could not conclude my remarks without referring to a question which was raised by the delegation of Colombia at the General Conference in Florence in 1950, repeatedly revived by the United States delegation and recently brought up again by Professor Veronese, with great skill and effectiveness, in the Executive Board. I refer to the so-called concentration of the programme.

(61) During the Unesco General Conference held in Florence in 1950, I spoke, on behalf of the delegation of Colombia, very clearly and frankly of the danger Unesco was running of frittering away its efforts and resources on a multitude of activities of secondary importance, and so losing in quality anything it might gain in quantity. I remarked, on that occasion, that Unesco should do its utmost to avoid that danger and concentrate its attention on a few basic objectives.

(62) I note today with deep satisfaction that this policy is taking practical shape in the document on the revision and remodelling of the programme, as an outcome of the informal discussions held by the Executive Board at Gif and Longchamps, and finally adopted by the Board at its session in Venice.

(63) This policy, which Colombia continues to support vigorously, does not, of course, involve abandoning activities which form part of Unesco's original work; but it does mean avoiding the

dissipation of resources on obtaining mediocre results in activities which are only remotely connected with the specific projects of Unesco, or which overlap with work already being done by other organizations.
(64) Many other comments occurred to my delegation on reading the report of the Director-General; but, since I do not wish to exceed the time-limit fixed for these speeches, I shall refrain from stating them.
(65) Nevertheless, I do not wish to conclude without expressing an opinion which may well, I think, be shared by the majority of delegates here assembled. This is, perhaps, the largest gathering of States ever witnessed by history. In addition to the seventy-two member nations, whose standards float against the glorious Uruguayan sky, there are the emissaries of many associated countries, whose swarthy countenances we have seen transfigured by the light of new hope. Other countries, where the language of freedom is not yet spoken, have entered the great community of Unesco. It is our duty to say to one and all: Welcome. Welcome because, when a new guest comes knocking at the door of the mansion built to serve as the abode of the basic human freedoms, it is clear that his intention can only be to respect and enforce respect for the regulations of the house into which he is received. Both the ends of Unesco and its means are well known, but they may be summed up in a single sentence: to achieve peace and friendly coexistence between peoples through recognition of human dignity and of fundamental human rights in the fields of education, science and culture.
(66) Many fears have been expressed of the ability of certain countries to fulfil, in practice, the promises they undertake, on entering Unesco, regarding respect for human rights such as freedom of thought, free movement of persons, books and periodicals, and freedom of conscience, which implies, essentially, freedom to disagree and to follow the bent of one's convictions. I myself had occasion to express similar fears. But, at the same time, it must be assumed that a State which pledges its word through signing an international treaty, such as the Unesco Constitution, is in honour bound to keep its promises. The assumption of good faith is the basis of all agreements between individuals and nations. It cannot therefore be assumed, even as a hypothesis, that any State which undertakes, before an international community, to guarantee human rights, would wish to maintain any form of subjection within its own boundaries.
(67) Many are the efforts which have been made, from the time of Grotius to that of Gandhi, to achieve peaceful coexistence amongst men. Many are the illustrious names connected with these attempts. But for my country, and for all those countries which were formerly part of Greater Colombia, it is a source of great satisfaction to be able to name, as one of the most eminent amongst them, one who flashed like a glorious comet across the American firmament. I am speaking of the Liberator, Simón Bolívar. The conquering genius of Bolívar cherished, as his political ideal, the dream of a community of free nations ruled by a pact of peaceful coexistence. This was no Utopia, such as those conceived by certain Renaissance philosophers; but a grandiose, practical conception. All the peoples of the earth were to assemble in a great amphictyony where any disputes which might arise would be settled by amicable means. Bolívar thought that the first steps towards the realization of this noble ideal might be to form a union of all the American States; but his ideal went further than that, and his real aim was to create a kind of ecumenical federation. In his famous Jamaica Charter, when proposing the International Congress of Panama, he stated his aim in the following words: How glorious it would be if the Isthmus of Panama were to become for the American peoples what Corinth was for the Greeks, a place where all the nations assembled to deliberate on the problems of peace and war.
(68) Thus, the history of the peoples of this America of ours is steeped in this tradition, which stems from the theories of Bolívar, and is personified, at a later stage, in the illustrious figure of President Wilson. For this reason, and because the American peoples are free of the heavy burden of surviving traditional inter-State feuds, we hope that the American continent may one day form the meeting place of all the peoples of the world.
(69) This august assembly of nations, which I have the signal honour of addressing this afternoon, is no more than a stage, a link in the great chain of efforts to achieve international brotherhood. We are assembled, this time, under the aegis and the generous hospitality of a great country whose pursuit of freedom was sustained by the will of the indomitable Artigas. We have been speaking of the contribution made to peace by many noble human values. I, for my part, would like to invoke the memory of one who, after dedicating his life and his divine gift of eloquence to preaching the doctrine of goodwill between men, left, as his testament, this sublime message: Peace be given unto you, my peace I leave with you.

(70) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of China.

(71) Mr. LI YUYING (China) (Translation from the French): I am very pleased to be here for the purpose of studying the numerous problems which arise in the fields of education, science and culture and the organizations dealing with natural and social sciences. It is a veritable encyclopedia, comaining a series of stories, so long that - as the Chinese proverb puts it - we do not know what subject to talk about. Fortunately we have the guidance of the Director-General's report, which is in itself, if not a whole encyclopedia, at least the table of contents or the introduction to an encyclopedia. I can only congratulate him, and express my admiration for his work, for this report is both a summary of and a monument to the work of Unesco.
(72) I shall have occasion to revert to this report, considered as a world encyclopedia. I have only fifteen minutes in which to speak of so varied and such vast subjects - a virtual impossibility. But, thanks to this simple and clear method of arrangement, we have a sort of picture which, like an encyclopedia - word by word, fact by fact - imparts knowledge and enables us to treat every subject thoroughly.

(73) All my colleagues have greeted the Republic of Uruguay, and I do the same; but I wish to do more than that, and my words are not mere politeness or formal courtesy. They are sincere, and they are true: Uruguay, Montevideo represent a torch of freedom, on account not of words alone, but of deeds.

(74) You are all aware that there is a Sino-International library in the National Library of Montevideo. This library, like the continent of China, was about to fall into the hands of the invaders; and its salvation was due much less to concrete, material conditions than to a high sense of democratic and impartial morality. Words fail me to express my gratitude to the Government and people of Uruguay, of Montevideo; the library stands as a symbol of freedom and justice in the history of Unesco, of the whole of mankind.

(75) Another word about Uruguay. Uruguay, as you all know, is aiming at a progressive ideal which is sometimes symbolized by the colour red. There is in China an adage which says that red (colorado) is a good colour; this is not true of purple because the colour purple is not the true red: it is deceptive. Uruguay is not deceptive: its ideology is the true ideology of freedom, equality, fraternity and social justice. In Uruguay education is free at all levels; everyone is entitled to protection, which implies social justice, and everyone is eligible for social insurance. There is no need for me to dwell on this point, as you are all familiar with it.

(76) I shall pass on to another term: the term Sino-International. You will probably ask me, as many people did in Geneva, what justifies the use of this term. The word international covers all the countries of the world; why add the word Sino?

(77) I personally, and we collectively - all of us who belong to the true liberal China, that is to say - are certainly not nationalists or partisans of State control, either Right or Left. It was wrong to call us the Nationalist Government; the Chinese Government itself never called itself by this name, a mistranslation of National Democratic Party. I am speaking of China, not as a Chinese, but from a completely objective point of view. I and my great friend President Herriot used often to say: We are citizens of the world. It is from this point of view that I speak of China, of the Chinese language, of Sinology. Linguistically speaking, Chinese should have been a working language here, but we have not requested that it should be as has been done in the case of Russian, since Chinese is a complicated language, and its adoption as a working language would entail expenditure too heavy for Unesco's budget to meet. We prefer to express our ideas from the point of view both of linguistics and of Sinology. There can be no universality without the real centuries-old China, without Chinese culture and science. The Director-General was formerly Director of the Library of Congress, which was interested in Sinology; and an article of mine on the study of Chinese words was published in Free World . Some Chinese words, especially those in the sphere of moral and psychological conceptions, do not exist in the dictionaries of other languages. Any internationalism omitting China is incomplete. That is why we are stressing this point, not from any spirit of narrow nationalism, but from the objective and universal point of view. The French Lycée in Montevideo has a course in Chinese; and there are 40 Chinese-speaking students who are assisting with the said library, to be inaugurated shortly with an exhibition.

(78) I return to the report of the Director-General, which is, I repeat, an encyclopedia, or the table of contents of a living encyclopedia. The report has been praised but comments have also been made on it. It is said that it is a very extensive programme, perhaps even too extensive. It might be better to concentrate the work, and set up a few large institutions, large branch establishments of Unesco. We do not think the two methods are incompatible. Scale and depth are the two dimensions - horizontal and perpendicular. In my capacity as encyclopedist, I have already published some works on this subject. At the time when I was delegate every year to the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, both in Geneva and in Paris, I used to submit a project of this kind every time. Unfortunately, although the principle was upheld it was never applied in practice by the Institute.

(79) I have no desire to diminish the scope of Unesco's work - on the contrary, I think it must be extended, but from the encyclopedic point of view. I do not mean that Unesco should issue the whole encyclopedia - we have not sufficient funds, and it is not necessary to have centralized funds in order to perform this task. With our system, every country, institution or even individual could produce a separate, independent volume on a given subject, which might even be a highly specialized one. Thus, it is not my intention that the programme or the scale of Unesco's work should be reduced.

(80) I believe that the French delegation has a research project to submit; and I am convinced that delegates can do no other than support this project. We approve this proposal, not only as a specific proposal but also by way of example. There are many projects regarding science and research, by which I mean to say that size and depth are not incompatible.

(81) The social sciences must not be neglected. The very structure of Unesco is an example of applied sociology. It was Auguste Comte who coined this happy term: sociology. I believe - and I have already expressed these ideas both verbally and in writing - that there is room for a social science which might be called sociotechnics. Sociotechnics would study both society in general and special organizations such as Unesco. Unesco is prospering and progressing - there is no denying that. But one sometimes senses a certain uneasiness; I am not pessimistic on this score - it is only a passing phase.

(82) In the individual there are physiological ailments and pathological ones. In society ailments or diseases are no longer incurable. It is hoped that even cancer, though at present not easy to cure, will in the future be curable. The same applies to society: there is normal and abnormal physiology. It is our job to study abnormal physiology also. How are these problems to be solved? We are suffering from certain diseases, and they

are not benign diseases, but stem from deep-lying causes.

(83) I now come to another word, or rather, two other words, of which we speak every day here. I mean the word peace. No one is against peace, everyone is for it, and has been for it since Confucius, from the philosophers of ancient times to those of our day. But there are two kinds of peace: normal peace, which might be called physiological, and pathological peace. There are times when aggression is approved in the name of peace. I would like to quote an example which I noted myself in France. France, at a certain moment, refused to use the word collaboration, although collaboration is a very fine word. Like the word peace. It is not a question of politics. Many people here say that Unesco is too political; I do not believe it. Regarded from the sociological or socio-technical point of view, all problems are natural, as all diseases are natural and curable. But these problems must be studied, it is not enough to have one word only, particularly in our era, when there is such confusion both mental and factual. Labels no longer have any meaning. People at one time used to say that the Left stands for progress, the Right for reaction; but now this no longer applies; we do not know which side is the left and which is the right. We therefore need a new name and the encyclopedia I have in mind will provide the true definition. That is why I think it corresponds to a deep need.

(84) I now come to the last word, the word universality. It is like the word peace - everyone is for it. It is on account of this word that we are here; no one is against universality. In order to achieve universality, we have to take account of the factors and phenomena of which I have just spoken: universality must be genuine, like all words, all facts, all phenomena. I long passionately - I and all my friends, not in China alone but throughout the world - for the advent of true universality; and though I am, naturally, interested in China, I have perhaps been much more interested, for the past 50 years, in the question of world co-operation and of the World Federation of International Organizations which was presided over by Mrs. Roosevelt, in New York, some ten years ago, and which constitutes the real basis for universality. I long passionately, I repeat, for the advent of universality, but on condition that it is an instrument not for world hegemony but for true co-operation, true federation, true universality, and true peace.

(85) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the Philippines.

(86) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, delegates: I have the undeserved honour of greeting, on behalf of the delegation of the Philippines, all the illustrious delegates gathered here to share with us in the difficult tasks facing this General Conference; and of greeting, also, the people and the Government of Uruguay, who have welcomed us all to their beautiful and hospitable country. Fortunately our two countries - nay more, all the South American countries and the Philippines - are bound, though not by concrete, physical ties, by the imperishable bonds of religion, culture and a common desire to improve both our own countries and all the other countries of the world. The Filipinos and the South Americans pride themselves on the fact that they have, for historical reasons, or maybe by the dispensation of providence, inherited from a common ancestor some of the same spiritual and moral traditions.

(87) Eight years ago, in Paris, the city of light, leaders from all over the world, men of all races and all political and religious beliefs, spurred by the same desires, beset by the same anxieties, united by the same desire and fortified by the same unswerving faith, assembled in that city at the First General Conference of this international organization

(88) Unesco as a whole believes that mankind must save itself by its own efforts; that it must, in order to do so, protect itself against its own weaknesses; that it must cure itself of its own afflictions: ignorance, hunger, physical and spiritual ailments; fanaticism, intolerance, love of excessive power, all of which lead to war and the defeat of the weak at the hands of the strong. And by what means did the visionaries of 1946 hope to achieve their noble aims? Strange as it may seem, they put their trust not in material but in moral forces; not in death-dealing weapons, but in the fruits of the creative mind; not in hate, but in love; not in excessive nationalism but in universal understanding. In a word, they laid all their hopes in Man, man with all his human, moral, dynamic and meritorious qualities.

(89) How can this man be produced, how can he be developed? That, is the great question which we must answer satisfactorily on pain of seeing man disappear, or revert to the brutish state in which he lived before the dawn of civilization. Ours is a titanic task, a great and noble task. There is no room for overweening impatience, destructive criticism or unwarranted despair. We must work earnestly and with perseverance; and because the work on which we are engaged is good and great and noble, it must needs be slow; it will take generations to complete, since we have to destroy the roots of evil which have spread wide and deep.

(90) It has rightly been said that there are no longer several worlds, but only one; and that this one world has shrunk so much that all problems affect us all equally. That is perhaps why the founders of Unesco adopted the single principle of human solidarity and universal comprehension. To know is to understand; to understand is to love.

(91) In the light of this irrefutable truth, I shall endeavour to tell you briefly of the position of the Philippines towards the problems with which we are dealing. I shall give a true picture. I shall not confine myself to describing the successes we have achieved whilst glossing over our failures and weaknesses. The picture will be in chiaroscuro, it will not be overwhelmingly beautiful, but it will be accurate. For the thinker who said that half-truths are better than a lie struck the right note. We cannot solve the problems of the world if we provide those who are seeking after the truth with misinformation or information which is only half complete.

(92) The Philippines are comparatively small; they have an area of only 15,000 square miles, inhabited by some twenty-one million people of different racial stocks. There are immense natural resources in its 7,000 islands and islets, but they are as yet untapped. As an independent country, it is still very young. Our independence was granted us by the magnanimous United States of America, as recently as 1946, in loyal fulfilment of a pledge voluntarily given when it occupied the country at the close of the Spanish-American war. Our independence came at a time when we were still suffering acutely from the horrors of the last war. Economically, our position is worse than it was before 1941. But, despite this difficult position, the Philippines have not been backward in participating in all international activities aimed at improving the conditions of twentieth-century man. We are members of all the international organizations, and we were among the first to join Unesco.

(93) Our Constitution furnishes definite proof that we Filipinos renounce war as a national policy, since we wish to live in peace with all the world. We have no designs on so much as a square inch of territory which is not ours; we do not even wish to exercise moral or spiritual domination over any other country, near or far. It is written in our Constitution, moreover, that all educational centres must undertake: (1) to train young people in accordance with the lofty principles of humanity; (2) to inculcate personal discipline; (3) to develop civic consciousness; (4) to teach the duties incumbent on the citizens of a democracy; and (5) to train everyone for an occupation or a profession. The Constitution also stipulates that primary school education shall be free and compulsory for all, and it guarantees freedom of expression, thought and religion, and freedom to exercise any profession. Finally, arts and science are placed under government protection. I have tried to sum up briefly the reasons impelling us to take part in all Unesco's activities.

(94) I cannot give impressive statistics of the number of books we publish, or other details calculated to produce a good effect. We are beginning to tread the path of progress, but we are proceeding with resolution and tenacity, overcoming obstacles here and there. Our proportion of illiteracy is, nevertheless, high - approximately 40% of the adult population are illiterate. As from the present school year, however, we have succeeded in admitting every child of school age to school. The school attendance throughout the whole of the country is approximately five millions. We have hundreds of secondary schools, arts and crafts colleges, agricultural colleges, domestic science colleges, teacher training and higher educational colleges, and fourteen universities. But it is not only numbers we are aiming at; we are now engaged in improving the standard of all our schools. We are also faced with the serious problem of reducing the number of young people entering the liberal and also the technical professions. The fact is that we are training more school teachers, engineers, accountants, chemists, dentists, graduates in commerce than the economic development and industrialization of our country, at least in its initial stages, is able to employ.

(95) Since the general economy of the country is at present at a low ebb, there is a great deal of poverty and unemployment amongst the masses. The standard of living of the rural population has not improved very much over the past thirty years. We are pledged to find adequate remedies for these evils, which are being accentuated by the rapid increase of the population: the total population has trebled in fifty years. I take this opportunity to request that there be included, amongst the urgent problems with which Unesco has to deal, a study of demographic conditions in Eastern Asia. Half the population of the world lives in this area with the result that food, fundamental education and health problems there are more acute. With all the goodwill in the world, there is not much we can do for people who are sick, hungry and who lack the means for satisfying their most pressing needs.

(96) Another question to which the delegation of the Philippines wishes to draw the attention of the Conference is that of spreading the knowledge of the use of new scientific discoveries and techniques, with a view to enabling the whole world, the greatest possible number of people, to enjoy the benefits of modern scientific discovery and so live, if not in happiness, at least in comfort; so that people may enjoy a higher degree of well-being, without being beset constantly by the fear that science and modern technique may one day be used for the diabolical purpose of destroying mankind. As Carlos Lazo, the designer of the new university city of Mexico rightly said:

"The world is lacking in co-ordination. Science introduced order into life, and the time has now come for life to put order into science so that the two may be made compatible, and that we may prevent life from coming to an end. It is not order that is lacking. What we lack is the co-ordination of order, a complete vision of the world and society, a consciousness of universality, a sense of planning. We are witnessing the spectacle of an age when the only technique which is not flourishing is that of using the accumulated knowledge possessed by mankind for the benefit of society".

The following declaration, made by James Roscoe, President of the North Western University of Illinois, United States of America, is also very apposite:

"It is not the atom bomb which is the greatest power in the world at present. The human mind which invented the atom bomb is a greater force, from all points of view. We have no reason to fear this power, if it operates in an atmosphere of freedom. We have reason to fear it if it is used for wrong ends, if we allow the intellect to be divorced from the conscience; if that happens, all the achievements of science, the accumulation of human wealth, the monuments erected by man and the discoveries of medicine will be worth no more than a handful of dust".

(97) I shall now proceed to state briefly the views of the Philippines delegation on a number of subjects

directly connected with the questions before us.
(98) Firstly: we support the idea already put forward by several delegations - that we must celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Organization by adapting our action to the new political, social and economic developments of the world.
(99) Secondly: the delegation of the Philippines considers the Director-General's report on the Organization's activities during 1953 and the first half of 1954 very satisfactory as regards both form and content and accordingly offers the Director-General its warm congratulations. We reserve the right, none the less, to submit our comments, both favourable and otherwise, when the opportune moment arrives.
(100) Thirdly: we support the plan to reinforce the National Commissions in every way possible. All Member States agree that the strength of Unesco is derived from its individual Member States.
(101) Fourthly: our Government and our people deemed it a great honour to receive the visit of the Chairman of the Executive Board, the Director-General and Mr. Secco Ellauri, which gave the Philippines National Commission and the friends of Unesco in our country fresh inspiration. Moreover, Mr. Secco Ellauri's praise of the beauty of your country was partly responsible for our decision to send a full delegation to this Conference, for the second time only since the establishment of Unesco.
(102) Fifthly: we support the proposal that the staff of Unesco should be free from political pressure, should enjoy stability of tenure in their posts, and be given the opportunity for promotion to higher posts subject to personal integrity, loyalty to the aims of the Organization, efficiency and devotion to duty. Without an efficient staff Unesco cannot achieve its aims.
(103) Finally, the delegation of the Philippines wishes to thank Unesco for all the assistance it has given our country since it was first founded. We have received much more than we have contributed; but we are determined to do all in our power to increase our assistance.
(104) May I be permitted, by way of conclusion, to quote one of the stanzas of the Last Farewell, written by the Philippine national hero, Dr. José Rizal, on the night before he was shot:

"On the field of battle, wrestling with delirium, others are giving their lives, without hesitation or regret. The spot matters not - cypress, laurel or lily, scaffold or open field, in battle or cruel martyrdom, it matters nought, when country and home command".

(105) Indeed, the place is of no importance, be it the open field, the office of the official or the professional worker, the research worker's laboratory, the factory, the teacher's rostrum, the pulpit - no matter, when the call of tortured humanity resounds. All alike must contribute in the measure of our resources to the dignity of man and the realization of the noble aims of Unesco.

(106) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the Union of Burma.

(107) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma): Mr. President and fellow delegates: I would like to join previous speakers in their spontaneous expression of gratitude to the Government and people of Uruguay for inviting the General Conference to this beautiful city which symbolizes the great and glorious culture of the Latin American peoples. For the members of my delegation and myself, this is the first visit to this great continent, and I would say with honesty that our information, gathered from books and previous visitors about the traditional hospitality and friendly attitude of the Uruguayan people, is not exaggerated. The moment we landed in Montevideo, after crossing the Equator for the first time, we felt we were in the midst of a sincere and friendly people - despite our unfortunate ignorance of the language. We are all sincerely grateful for the hospitality of our charming and considerate hosts, and we feel privileged to be in this part of the world which lies far from our own country in space though certainly not in spirit: in their ways of living, and in their cultural values and sense of hospitality, the Asian and Latin American peoples have much in common. It is our ardent hope that Unesco will be able to promote cultural exchanges on an ever greater scale between these two regions and also between all nations of the world. On behalf of the Government and the delegation of the Union of Burma, may I extend our hearty greetings to the great Republic of Uruguay?
(108) Turning to the report of the Director-General on the activities of Unesco and the Proposed Programme for 1955-56, I shall be brief in my comments at this stage. The Burmese delegation wishes to congratulate the Director-General on the very substantial achievements of Unesco during the last two years both in the implementation of important projects and in the planning of future activities. Unesco has now established itself as an instrument of international co-operation in the fields of education, science and culture, and is therefore capable of making substantial contributions towards building up the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind. That intellectual and moral solidarity is, indeed, the very foundation upon which the entire structure of the United Nations is built. All that now remains is for the Member States to show ever greater faith and zeal in the activities of Unesco, (and, in this particular, special responsibilities rest on those Member States which are more fortunately endowed with material resources) and show what is even more important, enough goodwill and faith in carrying out this great task of promoting knowledge and understanding so that the true worth of man everywhere may be revealed. In the infallible teaching of our omniscient Lord Buddha, the three flames, lobha, dosa and moha, which in our sacred Pali language mean greed, anger and infatuation, are the cause of distrust, fear, misunderstanding and all evil in mankind. When these flames have been extinguished, we shall all prefer the building of schools, public libraries and museums to the gigantic production of armaments for the destruction of humanity, its culture and all besides.
(109) The Government of the Union of Burma has been deeply interested in the ideals and the work of

Unesco from the time we were honoured by joining this great Organization. In a letter addressed to the Director-General, our Minister for National Planning, Religious Affairs and Union Culture sent this message: "I am taking this opportunity to convey to you through the Burmese delegation the kindest greetings of my Ministry and of the Government of Burma and their best wishes for the success of the Montevideo Session of the Unesco Conference. We in Burma are looking to this Conference to come to the aid of the cultural programme of our people. Indeed, we feel very strongly that Unesco should make greater efforts to prove its active interest in matters cultural as much as it has been doing in matters scientific and educational".

(110) We feel that, in the activities planned for Unesco's future action, cultural activities should be given a very high priority and certainly much more generous resources should be allocated for such activities than are proposed in the programme and budget for 1955-56. In making this suggestion, I do not for one moment ignore the magnitude and the importance of the immense needs in the fields of education and science, but when Unesco's total budget is less than the annual expenditure of a single American university of medium size, its efforts in these fields, where the main problem is one of resources, will not even touch the fringes of the problem. It is in this light that I made my humble remark just now that more goodwill and zeal are called for from Member States, particularly from those with ampler material resources than others. Whatever is being done or planned by Unesco in education and science is certainly very useful and our delegation would like to see even greater efforts made in these directions also. In fact, my delegation has submitted a formal request for aid to the Director-General to be granted in the form of essential equipment for geophysical research and a teaching laboratory in the University of Rangoon. Therefore, it is not our intention to emphasize Unesco's cultural activities at the expense of its educational and scientific activities. But we do feel that, in a proper balancing of the programme of Unesco, cultural activities should be undertaken on a bigger scale than has been possible so far. We believe that Unesco will find even better opportunities for the promotion of international understanding in the field of culture than in the fields of education and science. Activities such as the establishment of national libraries, national museums, the preservation of a cultural heritage, the promotion of arts and crafts and the dissemination of the highest form of culture through books, art reproductions, musical recordings, films, etc., are of the greatest importance to all countries, especially to those which are economically less developed and where traditional cultures are threatened by the onslaughts of modern technology. Technology should certainly march forward and rapidly in these underdeveloped countries, but only hand in hand with cultural appreciation. For this reason we welcome the inclusion of aid to Member States in the field of culture, which was unfortunately, in our opinion, ignored by the United Nations Programme of Technical Assistance. Assistance in the field of culture is not a one-way traffic; the expert who brings techniques and equipment often carries back the knowledge and appreciation of another culture, and in this way such programmes are invaluable for the enhancement of international understanding.

(111) Among the fields of Unesco's action, the Union of Burma attaches the highest priority to advice and technical aid for establishing our National Cultural Centre in the city of Rangoon, with its offshoots outside the capital and, secondly, for establishing a teaching and research laboratory in geophysics in the University of Rangoon. For us, this project for a Cultural Centre will not only fulfil the cultural ideals of a single people, but also contribute substantially towards the success of the historic and truly international meeting of the great Sixth Buddhist Synod now in session, which will last for two years. In the last 2,500 years there have been only five such Synods. The first three were held in India, the fourth in Ceylon and the fifth in Burma. Thus an international Buddhist Synod or Council has been convened on an average once in every 500 years. A Synod is a conference of all the leading Buddhist eminences from all over the world, at which the existing position of Buddhist philosophy and culture is assessed, standardized and recorded after the necessary purification and regularization of texts.

(112) We propose to establish a National Culture Centre, the nucleus of which will comprise a National Museum, a National Library, a school of Fine Arts and Crafts, a National Theatre and a National Art Gallery. The Union Government has been able to allocate four hundred thousand dollars, only a quarter of the total sum requested for the purpose by the Ministry concerned. The funds will probably suffice to carry out the main part of the project, but Unesco's assistance in the form of experts and equipment would certainly be most welcome. The Government's preoccupation with minor internal troubles and with the still very serious troubles created by Kuomintang Chinese aggression in Burmese territory is responsible for the drastic cutting down of the funds requested for cultural activities.

(113) We feel that Unesco's association with this national cultural project will give it an international character. There is no better way of improving international understanding than for nations to help each other in carrying out cultural and allied tasks; in the course of this collaboration they learn to understand and respect each other.

(114) My delegation notes with satisfaction the improvement effected by the Director-General in the organization of the Secretariat. I should, however, like to associate myself with the remarks of the delegates of Indonesia and India, on the question of a better geographical distribution of posts both in the Secretariat and on the Executive Board. We feel there is room for improvement in this regard. For instance, the Union of Burma, long a staunch supporter of Unesco from the South East Asian region, still has not had the honour and opportunity of serving either in the Secretariat or on the Executive Board. As for experience, we shall never have it unless an opportunity is first given us. And we feel that the requirement of proficiency in both English and French is quite unnecessarily harsh.

We do not deny the value of proficiency in two languages, but we are sure that duties can be efficiently discharged in the Secretariat even with a proficiency in one language only.

(115) I wish, in conclusion, to express the satisfaction of our delegation at the enlarged membership of Unesco although we are sorry that the General Conference has seen fit to postpone application of the principle of universal membership in the case of certain States, particularly Rumania, Bulgaria and the great Republic of Peiping, China. The Chinese people number today over 600 millions, in other words, there is one Chinese person to every four people in the whole world, and I feel that we shall be missing something if we do not hear the views and do not receive the co-operation of that great people. But we hope that the present obstacles to universality will soon disappear and that we shall be abie to welcome all, whatever their ways of thought or living, to this great family of nations in a spirit of tolerance and goodwill which must conquer the intolerance and distrust that corrode the hearts and minds of man.

(116) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

(117) Mr. KOVAL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: Allow me on behalf of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to greet the delegates to the Eighth Session of the General Conference of Unesco and to wish all of you success in your work. On behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Ukraine I wish to thank the Government of the Republic of Uruguay for creating favourable conditions for the work of our session.

(118) The delegation of the Soviet Ukraine considers that Unesco can make a definite contribution to the development and strengthening of cultural ties between States and to co-operation between them in matters of culture, science and education, if it acts in strict compliance with the principles which are laid down in the Constitution of the Organization. The Soviet Ukraine for its part is ready to support the activities of Unesco directed toward the development in every direction of science, culture and education in the interests of strengthening peace and creating an atmosphere of confidence, friendship and mutual understanding among the peoples. Our attention should be constantly concentrated on the strengthening of peace, all-round development of economic and cultural ties between peoples on the basis of confidence and equality, the elimination of racial discrimination and extending every kind of assistance to the underdeveloped countries.

(119) Our delegation will actively support all proposals directed against the utilization of the means of mass information for the propaganda of war, which brings in its train endless unhappiness to the peoples and destruction of material and cultural values. We, the Soviet people, recall the destruction which befell our country in the Second World War. Nearly all the scientific and cultural establishments in the Soviet Ukraine - institutes, schools, theatres, museums, hospitals, monuments and natural reserves - were ruined, destroyed and plundered. The total damage amounted to over 285 billion roubles. Many valuable examples of the sculpture, architecture and painting of the Ukrainian people were irrevocably lost.

(120) The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic joined Unesco after the annual report for 1953 on the work done in the field of education, science and culture had already been submitted. I would ask you, therefore, Mr. President, to permit me within the time-limit which has been laid down to give the Conference some facts and data on public education, science and culture in the Ukraine.

(121) The Ukraine, whose people suffered before the great October Socialist Revolution took place in Russia from social and national oppression, from economic and cultural backwardness, has during the period of the Soviet régime become a country with a highly developed economy and culture. The grievous heritage of previous years - illiteracy and a low level of education among the adult population - has been completely eliminated in our Republic. All the children everywhere enjoy universal primary education extending over seven years and every year sees an increase in the facilities for secondary education with a ten-year course, which will soon become universal also.

(122) Teaching in the schools is given in the native language of the pupils; schools where the classes are taught in Ukrainian constitute 92 per cent of the total but there are also schools where the children are taught in the Russian, Moldavian, Polish and other languages.

(123) The Soviet Ukrainian Government annually assigns large sums of money for public education. Expenditure on public education and culture in the current year amounts to about 60 per cent of the whole budget of the Republic. The steady growth of State allocations for public education makes it possible from year to year to increase the construction of school premises, institutes of higher education and children's homes, to give schools much larger supplies of school equipment and literature, to train and maintain teaching staff, to provide the pupils with all the necessary textbooks in their native languages. In 1954 alone 428 new school buildings were erected and more than 40 million copies of school textbooks were published. In the seven years since the war ended, 4,430 school buildings have been restored or erected. Education in our schools is secular and is organized on a scientific basis. Our Soviet system for the education and upbringing of the young generation is imbued with lofty humanitarian ideas and respect for all nations, large and small. The young boys and girls matriculating from Ukrainian secondary schools are given the necessary training to enter any higher educational institution or to work in industry, farming or culture.

(124) In my country great attention is devoted to the education of young workers and the adult population. Thousands of seven-year and secondary schools have been opened for such groups in the towns and countryside, and there are numerous correspondence schools. In these schools young workers and the adult urban and rural population can get

a secondary education free of charge without leaving their employment.
(125) Young people in the Soviet Ukraine have ample opportunities of acquiring a university education. The Ukrainian Soviet Republic devotes special attention to teachers in primary schools. We have a very extensive network of higher and secondary institutions where teachers are trained. At the present time 145,000 students are preparing to become school-teachers. Over 300,000 teachers are now working in the schools of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. More than half of our teachers are women. Women teachers in our country receive the same salary as men.
(126) Teachers in the Ukrainian Republic are given two months' vacation a year on full pay. Since the war the real salary of teachers has more than doubled. To help teachers in their work special newspapers, magazines and educational works of various kinds are published. There are also consultation cabinets and research institutes for pedagogy, psychology and the treatment of defects.
(127) Large numbers of intellectuals trained in higher educational institutions have played a leading rôle in the economic and cultural development of the Soviet Ukraine. In the Ukraine there are 137 universities, polytechnics, pedagogical, agricultural, architectural, medical or other institutes of higher education which train all the specialists required by the national economy. In 1954 alone Ukrainian institutes of higher education trained over 40,000 teachers, doctors, engineers, agriculturists, and other specialists.
(128) All students recording normal progress receive State scholarships, and graduate students are offered employment suited to their speciality. Our Republic has created facilities also for the training and development of science teachers for the universities. In addition, the Ukraine has 634 special secondary schools (technical schools).
(129) Five hundred and eighty-one thousand students are being trained in higher and special secondary schools, some of them by correspondence, without interrupting their employment.
(130) The Ukraine has an Academy of Sciences and a large network of scientific research institutes, in which more than 20,000 scientists are studying problems of agriculture, technology, medicine, biology, literature, language, history and art. The results of the research work done are widely published in the press. All of them are directed to peaceful development, to the production of material wealth for the people, to the alleviation of working conditions, to the use of natural resources for the well-being of humanity. The research work done by the Academicians E.O. Paton in the field of electric welding, N.D. Strazhesko in clinical medicine, V.P. Philatov in ophthalmology, A.A. Bogomolets in clinical physiology, A.V. Palladin in the biochemistry of the brain, V.Y. Youriev in grain selection and by many others is widely known.
(131) The scientists of the Ukraine are always ready to share the results of their research with the scientists of other countries and to take an active part in the work of international scientific conferences.
(132) We sympathize with and support the proposal of Unesco for the improvement of relations between the scientists of the various countries. In recent years scientists from Great Britain, Finland, Norway, Japan and other countries have visited the Soviet Ukraine and have become acquainted with the work of Ukrainian scientists. Ukrainian scientists have attended scientific congresses abroad.
(133) The Soviet Ukraine is covered by a dense network of clubs, libraries, cinemas, museums, opera houses, theatres and philharmonic societies. I shall not cite figures but will only say that everyone in the Soviet Ukraine has full facilities to obtain from a library any book he is interested in, to see cinema films and go to the theatre. The Ukrainians love music, singing, and theatre and books. Our theatres and art groups give performances with great success in the other Republics of the Soviet Union and abroad.
(134) The cultural relations of the Ukrainian people with the peoples of other countries, relations of friendship and peace, are becoming stronger and more extensive day by day. These relations take the form of exchanges of literature, musical works, and artistic productions. Suffice it to point out that in the last three to four years alone dozens of different delegations of representatives of culture, including delegations from Argentina, Great Britain, France, India, Denmark, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and other countries, have visited the Ukraine.
(135) The delegation of the Soviet Ukraine considers that Unesco has great possibilities of developing and strengthening cultural ties between all countries. We consider that Unesco will be definitely successful if it subordinates all its work to the interests of peace and the strengthening of world security. Science and culture must serve mankind, serve the noble purposes which are laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Constitution of Unesco. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic hopes that at this eighth session of the Unesco General Conference all possible and necessary action will be taken to consolidate peace and international co-operation, that no single possibility of easing international tension and of strengthening friendly relations in the fields of education, science and culture will be missed. On this will depend the success of our Conference and the real influence of the decisions adopted here on further progress in the life of the peoples.

(136) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the representative of the Union of South Africa.

(137) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa): Mr. President and fellow delegates: After listening yesterday to the moving discourse of the delegate of Uruguay - a speech, if I may be permitted to say so, completely in line with the record of this progressive and friendly country whose hospitality we are all enjoying so much - there is no more that I can say about the aims and objects of our Organization or about its achievements. Nor is there anything I can add to the remarks of other delegates

about the praiseworthy work of the Director-General and the Secretariat, both of the Organization and of this Conference.

(138) A point however in the address of the delegate of Uruguay that struck me forcibly was his description of the occurrences which led to what he called a small crisis in our Organization some while ago. This crisis had an economic basis and the thought immediately came to me: is it not our duty so to regulate our affairs that we can avoid so far as is humanly possible running into more crises?

(139) Previous South African delegations to Unesco have consistently urged that in the planning of programmes certain fundamental points be accepted if the most effective use is to be made of available resources. These are, very briefly, the need for budgetary stabilization, for concentration of the programme and the paramount need for the application of a system of priorities that will ensure that the Organization's resources are used to the best advantage.

(140) As regards budgetary stabilization, my Government has observed with regret the introduction of the concept of a higher budgetary level. To say the least, we consider this a retrograde step and I am instructed to make it clear at the outset that the South African Government is strongly opposed to the adoption of a budget on this basis. Other Specialized Agencies, in response to the wishes of a majority of Member States, have succeeded in introducing an element of stability into their budgets and it was our earnest hope that Unesco would follow this line and stabilize its programme activities now at the 1953-54 level.

(141) On the question of priorities, my Government feels that, althought the principle has been acknowledged, it has not sufficiently been translated into action. To us it appears that the only priority distinction in the 1955-56 budget is the differentiation between a programme item falling under the present budgetary level and one falling under the higher budgetary level. My Government is of the opinion that programme items which do not give satisfactory results should be discarded in favour of those which do.

(142) It will be recalled that the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations at its eleventh and thirteenth sessions laid down - and recommended Specialized Agencies to adopt - certain criteria for priorities. At its fourteenth session the Economic and Social Council laid down certain programme priorities for education and science. My Government feels that these concepts of priority should serve as a guide to Unesco when drawing up its grammes.

(143) In making these few remarks, I sincerely trust that my delegation will not be regarded as wishing to introduce an unnecessarily sombre note at this early stage of the Conference. On the contrary, our comments are motivated solely by a sincere desire to further the best interests of the Organization. Let us do a few necessary things well rather than attempt too much and lay ourselves open to the charge of biting off more than we can chew.

(144) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the German Federal Republic.

(145) Mr. HALLSTEIN (German Federal Republic): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. In addressing this Conference on behalf of the German Federal Republic, I wish first of all to convey our sincere gratitude to the country which is extending to us such generous hospitality. By holding this session on the South American continent, Unesco gives proof of the sincerity with which it follows its leading principle of universality. The Republic of Uruguay, a foremost exponent of a common Latin American culture, can be proud of its achievements. In these parts of the world, the heritage of Europe is happily blended with ancient traditions of the native soil. Many nations, and among them the German people, have benefited from the fruits of this growing civilization, which, at all times, has been open to international intercourse. We Germans feel gratified by a mutually productive cultural relationship with Uruguay, as indeed with the whole of Latin America. It is a particular privilege to lend expression to this feeling before a distinguished gathering such as the General Conference of Unesco.

(146) The occasion of this biennial Conference should, on our part, be used for re-stating our attitude towards the basic conception of Unesco, for reporting to the Conference the ways in which we try to meet our obligations at home and, finally, for setting forth some principles which we hope to support, during the deliberations of this assembly, together with many other delegations.

(147) Germany feels privileged to be a member of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. We are deeply attached to its principle of universality. We understand this principle not merely in the sense of aiming at a maximum number of members. We understand it rather in conjunction with the basic principles of common action as it is expressed in the first paragraph of Article I of the Unesco Constitution. The fundamental aims of Unesco correspond to a basic need established in every human being by nature itself. It is the need for the free and productive development of the human personality. Here is the common basis which justifies the principle of universality. In this service to the very humanity of the human being all nations should feel united beyond differences.

(148) You will allow me, I am sure, to speak frankly. At a moment when all responsible people are aware of tensions, we sincerely hope that this session of Unesco's General Conference will make a contribution towards the relaxation of this world-wide tension. All nations are suffering from it - the German people in particular, by the loss of its unity. And therefore this meeting, precisely because it is devoted to the ultimate goal of cultural co-operation, kindles our hopes for being reunited in peace and in liberty.

(149) Today, we Germans look back upon more than three years of active participation in the work of Unesco. Many links, both technical and personal, have been established between this world organization and Germany. They were strengthened

in particular by the recent visit of the Director-General to my country. I should like to express my heartfelt thanks to him for his visit and for his presence at the General Meeting of the German National Commission for Unesco. During these three years, my fellow citizens have learned to understand the significance of Unesco. We are convinced that (1) Unesco is destined to be the moral conscience of the United Nations; (2) by committing each of us to work in common with other member nations for the nobler purposes of human civilization, Unesco has become an institution of international co-operation unique by its very universality; (3) by engaging in this endeavour the German branch of human civilization is given the chance of displaying all that is best in it and, in turn, of being infinitely enriched by its contacts with others.

(150) As you know, we are not yet a member of the United Nations. All the more, we Germans feel gratified at belonging to Unesco, which is devoted to the peaceful tasks for which the United Nations are to lay the political foundations. For too long mankind has been engaged in promoting the art and science of war. We conceive of Unesco as the outstanding instrument of the world community for developing the art and science of peace.

(151) Thus, we are pledged to active co-operation in the work of Unesco, and I may now turn to some organizational problems. We approve the intention manifested in the new programme to consolidate the achievements of Unesco by a wise self-restraint. We have few objections to raise, and none of them on grounds of principle. From time to time, as a matter of course, the programme will be re-examined in the light of duly appraised experience.

(152) We welcome, therefore, the thorough examination of certain problems, as it is envisaged in the programme, especially in regard to educational activities and to the social sciences. We hold that the emphasis laid upon the humanities is a most gratifying development. It will bring a better insight into the particular variety of human culture which each national civilization represents, and into the ground common to all of them. We believe that the foremost need of our work is a sincere respect for the autonomous roots of each culture, for the particular wisdom inherent in each language, for the humanity basic to each religion. All of us have learned that the promotion of international understanding depends upon such respect for each other's basic cultural formation. The fact has been increasingly recognized that he who teaches also learns. In this spirit, we are resolved to take our modest share in the proposed studies and meetings on problems of inter-cultural relations and education, in the continued efforts at securing translations, and in providing reading material for new literates.

(153) In order that this work may be as efficient as possible, we approve Unesco's decision more and more to use already existing channels of international exchange rather than to act directly. For the same reason the relation between Unesco and regional international organizations needs to be drawn closer. For example, the co-operation between Unesco and the Council of Europe holds great promise. The process of consolidation initiated by the new programme will greatly enhance the results of the Organization's work.

(154) Both for financial reasons and for the sake of more thorough preparation, we welcome the decision to convene the General Conference biennially. This makes it even more necessary to strengthen the work of Unesco within each Member State and to strengthen likewise co-operation between the Executive Board, the Secretariat, Member States and the National Commissions. With the longer interval between Conferences, increased significance is attached to the permanent institutions of Unesco. Therefore, attention should be given to the most effective organization of the work of the Member States during these intervals. In order to maintain and possibly to increase Unesco's productivity, serious consideration should be given: (1) to the adequate participation of Member nations in the work of the Secretariat and (2) to the adequate participation of Member nations in the Commissions and other bodies set up by Unesco. If these questions of organization are solved in a spirit of fairness and equity, as well as in accordance with the needs of the work before us, the impulse toward active co-operation on the part of all Member States will gain momentum and, with that, the success of Unesco activities as a whole will be increased. We hope that the solution of this problem will already be reflected in the decisions to be taken by this General Conference.

(155) I will conclude my remarks with an expression of confidence that Unesco will preserve its character as a universal forum for discussion; that it will maintain free and intensive exchanges between all nations and cultures, and that it will succeed in engaging each of them more and more in the common task. You will find, we are sure, that we Germans shall accompany you along this common road, sincere, co-operative, ready to learn and, above all, unfalteringly attached to the great aim of Unesco. I am saying this not only on behalf of the population of the German Federal Republic, but on behalf of the whole German people.

(156) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of France.

(157) Mr. BERTHOIN (France) (Translation from the French): My first duty, or rather, my first pleasure, is to convey greetings, on behalf of the Government of the French Republic, to the whole of this American land, whose very name, the New World, speaks of the promising discoveries which the old civilizations are ever eager to find there and the aspirations they have reason to hope will be realized there. Professor Carneiro already spoke in eloquent terms, three years ago, on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus and Isabella of Castile, of the historical and contemporary significance of the links between the Old World and the New.

(158) The history of Unesco, even before its Constitution was laid down, was linked with the Western hemisphere. It was in fact, in 1945, at San Francisco, the cradle of the United Nations Charter, that the foundations of the Greek temple which constitutes our symbol were laid. It was in Mexico,

in 1947, that the Organization first took stock of the full scale and complexity of its task. And now, seven years later, during which our Organization has matured, striving to forge an effective instrument to serve the cause of peace, it is again one of the republics of Latin America that provides our meeting place.

(159) I wish to convey particularly warm greetings and thanks to the people of Uruguay, to whose traditional hospitality we are indebted for the opportunity of assembling here.

The French delegation to Unesco considers itself very fortunate to have been invited - albeit at the price of a 32 hours' flight - to visit this city of Montevideo, some 3,000 miles away from Paris in distance, though, happily, much closer to it in spirit.

(160) We are no longer at the stage of discovering Uruguay; and we know a little more about it than did Juan Diaz de Solis or Magellan. We are now able to appreciate with our own eyes the beauties of which we knew, up till now, only by hearsay. And indeed what we had heard was true. And this pleasant abode, with its modern boldly constructive town planning, which has yet managed never to mar the beauty of the natural sites, is symbolic of the scale and boldness of the progress which you in your country have always managed to achieve without trampling on your most venerable ancestral traditions. We know that you Uruguayans are justly proud of your democratic institutions; that your social security system, for instance, was introduced a quarter of a century before ours in France; that children, families and workers enjoy protection which might well be taken as a model. And I could continue in the same strain .....

(161) You will, I hope, forgive me for not enlarging further on a subject of vital importance to a State which is a credit to mankind; and passing on to one with which I am more closely acquainted. I want to speak of the admirable progress made by Uruguay in the field of public education. As I remarked, it is a matter for special eulogy, and one directly relevant to the work on which we are all engaged, that this country is one of those which has the lowest percentage of illiteracy and the highest number of playing fields and sports grounds, doubly useful for being attached to schools. I need hardly remind you that higher education is given here in Uruguay free of charge, by eminent teachers, some of whom are world renowned; nor need I describe so daring an experiment as the evening high school catering specially for young people working during the day; and divers other admirable experiments the success of which may well make us envious and rather abashed.

(162) Everything indeed, in this generous country, bears witness to its deep feeling for humanity. And if the song of the thousands of children who came to celebrate the solemen inauguration of this Conference, under the aegis of the illustrious Vice-President of the Republic of India, touched a chord deep down in the hearts of those privileged to be the guests of this country, it was because they all had the overwhelming feeling of finding in Uruguay a true spiritual brother.

(163) To proceed to the subject we have to discuss, I shall, I feel sure, speak for all the delegations if I begin by congratulating the authors of the programme of work we have before us this year. To prepare that programme was no easy; it required a great effort of clarification and synthesis.

(164) All the questions covered in the programme are of vital importance; there can be no question of omitting any. We shall have an opportunity, in the course of our work, of taking them one by one. Indeed, the peoples who have placed their reliance on us from the outset would be justified in becoming more and more demanding as their anxiety increases; and we are in honour bound to heed their indications.

(165) Let us clear up, without further delay, a question which, as all our governments know, is perhaps the most serious and disturbing of all: the question of our budget. The budget should, in our opinion, be so adjusted as to maintain the requisite balance between two categories of projects - the one dealing with direct assistance, the other with the maintenance of the continuing services and international intellectual co-operation work - which act, as it were, like beacons lighting up our path.

(166) That is why the French delegation will give whole-hearted support to the Director-General's proposal that Unesco, in conjunction with the World Health Organization, should undertake international action to promote and co-ordinate fundamental research on cancer, the vital importance of which was stressed yesterday by the eminent spokesman of the Swiss delegation.

(167) The French delegation would also view with favour the establishment of an Institute of Industrial Techniques in South America, an immense area full of promise for the future.

(168) On the other hand, the French delegation would regard the elimination from the Secretariat of the section on international understanding, and the absence of any project on teaching about human rights, as an indication that the Organization was neglecting one of the tasks considered by most countries to be one of its essential duties.

(169) These subjects would appear to require further examination, and the French delegation will make its views thereon clear in the various committees and commissions. If the reasons for these and other changes are financial, it might perhaps be possible to reallocate the budgetary credits, or to concentrate certain administrative expenses somewhat; or even, if necessary, to allocate increased funds to certain items. France would certainly, in view of the importance she attaches to the retention of certain activities, raise no objection.

(170) One thing which I can state now - but do I really need to repeat it? - is that my country has never ceased to regard money invested in cultural enterprises as one of the best forms of investment, and to consider that the highest and safest securities on the market, in this world where the passage of time lays all too much stress on material trends, are those which, if I may so put it, promise good returns in the form of culture, that is to say, in the final analysis, of spiritual profit.

(171) Nor do I intend to shirk speaking from this rostrum, albeit very briefly,

on the subject of the Organization's staff.
(172) Under your outstanding administration, Mr. Director-General, and on the basis of the tradition inherited from your eminent predecessors, the Organization has, amidst the multiple activities to which the voluminous reports presented at this Conference bear witness, achieved a number of highly successful results. These are due both to your personal initiative, to which I have great pleasure in paying public tribute, and also to the unremitting efforts of all the officials whose competence and devotion to the ideal of international co-operation are known to us all and, I am confident, fully appreciated by you. It behoves us to keep our conscience alert when it comes to dealing with certain questions which you, as chief international official of the Organization, have thought fit to submit to this Conference.
(173) France, which has the great privilege of being the seat of the headquarters of the Organization - to which it has readily granted important concessions, especially as regards territorial sovereignty - does not consider that it is thereby entitled to interfere in the Organization's domestic affairs. But it cannot remain indifferent to this problem. It cannot but hope that the General Conference will examine it calmly, in a spirit of impartiality, and that a balance will be struck between the powers invested in the Director-General and the guarantees enjoyed by the members of the staff. France also hopes, naturally, that the independence of the officials of the international organization and of the members of the Board in regard to their governments will be maintained. Incidentally, the rights of the members of the Board would seem in any case to be safeguarded, since it is the governments which appoint delegates to the General Conference, and it is the Conference itself which decides on the amount and composition of the budget. But let us view the problem from a wider angle: is it not self-evident that sure and lasting happiness for any people can only be achieved through the happiness of the world as a whole; and that, accordingly, a good servant of Unesco must, ipso facto, also be a good citizen of his own country?
(174) As regards the programme which we have before us, and on which the French delegation has just now indicated its views, it must in any case be examined as a whole; and the separate parts of it, different as they may appear to be, must necessarily reflect a single guiding policy. This underlying unity must be stressed over and over again, for it determines the specific nature and to some extent the authentic character of the enterprise to which we are dedicated, a character which must be maintained at all costs, even if it means rejecting projects which in themselves are excellent, but which would in practice lead to dispersal of effort.
(175) The Organization must make its influence felt in its Member States not merely through its special projects, its offices and its delegations, but above all, through its work, its special initiatives and its support of everything designed to further international co-operation in the non-political sense of the term, its rôle always being to rise above individual and sectarian interests (noble though they may be), and to seek the human, the universal element.
(176) In short, France considers that, while a certain pragmatism is undoubtedly necessary in order to continue to bring the benefits of progress within the reach of the underdeveloped countries, Unesco's reputation would be enhanced if it demonstrated courageously that the first duty of so noble an institution must always be to elevate a civilization which is in danger, unless we take heed, of making efficiency the be-all and end-all.
(177) The French delegation therefore ventures to suggest that even the initial premises must be reexamined if we can thereby restore to our humanitarian policy the full significance it sometimes seems to have lost. The path to ideal fraternity is a long and a thorny one.
(178) Why is it that, despite an encouraging glimmer on the horizon, the fruits of the first, albeit restricted, agreement between the Great Powers on disarmament - so long pursued like a myth - the world is still fumbling on the road to universal peace?
(179) It is because all spoken or written protestations, however sincere, are powerless in the face of a contradiction which still remains fundamental: the contradiction between the individual and the group, between the conception of the Nation or the State - corresponding to the conception of order and efficiency - and that of the world, or the human community - corresponding to an ideal of solidarity and justice which is irrefutable but which cannot, obviously, become part of everyday life until man's needs, which appear egoistic but are in fact merely vital have been satisfied.
(180) If one thing is certain, it is that all the delegations assembled here firmly intend to reach a sincere agreement, one dedicated passionately to the cause of peace. And we are equally sure that their desire for agreement is a faithful reflection of the fundamental wishes of our peoples and our governments.
(181) But it is true too that each of our countries derives, from its traditions, customs and peculiar racial characteristics, certain dominant local, geographical, historical, and even ethnic trends which, besides being truly symbolic of the diversity of life, are probably necessary in order to lend civilization a pleasing variety.
(182) Now, our national soul is imprisoned in a body called the State, making its own demands and also having its own exalted duties, which are not invariably compatible, at any rate for the present, with those we are striving for. That is why no societies based merely on considerations of political coexistence can ever, even at the best, be more than federations of agreements, a far cry from an empire linked by ties of friendship. If such an empire ever came into existence, an empire which might take as its motto the famous saying of your great Artigas, "I have no enemies save those who are hostile to the public weal", its first decree, against which there would be no appeal, would be to proclaim peace. And none of the subjects of this empire would ever have to face problems such as those by which our world is racked. But we are well aware that this empire, if ever it comes into being, must be born of something other than reason: from an impassioned

appeal for the restoration of the ascendancy of spiritual over material values.
(183) This is not the actual atmosphere in which we are living in this era of machinery and speed, this atomic, or rather this nuclear age whose wizardry could, on the contrary, be devoted to reviving the prosperity as well as the virtues of the golden age.
(184) Never has it been more vital for man, unless he is to plunge into the abyss, to defend all spiritual values and to promote all means, both of improving understanding in communion with his fellow men of all countries and of savouring life with greater pleasure. The more mechanized civilization becomes, the deeper man penetrates, though without really understanding them, into what we call the secrets of nature, the more completely he appears to tame these forces, which nevertheless remain dangerously mysterious; the more widely he exploits them to extend his conquests in the eternal night through which he is travelling - the more imperative does it become for man to preserve the things which in this new age still remain free: the power of thought and the power of love.
(185) Thus culture alone is capable of defending everything that makes this life worth living; and this makes us realize the full grandeur of our mission, which is to render education ever more worthy of humanity and give man an ever closer understanding of the thought of his fellows. This alone would be a magnificent achievement, and we must make every effort to fulfil it worthily, enlisting all the successes of material progress for the protection and salvation of the spirit.
(186) And it may be that, by dint of working for and passionately desiring this end, we shall, one day, go a step further, and, passing beyond the realm of thought, creating the new ethical standards of which Dr. Schweitzer spoke in his remarkable address in Stockholm a few weeks ago, we shall attain to the state of heightened awareness which transforms everything and engenders, in perfect love, those great emotional forces which alone are irresistible. When the time comes, ladies and gentlemen, politics will no longer matter much, the domain of man will know no bounds, Unesco will reach its supreme aim, and the noble sacrifices made by all national patriotisms will appear to have been made for the sole purpose of paving the way for the utter devotion of the citizen of the world to his boundless country, his ideal of peace and complete humanity.

(187) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the representative of the World Health Organization.

(188) Dr. BUDNIK (World Health Organization): The Director-General of the World Health Organization has instructed me to convey to the General Conference of Unesco his greetings and good wishes. Unesco and WHO are members of the family of Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. They are organizations with closely related objectives in raising standards of human welfare, and with mutual interests in the fields of education and science. These are fundamental reasons for close association and co-operation. On behalf of the Director-General of WHO it is, therefore, a pleasure for me to report to you our acknowledgement of the constant and friendly collaboration of the two organizations, and of the excellent assistance and support we receive from Unesco in so many fields. The essential contribution Unesco has to make to the work of WHO in all countries and in all subjects through extending basic knowledge is well recognized.
(189) In the period since your last General Conference there has been a growing number of subjects in which the two organizations have successfully co-operated. These have included your programme of fundamental education and arid zone studies, conferences on education and scientific publications, joint work on community development, health education, housing, documentation and bibliography.
(190) WHO is pleased to be represented at this eighth session of the General Conference, to take note of your deliberations in general and of those which bear directly on matters of health and medical interest.
(191) I have been instructed by my Director-General to call your attention to the communication he has sent to the Director-General of Unesco asking for clarification of two points in the document containing the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 . The details are fully explained in the document before you. I might, however, for your information, explain to you the interest of the World Health Organization in the field of cancer.
(192) The problem of cancer and the possibility of further organized international action have been before the World Health Organization regularly. Account has been taken of the substantial funds in many countries at the disposal of universities, foundations, research institutions and individuals. We know that the scientists concerned are constantly considering all possibilities of extending and improving study of the whole complex range of pathological conditions implied in the word cancer. Guidance in the matter must come from the experts, whether expressed through their national or international association with the World Health Organization.
(193) It has been accepted too that international programmes are only needed where appropriate action is not possible through local institutions or arrangements. As local resources and effort are enormous, and are appropriate for meeting most needs, WHO has not been requested to undertake many international programmes in this field. Apart from general health and medical services, which are as important in cancer as in other conditions, WHO has undertaken the requested international services, covering such fundamental matters as nomenclature, standardization of definitions, collection and analysis of epidemiological data, co-operation with the responsible international bodies concerned with cancer, and related subjects.
(194) However, with the many newer techniques available, WHO intends to review the position even more thoroughly. It will consult the responsible experts and scientific groups to determine whether there is any way in which the world medical and health groups amalgamated in WHO can fruitfully contribute more to the investigation of

this subject. This too will be a most timely complementary survey, to be linked with possible international application of the newer techniques coming from the field of atomic and nuclear physics.
(195) These considerations are sufficient confirmation that any work Unesco can launch in the basic sciences, studying cell growth and other phenomena of the cell, will be welcome to medicine. Indeed, such study is an essential parallel to medical scientific work on cancer. I am therefore instructed to say that WHO, so far as resources are provided, will be willing to accept any responsibilities which co-operation in such work with Unesco will impose.
(196) May I again convey to you the good wishes of WHO to its sister organization.

(197) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom.

(198) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, fellow delegates. As I join in this debate, now drawing to its close, I recall that good man who married a widow with ten children. With entirely estimable humility he confessed to a friend that he felt that there was little left for him to do! We remaining speakers now feel that there is little left for us to say. My first word, however, is a simple one. It is that all the members of the United Kingdom delegation are glad to escape from their northern winter into the summer sunshine of Uruguay and to find that this sunshine has its counterpart in the warmth of heart of their hosts.
(199) This is the first time that a Unesco Conference has met in South America. Among the Latin American republics, what better choice could have been made than Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay? My country has always taken a special interest in this liberal State, having had the honour to play some small part in its foundation. The ideals practised here are the ideals of Unesco, too, and so the hospitality of the Government of Uruguay is particularly welcome. May I on behalf of the British delegation express our pleasure at being in this country, so happily free from political persecution, tyranny and oppression and now so melodiously active in the excitements of an election campaign. We are watching this with great interest. If we cannot readily grasp all the issues at stake, we are gratified to see that, in contrast to the fate of the people of some countries, everybody here can say what he thinks, or sing what he likes if he feels that to be a more satisfying way of expressing himself.
(200) Today is the sixteenth day of November. On 16 November, nine years ago, Unesco's Constitution was approved in London. Today we number 72 Member States and 4 Associate Members. The mere numbers are sufficiently impressive, but far more significant are the hosts of individual men and women who will now be brought into active co-operation with Unesco through the action of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in signing the Constitution of Unesco. The United Kingdom delegation, and Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom which it represents, share the satisfaction I am sure we here all feel at the entry into Unesco of the USSR. We recall their co-operation with the London Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, whose work led to the foundation of this Organization. We remember how at our first conference in Paris we all hoped to see a delegation from Moscow, and how disappointed we were that they did not come. Much has happened in the nine years that have since elapsed; fear and suspicion again cloud the minds of men. The preamble of the Constitution of Unesco contains words which, when they were drafted, were thought likely soon to become out of date as obsolete reminders of a state of affairs that had passed away. Unfortunately we have by no means seen an end to the denial of the principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men. Ignorance of each other's ways and lives and the prejudice which that ignorance breeds have continued to create suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world. My delegation therefore warmly welcomes the presence here of delegations from the USSR, Byelorussia and the Ukraine, and also those from Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland. We have noted with profound satisfaction, especially in the comprehensive speech delivered by the leader of the USSR delegation, that his country has decided to accept with sincerity the fundamental principles on which Unesco is founded. If he and his colleagues have come here with a desire to co-operate with us in the work of this Organization, then bright vistas open before us. Perhaps we shall at last be able to see an end of recrimination, to bridge the gap which divides the Communist from the non-Communist world and gradually bring about that intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind of which Unesco's Constitution speaks. Printed and spoken words however are not enough. It is easy to write and talk about principles in general terms, but it is right to ask for deeds as well. What kind of deeds do we want to see? Virtue and truth are the monopoly of no group or people. We want to see a readiness on the part of all of us to give as well as to take, we want to see the free exchange of ideas of knowledge recognized as a two-way traffic, including the admittance to and circulation within all Member States, of information and ideas which governments may not like, and of knowledge which may be politically inconvenient. We want to see the free movement of peoples and not merely the approved transport of officials, experts and delegates. Nor do we want a rigid political approach to the problems which confront us. To push rigid principles remorselessly in the affairs of international institutions is to produce frustration and instability. Let us rather work for practical expediency, based upon increasing mutual understanding and respect. We do not want a political approach to the problems which confront Unesco, and so we should like to see, not merely at this Conference but in the years to come, the abandonment of any tendency to approach our affairs in terms of political blacks and whites, rights and wrongs. We want a spirit of real tolerance, for, without it, education becomes indoctrination, science becomes bigotry, and culture degenerates into thought control. Let us then start our work together in the belief that we are making

small beginnings from which great things will grow. Suggestions as to what might be done can be found on almost every page of Unesco's draft programme. If we eschew the general and abstract and concentrate upon the modest, the practical and the concrete, we shall find ourselves building on better foundations than we know.

(201) Saturday, 13 November 1954 will be a proud day in the annals of the British Commonwealth, for we then witnessed the entry into Unesco, in their own right and with impressive dignity, of two large territories and two large groups of territories forming part of the British Commonwealth of Nations, as Associate Members. There have always been representatives from these territories on United Kingdom delegations, but they will now, as Associate Members, make their own independent contribution. We are confident that they will effectively enrich our proceedings. They have already thanked you, but the United Kingdom delegation, on behalf of the people of Great Britain and of all other British overseas territories, would also like to do so.

(202) Our colleagues who have attended other General Conferences will be aware of the constant preoccupation of the Government I represent with the cause of economy. It is forced upon us by the heavy financial burdens our own people are bearing at the present time. We represent a country in which thrift is still regarded as a virtue and unjustifiable expenditure as an evil. In the last ten years my country has contributed nearly 8 million dollars to this Organization, and very much more to the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies. At the same time we are making available for economic and social development within our Commonwealth over 350 million dollars each year. These contributions are being made at a time when expenditure upon the defence of all those values for which Unesco stands absorbs about one-eighth of the total resources of the United Kingdom, and when our country is only just emerging from a long period of austerity, during which there was little to spare for the considerable social and industrial development that was necessary within the United Kingdom itself. We are deeply concerned at the steady rise in the budgets of the international governmental agencies, to all of which we contribute. In our opinion, it does not necessarily follow that, because new Member States join us, we must expand our programme. The concentrated programme for which so many delegations have asked should remain concentrated, whether there are 50 or 100 Member States. In these circumstances, the United Kingdom stands firmly for the adoption of the present level budget which the Director-General has presented. So strongly do we believe this that at a suitable opportunity we shall propose a resolution to that effect. Subject to this, my delegation believes that Unesco is developing on the right lines, and that the remodelled programme gives promise that such a development will continue.

(203) The Director-General has shown a sincere and sensitive appreciation of the needs of our Member States in this draft programme. Let me pay a special tribute to Dr. Luther Evans. First of all we are very greatly in his debt for undertaking the heavy burdens of this most difficult office. They were more than Dr. Torres Bodet could bear, as he himself told us. His loss two years ago was a serious blow, but we remember him with respect and with gratitude. We hope that with his health restored he will, in his present high position, continue to follow and help the fortunes of Unesco. High courage was needed to follow in his footsteps. Dr. Luther Evans possesses that courage and we should like him to know that he has our confidence. We must have a strong and resolute Director-General. He must also know that we are strong and resolute in his support.

(204) Of course we have our duties also. May I briefly restate them as I see them? We need loyal and active Member States, effective National Commissions and enterprising international non-governmental organizations, aiding Unesco voluntarily with their own resources. We also want the record of Unesco to be more widely known; its achievements in fundamental education and campaigns for literacy and free and compulsory education, its work for the arid zones, the progress of the social sciences and their international applications, library development throughout the world, the dissemination of reproductions of the world's masterpieces in art, copyright conventions, the reduction of barriers to the movement of books and films, coupon schemes and facilities for the exchange of persons. We need to see growing amongst people an awareness of their responsibility to co-operate in these tasks; tasks to which they have been dedicated through their governments. There are no international interests and duties that are not national interests and duties and are not ultimately private interests and duties, and we cannot lose sight of the needs and aspirations of the millions of human beings on whose collective behalf we meet here in Uruguay.

(205) I believe that there is a character in an Icelandic saga named Hord. It was his attribute that he saw things clearly and without glamour. Let our discussions too be of a practical nature, in which we shall concentrate upon securing a manageable programme related to urgent and necessary tasks.

(206) I think I have said enough to show that the economy for which my country stands is not a rigid and inelastic economy, rather is it that of a prudent and eminently practical economy. This view is one which we know that we share with other Member States.

(207) In the successful conduct of public affairs, in the exercise of the arts of the possible, there must always be a combination of three factors: there must be idealism, there must be realism, and the two must be married in an effective and practicable policy. Let us keep our hearts warm, but let us keep our eyes clear, let us keep our feet firm and steady on a broad highway. Bertrand Russell, that doyen of British philosophers, in his latest book concluded with words which I would like to quote to you on this occasion:

"I see before me a shining vision: a world where none are hungry, where few are ill, where work is pleasant and not excessive; where kindly

feeling is common and where men released from fear create delight for eye and ear and heart. Beyond all reason, I am unconquerably persuaded that this will come."

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, let us bend our energies to the task of hastening its coming.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

# NINTH PLENARY MEETING

*17 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Addition of two items to the Conference Agenda . 135
Discussion of the Director-General's Report (continued): Speeches by the delegates of Costa Rica, Cuba, Iraq, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Laos, Mexico, Cambodia, Viet-Nam, and the representatives of the United Nations and of the Organization of American States . . . . . 135

## ADDITION OF TWO ITEMS TO THE CONFERENCE AGENDA

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I have to announce that Yugoslavia and Israel have submitted requests, similar to that put forward by the Government of Iran under item 9.4.7 of the agenda, for the writing off of a sum owed to the Organization, being a loss incurred by the National Commission acting as a distributing agency for Unesco coupons.
(2) The General Committee proposes that two new items be added to the agenda:

9.4.7.1: Request from the National Commission of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia for the writing off of the sum of $1,666.67, being a loss incurred by the Commission acting as a distributing agency for Unesco coupons.

9.4.7.2: Request from the delegation of Israel for the writing off of the sum of $5,714.30, being a loss incurred by the Israeli National Commission acting as a distributing agency for Unesco coupons.

(3) In accordance with Rule 14, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Procedure, new items of the agenda, proposed to the Conference by the General Committee, must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. If there is no objection, I shall take the vote on the two requests together, as both are concerned with the same question and will be dealt with in the same resolution.
(4) The result of the voting is: 26 in favour, 2 against and 2 abstentions. The requests made by the delegations of Yugoslavia and Israel are therefore to be added to the agenda.
(5) I have to announce that, this morning, on the proposal of the delegate of Colombia, Mr. Bernal Jimenez, the General Committee unanimously decided to invite the famous poetess, Juana de Ibarbourou, to attend a meeting of this Conference, as a tribute both to her genius and to the Republic of Uruguay. The General Committee will be responsible for making the necessary arrangements.

## DISCUSSION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S REPORT (continued)

(6) As the list of speakers is still so long, I should like to ask delegates wishing to speak to confine themselves strictly to the prescribed time-limit. I call upon the delegate of Costa Rica.

(7) Mr. GAMEZ SOLANO (Costa Rica) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the Government of Costa Rica, through its delegation to this eighth session, wishes to convey its greetings to the General Conference of Unesco.
(8) In 1949, as a member of the Junta Fundadora of the Second Republic, the present President of the Republic, Mr. José Figueres, signed the decree whereby Costa Rica became a member of this Organization. He therefore wished to send me, the present Minister of Education, to represent him at this session of the Conference, for

I was also in office at the time when the instrument of acceptance was signed in 1949. Our Government places such steadfast confidence and such great hopes in international organizations that, were it not for the special responsibilities of his office, the President of our Republic would be here himself, leading the delegation as he did at the First Regional Conference of National Commissions, held at Havana in December 1950.

(9) Our country is so small and our people so few that we need have no fear of aggression by armed might and can stand aside from the great struggles to which the clash of economic interests gives rise.

(10) With our clear appreciation of our responsibilities, we are a people devoted to the cultivation of Man, the finest flower of the Universe. It has truly been said of my country that its teachers outnumber its soldiers, and I can state here today, as a tribute to world culture, that, under the explicit provisions of the Constitution, there are now no soldiers in Costa Rica, but there are teachers. Our armies are striving for the development of character through culture: they are the children at school, the young people in our colleges, the men at the university. We are seeking to give the men and women of Costa Rica rights of property, but it is our firm resolve that they shall be first and foremost lords and owners of themselves.

(11) If we ever have to fight for the defence of our territorial sovereignty, we shall be able to call upon our citizens, our civilians, who will have learnt at school to love their native country more than life itself. And they are fully aware that their blood may justly be required of them, for it is the life-giving sap from which the splendid tree of national honour draws its strength. Moreover, as a nation belonging to the Organization of American States, we trust in the observance of the treaties governing inter-American relations, which we, for our own part, have sworn to respect and are indeed respecting.

(12) This being so, the trust and confidence we place in all international organizations, and, more particularly, in Unesco, will be readily understood. In view of the functions which the United Nations is undertaking, including the functions of Unesco, whose field of activity is steadily being more clearly defined, we consider that the system of co-ordinating the activities of the various departments, as described by the Director-General, is very suitable and effective. Such co-ordination is bound to benefit the Organization, and we believe that the United Nations might very well introduce a similar system among all the Specialized Agencies in order either to avoid duplication of work or to furnish greater aid in specific directions.

(13) With regard to the Organization's programme for the forthcoming two-year period, 1955 and 1956, our delegation is very well satisfied with the division of each chapter of the proposed programme and budget into two distinct parts - namely, services, activities and obligations for all the Member States as a body, and work connected with special problems in which individual States may be particularly interested. This programme structure meets the need, mentioned in his report by the Director-General, for giving greater assistance to Member States and for working out more practical schemes for them. The decentralization of the implementation of Unesco's programme, of which there has been so much talk at this and previous sessions of the General Conference, can now be based on devoting larger resources to the carrying out of these urgent projects for providing the help needed by States. In the opinion of our delegation, the planning of these practical projects calls for careful study and wise and cautious preparation, so that they may not compromise the established service activities of the Organization, in which all the Member States are interested. Unesco's work, since the Organization came into being, has been marked by a clear and constant extension of the scope of the Organization's activities. It sometimes seems to us that this extension, although it may be considered natural for an Organization working in a field as wide as that of education, science and culture and reaching out to every branch of man's activities, entails a danger that efforts and resources may be dissipated unprofitably on too large a number of projects. Our delegation is pleased to see the great efforts that Unesco has made to do really useful work in fundamental education, which is rightly considered to be one of the Organization's main responsibilities, and to plan for a better co-ordination of work in this field by elaborating special projects for the purpose, which are shown under the headings of Cultural Activities, Social Sciences, Mass Communication, Exchange of Persons and, in particular, Education. We can say the same of the improvement of textbooks, syllabuses and teaching methods, a field in which careful thought has been devoted to the need for giving the individual a well-balanced training, and for discovering the needs of the community, and the opportunities open, in advance.

(14) With regard to the work already done, and the activities planned for the purpose of developing the spirit of international understanding, we note with satisfaction that the Organization has attributed very great importance to these activities, which are basic to the programme of Unesco. In this connexion, when the proposed programme and budget come up for discussion, our delegation will have an opportunity of speaking of an activity which, in our opinion, is one of the most useful, enduring and effective of all our projects; I refer to the scheme of co-ordinated experimental activities in education for international understanding and co-operation.

(15) We must recognize that there are two distinct sides to Unesco's work: the governmental side, carried out through the delegates and the officials who give their services to the Organization, and the no less important activities in which the peoples take a direct part. Without this backing from the ordinary citizen, the work of this and all other international organizations would risk being undervalued because it is not understood, or coming to nought because people are not interested in it. This popular support is furnished by the work of the non-governmental organizations; and the National Commissions play their part, in the various Member States, by stimulating and co-ordinating the activities of these organizations.

The National Commissions are small-scale Unescos in all the Member States, responsible for ensuring continuity in the efforts for the implementation and development of the programme and for helping to achieve the ideals set forth in the Constitution. The work of Unesco is an act of faith; as an alternative to the misunderstanding, fear, hatred and doubt which seem to prevail in certain parts of the world, it offers the understanding of man for man, the principles of collective security, and an unfailing trust in the triumph of the postulates of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(16) We hope that, at this eighth session, the General Conference will adopt the provisions in the proposed programme and budget relating to the encouragement and better co-ordination of the work of the National Commissions. We for our part shall take the opportunity of putting forward some ideas and suggestions on this question, which is of special interest to us.

(17) The Costa Rican delegation to the First Regional Conference of National Commissions, held at Havana in December 1950, which was led by Mr. José Figueres Ferrer, now the President of the Republic, submitted a request for technical assistance for the country. That request was approved and in 1951 we signed the basic agreement for a five member technical assistance mission, which began work immediately on fundamental education, the organization and administration of primary education, the organization and administration of secondary education, vocational and technical education, and the training of teachers.

(18) This mission has worked with us for three years and we, the members of the present Government, have seen its results. I have with me the final report of the mission, which we shall make available to the delegations attending this Conference and on which I shall comment in due course.

(19) Technical assistance is, we consider, the most important of all Unesco's activities, for it brings the Organization into direct touch with the real needs and aspirations of the peoples. On its success or failure the prestige of the Organization very largely depends, not only in the eyes of the governments but also in those of the people they represent. Unesco should therefore devote the utmost care to this type of assistance and mobilize all the factors which can help, or on which final success depends. Sometimes these factors depend on the government which has requested assistance; sometimes they depend on the organization of the Unesco mission; and sometimes they depend on the methods and techniques adopted by the mission in planning and carrying out its projects.

(20) It would be a wise move on the part of Unesco, in this extremely important field, to review and improve the methods of supervising the work and giving assistance during the progress of the projects, and of evaluating results.

(21) On the termination of the three-year technical assistance agreement concluded with my country, I have to bring this Conference the grateful thanks of the Government and people of Costa Rica for the invaluable co-operation furnished,and to state our firm intention of continuing the experiments already launched and of carrying out immediately the recommendations contained in the relevant reports.

(22) The Government of Costa Rica thought that the choice of this model Republic of Uruguay for the seat of the eighth session of the Conference was an excellent one. The excellence of that choice can be seen immediately in the fact that, at this present session, a larger number of countries are represented and there is a larger number of delegates per country. I thank you, Mr. President, for allowing us to come and live among this proud and glorious people of Uruguay, whose every action, every thought provides a lesson in nobility. This is a fair country; Nature here is fair; but fairest and most glorious of all is Man. Such is the distinguishing feature of the laws and way of life of Uruguay, this laboratory of democracy.

(23) A government is drawing to the end of its term of office surrounded with the respect and admiration of its people, who are now preparing, with processions, songs and demonstrations, to cast their votes for the candidates of their choice, while in public places the work done is freely discussed, and arguments and plans for the future are expounded. Freedom and dignity are the bread of life for the citizens of Uruguay. The schools of Uruguay are academies of democracy. The colleges of Uruguay are academies of democracy. Its universities, too are academies of democracy.

(24) Thank you, Mr. President, for having brought us to Uruguay. Here we can speak of freedom. Here we can speak of brotherhood, for every man respects, in his fellow man, that wherein he is most truly man - his thinking, his speaking, his actions. Here we can speak of equality, because all have the same opportunities of cultivating their abilities, because the only difference which counts is the difference of personal culture. The only man who can claim superiority is he whose mind and soul are superior. In Uruguay, we can dream of a better humanity because, here in the Americas, it furnishes an archetype of civic life. Costa Rica, through me, pays tribute to the people of Uruguay.

(25) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the head of the delegation of Cuba.

(26) Mr. FERRARA MARINO (Cuba) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me appropriate, in this general discussion of the business of the eighth session of Unesco's General Conference, to make a reference to the presence of Soviet Russia in our Organization. More than two hundred million men and women, living in an enormous, fertile land, have just brought their aid to this great Republic of Learning in action. They come with an age-old literature whose clarity of expression and vigour of thought compete for our admiration; they come with amazing scientific skills which we hope will soon be devoted to ensuring the welfare of their people, whose lot, like that of many other nations, is certainly not entirely happy; and with achievements in education to their credit which seem to me, as a humble but impartial student of history, to represent the best side of their present régime.

(27) The adhesion of Russia is particularly important because other States, holding similar political views, have now expressed their intention of co-operating in the same way with the rest of the world in the wide field covered by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; and because certain others, who seemed to have decided to abandon the noble undertakings to which they had once voluntarily committed themselves, are now returning to the fold.

(28) All this should cheer us, especially as these developments combine with other signs in the political firmament (which we would wish to see more often and more generally) to strengthen the belief that we are now on the threshold of a general agreement, despite differences in political creeds which, reflected in disputes between governments, have recently assumed a bitter and menacing character.

(29) The Conference has adopted the British proposal that the discussion on the admission of the Republics of Rumania and Bulgaria be postponed until the next session; but this - far from indicating, as has been suggested, any intention of abandoning our progress towards universality - reflects a determination to make the foundations secure, so as to avoid trouble and difficulty at a later stage. The vote can be interpreted as showing that this Conference desires the co-operation of Rumania and Bulgaria but hopes that, once the still heated passions of the revolutionary days have calmed, the generosity of human feeling will return and that we, distant spectators, will hear at least some rumour of the event.

(30) Another happy idea in connexion with this matter of universality was the United Kingdom proposal that we should open our doors to territories and groups of territories which are not entirely responsible for their international relations, as Associate Members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. This suggestion from the United Kingdom Government, which has been enthusiastically welcomed by the Conference, means a practical widening of the world - a step forward which, in helping the underdeveloped countries, also helps those which are already advanced, and opens up new opportunities for the welfare of mankind and the development of the human mind.

(31) This eighth session in Montevideo, beginning with this addition to its membership, will do its work well in the days to come, as can be prophesied from the report by the Director-General and the Executive Board, and from the proposed programme, on which we are soon to begin discussion.

(32) The American proposal that Member States be given greater responsibility in the structure of the Board will strengthen the bonds between each one of the Member States and the community to which we all belong. It is a well-known fact that, in international organizations, any exercise of authority brings with it greater responsibility. Unesco will therefore be strengthened by this new system for the election of its highest administrative organ, without losing the flexibility and variety it owes to the independent cultural organizations operating in its orbit, or the independence of thought and initiative essential to any mental process based on reason; these, in our particular case, are the direct and necessary consequence of the Organization's varied and heterogeneous make-up, or, in other words, of its universality. It would be a very grave error to seek to impose State control over the elusive operations of the mind and the great adventures of the spirit. The United States of America would never entertain such an idea - and I say this to the honour of all the States belonging to that Union - precisely because the chief cause of its political greatness and economic development lies in the limitations imposed by its Constitution on the power of the State and, especially, on the power of the Federal Government. By approving the United States amendment, Unesco will ensure its future but will remain free.

(33) The programme submitted by the Director-General for the next two years is arranged on rational and practical lines. The proposed activities described in that programme can be divided into two groups - one group being designed to complete what has already been begun, improving and systematizing the work, and the other to meet the latest demands.

(34) Any human community, great or small, private or public, religious or speculative, must from time to time pause and give thought to co-ordinating the principles, ideas, activities and aims which have grown up spontaneously and sometimes in confusion.

(35) Far be it from me to suggest a pause in our work; but I do wish to help, by my words, in ensuring that the various projects already adopted or about to be adopted are fitted into a system of practical application which will enable them to produce all the results hoped for by the States which have proposed them. Ideas, even the most brilliant, produce good results only when efficient, orderly and, above all, systematic arrangements are made for carrying them out. This co-ordination will be facilitated in the future if the States proposing projects, or the delegations taking part in the Conference's work, will elaborate their ideas a little more when initiating new activities - that is to say, if, instead of setting forth general desires, as they sometimes do, they will propose specific projects. The United Kingdom has performed what I have in mind with its proposal regarding Associate Members. A proper presentation of resolutions submitted to Unesco would enable our Conference to take fuller advantage of the investigations made by the proposing State and would give the Executive Board and the Director-General, as it were, an authoritative interpretation of the purposes of the proposals. By this means, moreover, the Conference could more easily cast its resolutions in a mandatory form instead of limiting itself, as sometimes unfortunately happens, to the vague terms of political and diplomatic papers, which, though they may occasionally solve practical problems, do not assist in creating a fitting idea of justice among the ordinary people - who, incidentally, with ever critical eyes, look to us, raised on our lofty stage, for constant and unfailing wisdom.

(36) In my opinion, the United Nations Educational,

Scientific and Cultural Organization is now about to delimit the scope of its concerns and to determine its objects more precisely. If we are to do this, it is essential that we lay fresh emphasis on the free and popular character of our Organization, for there could be no greater mistake than to abandon this great centre of culture - the promoter of progress and of intellectual and moral development - to an impersonal bureaucracy, ruled from afar by a hundred discordant political heads. A Unesco which stooped to being the tool of an official culture, of an autocratic science or art - fossilizing itself, at best, in a particular historical stratum - would be, not a force for progress, but an agency of stagnation or indeed of deplorable regression.

(37) We must ensure that our Conference is not infected by the errors which, in some countries, have evoked criticism of parliamentary assemblies. If fixed majorities and minorities established themselves, our discussions could not achieve their aim. The overriding influence of certain dominant countries, though perhaps tolerable in the political field, would be disastrous in the field of culture. The growth of satellite groups, clinging like fungi to any power able to provide material advantages or minor honours, would be the beginning of the end. Anything which marked a departure from universality, from strict equality, from the full observance of geographical representation in the making of appointments to certain posts, from the true, lofty and just application of our Constitution and our accepted principles, would be a sign of the incipient decadence.

(38) The Republic of Cuba sees in this tremendous adventure - daring to the point of temerity - which goes by the name of Unesco, something more than the idea of maintaining an intellectual centre for the world, distributing modest material resources for the attainment of certain spiritual ends: it sees in it something even higher, something which, in truth, emerges as the synthesis of all the programmes drawn up, all the proposals made and all the measures taken by the Executive Board, the Director-General and successive sessions of the General Conference. We look forward to an Organization constantly developing and progressing, in which pursuit of the temporary, futile advantage of the moment gives place to a spirit of well-advised foresight uniting the good of the one with that of the many. And may this change come about not only through the work of education and the public formulation of moral principles, which are easy enough to proclaim but difficult to put into effect, but also through the practice of living as a community, resulting from the combination of a habit of mind - perceiving, albeit dimly, the true import of events - with the practical enjoyment of the blessings of peace and the rich fruits of our dynamic modern civilization.

(39) In Cuba we are seeking to make ourselves equal to our lofty aspirations, by endeavouring to unite all the factors which may help to achieve these purposes around the National Commission. Even now, there is increasing evidence of the vitality of culture and a healthy way of life in our country. We hope that we shall have still better success in future and that, one day, we may be able to show you a free organization, full of variety and uniting a multiplicity of tendencies, which will give a complete reflection of the educational, scientific and cultural life of our nation.

(40) I would not wish to end my remarks without endorsing all the tributes which, from this rostrum, have already been paid to Uruguay. Whenever in future I hear the inspiring strains of the Canticle to Hope, that wonderful testimony of art to the greatness of humanity, which thousands of youthful voices sent surging upwards to the cloudless sky in front of this Parliament building, I shall wonder afresh, in retrospect, at that mighty appeal to the sovereign with a hundred thousand heads - the only arbiter and judge of the peoples' destinies - to take part in the struggle which is going forward, before our eyes, with a true sense of civic responsibility and firm resolve.

(41) My hope for the people of Uruguay, now as ever, is that they will enjoy greatness but not pride, will know prosperity unsullied by the suffering of others, and will be granted happiness in full and unfailing measure.

(42) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the head of the delegation of Iraq.

(43) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq): Mr. President, fellow delegates. On behalf of the Government of Iraq and my colleagues I would like to express my profound gratitude to the Government and the people of Uruguay for their generous hospitality.

(44) Wendell Wilkie, the eminent American leader, said, while visiting Baghdad, the capital of my country: "I have heard of the Thief of Baghdad but I have never heard of so many thieves in it. Indeed, they have stolen my heart." To pass the remark, if I am allowed, the Montevidean people with their charm prove to be real thieves of hearts.

(45) Iraq, as you know, is an Arab country of five million people. This country, once the cradle of civilization, is known to some of you as Mesopotamia, to others as the land of the old Caliphs, of the magic carpet and the Arabian Nights.

(46) Iraq has seized every opportunity to secure its development in the different spheres of life. In Iraq one can see ancient and modern civilization side by side. The former indicates the endeavour of Babylonia, once the centre of the world, to establish an immortal civilization the relics of which still survive here. It may be of use to point out that the latest excavations at Tell Harmal in Iraq are changing our whole concepts of Ancient History. Among the many great finds, we are told it was there that the first university of the world was established. The awakening of modern Iraq indicates the will of our people to preserve the glorious legacy of their fathers and to adopt the best in modern civilization.

(47) In commenting on the report of the Director-General I should like to describe the advance that we have made in education recently, how Unesco has assisted us in this advance in the last four years, and how it can further assist us in the next two or three years.

(48) We are a country with a high rate of illiteracy. At the end of the First World War we had no more than about 6,000 children in our public schools.

By 1932, when the British mandate ended, we had about 35,000 children or almost six times the enrolment in 1918. By 1944 this primary school enrolment became slightly over 100,000 and now stands at a little less than 300,000 students. This is almost fifty times what it was in 1918, eight times the figure of 1932 and three times that for 1944. Nevertheless we have yet a long way to go in order to put every one of our children to school. Our present primary school enrolment, in spite of all the advance achieved, is still only half of what it should be.

(49) At the same time Iraq is an agricultural country with great potential agricultural resources. It also has rich resources in oil. To raise the standard of living of our people we must develop our agricultural and technical education. We have had technical and agricultural schools for a long time, but they have not been very successful either in attracting students or in giving them a good training.

(50) We also need leaders in all fields of life. For this purpose we have been sending students abroad by hundreds. There are this year more than a thousand students studying in universities in Europe and America as well as in the Middle East. We have also founded our own colleges for higher learning, which now have more than 5,000 students.

(51) In the last five years we have applied to Unesco and other Specialized Agencies for assistance. Unesco sent us an expert in 1950 to make a preliminary study of the problem of compulsory education. For the last three years we have had a five-man technical assistance mission in fundamental education, which has been operating successfully on one of our new land distribution schemes. Through that mission and with the full support of the Iraqi Government the idea of fundamental education has taken root, so much so that we have established a fundamental education section in the Ministry of Education.

(52) Unesco also sent us a two-man mission on vocational education and its relation to secondary education. On the technical assistance programme we have also been sent two technical education experts. These have helped us reorganize our technical schools, and their reports have been translated into Arabic and published by the Ministry of Education.

(53) Further, Unesco sent, at our request, an expert librarian who has reorganized our public library and the libraries of two of our higher institutions. We have also had for the last three years four professors of science and mathematics in the University College of Baghdad, who have helped in laying down courses and founding laboratories. We have also received a number of fellowships in all the above fields.

(54) We are very grateful to Unesco for this aid, but we are a fast developing country, which wants to exploit its resources in order to raise its standard of living and to lead a new, cultural and peaceful life. We therefore need further assistance.

(55) In the first place we must put all our children to school. This is now the policy of our Government. How to organize, administer and finance a school system which will take another half million children on top of the 300,000 now enrolled is a problem for which we need advice from Unesco. Along with that, of course, should go a programme of teacher training and we have already begun to found new training colleges.

(56) Side by side with the compulsory education campaign we want to establish a wide programme of fundamental education. For the training both of rural teachers and of fundamental education leaders we want to establish a national training centre. We should very much like to have Unesco's assistance in this field, and for this reason we welcome the project of rural teacher training in Unesco's education programme for 1955-56.

(57) Again, one of our big problems is the training of teachers of vocational and technical subjects, and Unesco might be able to assist in this field. We welcome the conference on vocational and technical education in the Arab States proposed in the programme.

(58) It is our hope that Unesco's assistance in the field of libraries will continue. Of great importance to us also is the close relationship between our rich archaeological museum and Unesco.

(59) I have said enough to show how the programme of Unesco has been closely tied up with our needs, how it has contributed to our educational and cultural development and how we hope it will continue to do so. For my part I am glad of the new tendency in the programme to give direct aid to Member States at the higher budgetary level.

(60) I should not like to leave the floor before raising one further point. Unesco, in co-operation with the United Nations, has been ensuring that the children of Arab refugees shall have a good measure of education. We are grateful for this and in the last few years hundreds of schools have been opened for refugees. But, if I may say so, I am puzzled by the lowering of Unesco's contribution to this enterprise. We hope that no petty pecuniary considerations will stand in the way of this real human endeavour. After all, the Arab refugees who were deprived of the National Home that is rightly theirs, should at least, by the assistance of Unesco, secure proper education for their children. In our opinion, this is the duty not only of Unesco but of the whole world.

(61) Unesco's name stands high in Iraq and in the Arab States. This is in recognition of its constructive work of the last four or five years. I sincerely hope that in the coming years it will continue to advance from one good achievement to another and better achievement in our Arab lands as well as in the rest of the world.

(62) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Lebanon.

(63) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, the Lebanese delegation wishes first of all to discharge a pleasant obligation - one, however, which it is a delicate matter to put into words.

(64) In this country, where culture, education and science appear to have found an ideal climate, and whose thinkers, writers and poets have borne high the banner of the mind in all fields and

in many languages, no delegate to a Unesco General Conference can altogether feel a stranger.
(65) But what is the position of the Lebanese representative? Yesterday you gave our Head of State, President Camille Chamoun, a welcome that still echoes in our hearts and that we shall long remember. In this country of Uruguay, which preserves among its splendid characteristics a sense of hospitality both Spanish and Arab, to which it is one of the successors; where so many Lebanese, received with open arms and assimilated, now share your life, your joys and your sorrows; how could I feel a stranger, even in expressing the fullness of my gratitude? It is thus as a brother, if you permit it, Mr. President, that I express from the bottom of my heart, the feelings of my country's friendship and admiration for all you have done for us, as well as the sense of my own personal gratitude.
(66) You will know, gentlemen, the saying of a French historian about Talleyrand: "So much bad has been said of M. de Talleyrand that to speak about him with any novelty one must say something good". The same might almost be said of the report of the Director-General. So much good has been said of it that to speak with any novelty one would need perhaps to say something bad; however, the taste for novelty will not carry us to this extreme.
(67) Since its foundation, Unesco, faithful to its Constitution, has constantly contributed to mutual understanding among the peoples. To follow and grasp the immensity of the task it has undertaken - to appreciate the results of the efforts made, which would have been even more fruitful if budgetary difficulties had not arisen to impede or retard them - it is enough to glance at the programme. We, Mr. Director-General, associate ourselves with numerous other delegations in expressing our deep gratitude to you, in saying how much we admire your programme, and in assuring you that we recognize the full value of your endeavours.
(68) All branches of human activity in the fields of science, education and culture have been intelligently and effectively dealt with. The immense effort spread over every discipline of the mind, the creation and subvention of international associations, fellowships, practical aid through technical assistance, social studies, cultural endeavours, fundamental education projects, meetings, numerous agreements and conventions, travelling exhibitions, the literacy campaign - all this is but a brief summary of Unesco's activities.
(69) The results are encouraging - even magnificent. Undeniable achievements stand to Unesco's credit. Yet this is not enough; and we should like to see Unesco tackling one essential, vital problem. This problem has been raised in a draft resolution by the Indian delegation, and we would like to see our Specialized Agency make the principle there enunciated into a prime aim of its activity and research.
(70) The drama of our age, the only real problem, is the latent apprehension in face of the power inherent in our resources for destruction - the wearing anxiety, the fearful anticipation of the hour when man might grasp the paraphernalia of science, suspended by an invisible nail, from the ceiling of his fate, and which would inevitably smother him in its fall.
(71) Not one of us, even in his daily routine occupations, can presume to escape from this tragic obsession. Two ideologies, two systems of thought, two different conceptions of man, and two beliefs - if not, indeed, two religions - face each other in opposition. What is to be gained by refusing to recognize this fact? Is it not our compelling duty to look for a common denominator between these two conceptions, and to seek for means whereby these two ways of thought may coexist?
(72) Without renouncing our convictions or our faith, without being false to our ideals, must not we of Unesco seek to expand our search and action to the uttermost human limits and discover, by every possible means, the point of contact?
(73) We have nothing to be ashamed of in our convictions, our faith and our ideals; but neither must we fear to face convictions, faith and ideals that are different.
(74) Never have we approached as closely as today to that universality which is the very essence of our Organization. Everything bids us act, and act before the sorcerer's apprentice of our childhood tales can lay hands on that dreadful paraphernalia upon which our apprehensions are concentrated. Ideas lead the world, and will continue to lead it, towards the best or the worst of fates. To reconcile, defend or spread them - that is our task and our mission.
(75) Will there ever be a more favourable moment? Throughout the world today, all men of goodwill are showing a desire to give first priority to this problem of coexistence.
(76) Several months ago, at The Hague, we signed a Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; but must we not do all in our power to avoid the conflict itself?
(77) What is the use of fundamental education and our efforts to raise the cultural level of adults, if tomorrow sons and fathers are to perish together on the same battlefield, among the ruins of a civilization so dear to them, and if the survivors (assuming there are any) can reproach us with having neglected to take all measures consistent with honour, humanity and dignity for its defence and preservation? When such things as human life itself and the future of civilizations are at stake, there can be no room for scepticism or discouragement, and no effort can be regarded as vain.
(78) An Eastern parable tells, as you know, of a king's son who had fallen sick. In order to recover he had, for a few hours, to wear the shirt of a happy man. His father despatched messengers throughout the kingdom, but they searched for such a man in vain; everyone had something to make him afraid. At last a happy man was discovered; unfortunately, he had no shirt! Are not the happy peoples the peoples without the bomb, like the man without the shirt? We are one of those peoples.
(79) Let therefore Unesco's eighth General Conference, and its Director-General, identify themselves with this task. In so doing they will be serving the Constitution and its aims, which is good; and they will have responded to the hopes placed in them by all men of goodwill, which is even better.

(80) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Head of the Czechoslovak delegation.

(81) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, it so happens that the Czechoslovak delegation takes the floor in this great assembly on International Students' Day, which commemorates a tragic event in the life of our people and in our national civilization. Fifteen years ago, on 17 November 1939, the Hitlerite occupation struck a heavy blow at the culture of the Czech people and its century-old achievements, when it closed all higher educational establishments - including the Charles University of Prague, the oldest in Central Europe - and massacred and deported their intellectual workers, as well as thousands of students. This act of violence, which was only the prelude to subsequent and even more cruel massacres in many other countries, shook the conscience of the world. What had made it possible was the failure of earlier attempts to preserve peace on the basis of coexistence and collective security. On the other hand, the indignation it aroused helped to revive intellectual and moral solidarity among the peoples attached to peace and freedom; this solidarity triumphed and, after the victory over Fascism and Hitlerism, resulted in the basis being laid for the fruitful and constructive co-operation outlined in Unesco's Constitution.

(82) If our delegation has mentioned this tragic date in the history of Czechoslovak and world culture, it is merely to say that it is in this same spirit of solidarity and co-operation that our civilization and our people today commemorate this anniversary with all the universities of the world, with all intellectual workers, and with all student youth. It is in this spirit that they are striving to make a positive contribution to the intellectual, cultural and moral progress of mankind. The history of the past fifteen years has amply shown us that the development of our national life and culture is closely linked with the cause of peace, of mutual understanding and of international co-operation.

(83) Today, in Czechoslovakia, we are witnessing an unprecedented expansion in our culture, science and education. Science, as a guiding principle of our national policy, and education and culture, as important factors in social progress, the economy, and the training of men, occupy a prime place in our national life. This is shown by the figures of our national budget. In 1953 25.8 per cent and in 1954 31.2 per cent of the total budget was devoted to education, culture and public health. If we compare these absolute figures, we find an increase of 23 per cent during last year alone. As a result of our achievements in the economic sphere, the Government has been able to carry out important measures in education, culture and the organization of science, of which we will merely mention the most outstanding. We have established a unified educational system, which we are gradually expanding with a view to achieving, before long, complete, free and compulsory secondary education for all young people up to the age of 17. The number of higher educational establishments has been increased to an extent never before attained. Special forms of secondary and higher education have been developed in order to raise the professional and cultural level of tens of thousands of workers. The organization of scientific studies has culminated in the creation of three Academies of Sciences. Access to the classics of literature and art, both national and international, is now ensured for our people on a large scale, thanks to a rational publishing system. There are a vast number of galleries, museums, exhibition halls, theatres and concert rooms, continually thronged by fresh visitors who are showing themselves most sensible to artistic and cultural values. The radio and television networks have been extended, and their programmes assign a considerable place to educational, cultural and artistic activities.

(84) It is in this spirit that we wish to work, likewise, within Unesco. So far as Unesco's mission is concerned, we base ourselves on the provisions of the Constitution, which states that the Organization's purpose is - and I quote it - "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture".

(85) Such collaboration, as contemporary history shows us, can be based only on peaceful coexistence between countries and nations, whatever their economic and political systems may be. It must be founded on mutual respect for their sovereignty, frontiers and internal affairs. These principles, which are the very foundation of the United Nations Charter, must also be applied in the cultural sphere. In this field, therefore, the creation of ideological blocs and exclusive groupings can make no contribution to the strengthening of confidence or to peaceful coexistence. Trends of this kind are becoming more and more discredited by world opinion and by history. It would be all the more unfortunate were they to try to gain the upper hand in cultural and intellectual relations; any such attempt could not but prejudice our Organization and its mission.

(86) The influence of these trends is the main source of the weaknesses that public opinion has, in recent times, identified in Unesco's work. From the standpoint of Unesco's peaceful mission and the Organization's universality, its gravest defect is the absence, from its ranks, of countries and nations which, in the creation of cultural values and in efforts for peace, occupy a position of the first importance. This applies, in the first place, to China. The fact that China is not represented in the organs of the United Nations is in itself a grave injury to the cause of world peace, and to the effectiveness of the United Nations. In Unesco the absence of the true representatives of China is a cultural absurdity. Many speakers here have already shown, eloquently and persuasively, how mistaken it is to ignore the tremendous historical process of a cultural revolution whereby 600 million human beings are taking in their hands the splendid heritage of a culture thousands of years old and are placing their talent and their labour at the service of peace and international co-operation. It is regrettable that our Organization has failed to take the slightest initiative towards solving this problem, which is one of the

most serious known to present times. To postpone dealing with a problem that is now so mature is by no means to solve it.

(87) Unesco's universality and peaceful mission have also been gravely harmed by the fact that at this very Conference certain political pressure has prevented the admission of Bulgaria and Rumania, although they were recommended by the Economic and Social Council and by Unesco's Executive Board. This is the more regrettable in that the sole reason for this negative decision was the fact that these peoples, which are culturally most active and evince a great desire for peace, have chosen an economic and social system displeasing to the governing circles of certain countries. We must nevertheless stress with satisfaction and gratitude the vigorous opposition shown by many delegations to this evidence of intolerance. We have the proof that in Unesco there are forces loyal to the Organization's mission. Their presence here allows us to hope that the serious errors committed in this matter can be rectified.

(88) In the spirit of the universality and peaceful mission of Unesco we support the proposal by the great nation of India that Unesco shall turn its attention to the culture of the countries and peoples of Asia and Africa, whose values have not been sufficiently appreciated in certain countries of Western Europe and North America. We think the same is true of the culture of Central and Eastern Europe, and especially of the Slav nations. In this connexion we can detect inadequacies in the programme of the International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, to which we shall revert later.

(89) We hope that in this sphere, as well as in that of bibliographies and cultural documentation, the Conference will succeed in informing Unesco's work with the requisite spirit of universality. We in Czechoslovakia are following with keen interest the efforts put forth by Unesco in the field of education and the considerable advances made by the Organization in the campaign against illiteracy and ignorance in certain regions of the world. We shall be happy to contribute within Unesco, thanks to our own experience, to educational co-operation, and to benefit from the experience of others. We agree that Unesco should concern itself with the problem of education for living in a world community. This trend, however, should not lead to speculations about some so-called citizenship of non-existent super-States, or to the evolving of theories contrary to common sense and the true interests of nations. We consider that the education of youth and adults should be directed towards practical understanding of the concept of peaceful coexistence. Education must inculcate a respect for the existence and special characteristics of other nations; it must teach respect for the freedom and sovereignty of other nations, and lay stress on the need for enlisting their co-operation. Here, Unesco can assume a task of the highest importance - the elimination, from education and public opinion, of all factors calculated to produce, support, encourage or foment war propaganda or the glorification of aggression, such as might stimulate national or racial hatred or any form of intolerance.

(90) The scientists and numerous other scientific workers of our country have, since the war, renewed and extended their contacts with colleagues in other countries. Through Unesco they will be happy to strengthen these relations and to take part in numerous forms and plannings of international scientific co-operation. They would like to make known their not inconsiderable achievements - to give proof of their unshakable faith in the power of science to accomplish the great tasks of our age, and of their fidelity to the mission of science in the service of humanity and peace. Peace is essential to the development and true freedom of scientific research. It is right that Unesco should devote its attention to research in nuclear physics; we in Czechoslovakia fully appreciate the fundamental importance of this research for science as a whole, for technology, for production, and hence for every form of social relationship. We warmly welcomed the plans for the peaceful use of atomic energy, and the pioneer example of such use given, this year, by the Soviet Union. But it seems to us impossible to work for the peaceful use of atomic energy so long as we are overshadowed by atomic and hydrogen bombs and their testing, by the abuse of science and its results for the purpose of the mass destruction of civilization. We consider it essential to prohibit atomic weapons of every type, and to set up an effective system of international inspection and control. We can only welcome the progress made at the Ninth General Assembly of the United Nations. We regard it as one of Unesco's primary tasks to make its contribution to further progress in this direction.

(91) The Czechoslovak people attaches particular importance to the social sciences. It regards intellectual workers in this field as the engineers of human society, and wishes them also to be engineers of peace. Unesco should act here in order to steer scientific work towards research into the bases of social relationships from the standpoint of coexistence between the nations. The collection of international legal texts mentioned in the report is already a step forward. Unesco might well encourage investigation of the contemporary historical processes whereby, thanks to humanity's efforts in the cause of peace, the principle of coexistence is manifesting itself ever more clearly - in economic relations, in human thought and in the realm of politics and law.

(92) One of the principal tasks assumed by Unesco is that of developing and expanding cultural exchanges. Czechoslovakia is happy to state that in this sphere the country has achieved considerable results. Numerous exchanges of delegations, of folk art and folklore groups, of scientists and artists, and of the results of their activities and creativeness have placed our peoples in close contact with the cultures of neighbouring peoples and other nations which, despite their geographical distance from us, are so at one with us by reason of their efforts in the cause of peace and constructive progress. Our cultural activities, our endeavours in education and science, and our international relations are aimed at mutual understanding and peaceful co-operation with all peoples. Cultural events of the greatest importance in our country, such as the

Prague International Spring Music Festival, the International Film Festival at Karlovy Vary, and this year the celebration of the anniversary of the composer Antonin Dvorak, have had international repercussions as demonstrations for peace and peaceful co-operation among all nations.

(93) During 1953 and 1954 many delegations visited Czechoslovakia, including groups from Italy, France, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, Uruguay and Brazil, and a delegation of British writers. Quite recently a large Indian delegation of artists and cultural workers was warmly welcomed in our country.

(94) In addition, Czechoslovakia has taken part in various international events, such as the international film festivals at Locarno, Venice, Edinburgh, Cannes and New Delhi, and in Argentina, Mexico and Uruguay. All this shows us that, in order to expand cultural exchanges, it is essential to create a firm basis and a favourable atmosphere for them. A climate of confidence must be established and international co-operation must be practised, on a world as well as a regional scale, on a solid foundation of peaceful coexistence. Allow me to say that it is the great peoples of Asia who, in the form of peaceful agreements between the People's Republic of China, India and Burma, have set us the example. We should like to believe that Unesco, by developing cultural relations, will throughout the world contribute to the success of the noble efforts put forth by the peace-loving governments and peoples which are now being intensified and are aimed at creating a genuine system of collective security based on peaceful coexistence, without distinctions of political or social régime.

(95) It is likewise on such a foundation and within such a framework that the best prospects can be held out for the technical assistance plans designed to help less developed nations and peoples to shape their national cultures, so that they may contribute more effectively to the cultural endeavours of humanity as a whole. Czechoslovakia has, in the course of many centuries, acquired certain experience which can be usefully applied in the planning and implementation of educational, scientific and cultural assistance, and she would be happy if this experience could effectively be made use of.

(96) Many speakers have eloquently described the new prospects opening up before Unesco, thanks to the results of the efforts of certain governments and peoples to bring about a gradual lessening of international tension. It is for us at this General Conference to take these great possibilities into account and jointly to convert them into reality, with a view not merely to developing cultural activities but to using them in the cause of world peace. If we do that, this Conference may well mark, as certain speakers have hoped, the beginning of a very great period for our Organization. The Czechoslovak delegation, inspired by its people's desire for peace, will do all in its power to contribute to such a result.

(97) (Translation from the Spanish): In conclusion, Mr. President, allow me to pay tribute, in the name of the Czechoslovak delegation, to the Government and people of Uruguay for the hospitality with which we have been received in this beautiful city of Montevideo, and to express our desire that the democratic traditions and peaceful spirit of the people of Uruguay may contribute powerfully to the creation and maintenance, in this Conference, of a fruitful atmosphere of mutual understanding and international co-operation.

(98) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Turkey.

(99) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of the Turkish delegation I have the great honour to greet the representatives of Member States assembled, thanks to the legendary hospitality of Uruguay, in this beautiful city of learning, and to make certain observations with regard to the reports of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization between January 1953 and June 1954.

(100) We will venture, first, to recall that the aspirations of the new Turkey have harmoniously coincided with the ideals and objectives of Unesco. An organization assuming the task of dealing with major questions such as fundamental education and international understanding could not but merit the attention of our country, which has long been exerting itself in regard to them. This has been reflected in Turkey's implementation of the programmes adopted by the General Conference; and our country will likewise actively further, in every way it can, the execution, on a national scale, of the various resolutions adopted during the present session. I shall not abuse your patience by discoursing at length on the separate chapters of the reports, which have been prepared with an admirable regard for accuracy and scientific precision. Even a superficial examination of the reports reveals substantial progress in the Organization's activities. It can be frankly said that, so far as the execution of its programme is concerned, Unesco has done everything in its power to facilitate the task of Member States. Activities are beginning to assume clearer shape and to concentrate on essential problems. We are persuaded that, in time, the Organization will be in a position fully to attain these objectives, for the greater good of humanity. Many problems, however, remain whose solution demands more active collaboration from governments. Co-operating bodies are also faced with important tasks, if Unesco's work is to become more effective.

(101) Having stressed the significance of the Organization's activities during the past year, I shall proceed, on behalf of my Government, to make certain observations on Unesco's actual programme.

(102) We think that, if Unesco's action is to be effective, the Organization should concentrate on matters outside the competence and functions of other United Nations Specialized Agencies or governmental and non-governmental organizations concerned with education, culture and science. In other words, close co-operation with other Specialized Agencies is essential. In this way, in the different subjects of the programme, the danger of overlapping can be avoided. Our Government also considers that, when the draft programme is being prepared, the Executive Board should give most careful consideration to the real needs of

Member States in the fields of education, science and culture. The reports of Member States to the General Conference could provide a reliable source of information as to the requirements of each country, and one could thus draw up a simple, practical programme in which certain essential subjects, such as fundamental education and technical assistance, would occupy the place they merit. Admittedly the reports of Member States have, since the fifth session of the General Conference, been studied by a special committee set up by the Conference. But this examination is in our view far from adequate, since it is simply devoted to establishing how far the reports conform to the plan evolved by the committee and proposed to Member States by the Director-General. What is required is, not a purely formal examination which in time might become over-mechanical, but a thorough study of common problems and common needs, which would be determined systematically and listed in a genuine order of priority. It would thus be desirable to expand the qualifications and powers of the Committee on Reports of Member States, in such a way that its work would greatly facilitate the task of the Executive Board when the draft programme was being drawn up.

(103) We hold that Unesco's relations with governmental and non-governmental organizations merit greater attention. Close collaboration with appropriate bodies in this category would singularly lighten the tasks and financial burdens of the Organization. Certain activities might well be completely entrusted to them. There are, in addition, organizations that are even more specialized in the fields associated with certain parts of Unesco's programme. In another connexion, the working of the centres and institutes set up by Unesco should be the subject of special treatment in the Director-General's report; in this way a picture could be obtained of these institutions' achievements, or of the difficulties impeding their development.

(104) So far as fellowships are concerned, we favour their further expansion, in relation to the actual needs of each State.

(105) The steps taken by the Director-General to deal with the delicate question of Unesco's administrative services appear to meet the requirements of good functioning within the Secretariat. New methods of staff recruitment are necessary, in order to achieve better output and a saving of expense, such saving being employed for the execution of the programme itself. In our opinion broader geographical distribution must be adopted in staff recruitment, so as to enable all Member States to collaborate effectively with the Organization. Apart from the permanent posts, which demand continuity of work, certain temporary functions might be entrusted to skilled personalities, who would thus acquire valuable human experience. To sum up, if Unesco is to make its action effective and spread its message abroad, it needs the active collaboration of outstanding specialists and scholars from every country.

(106) In conclusion, Mr. President, we wish all success to Unesco, which, with a simple and practical programme and through concrete achievements, will continue to serve the cause of peace and international understanding, while remaining, as ever above purely political considerations.

(107) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Mr. Steinig, representative of the United Nations.

(108) Mr. STEINIG (United Nations): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen; with the wishes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for a fruitful session of this General Conference and the full success of your endeavours, I am desired to express on his behalf deep appreciation of Unesco's efforts to realize the fullest possible measure of co-ordination of its activities with those of the United Nations and its other Specialized Agencies and to thank the Director-General and his staff for their most active and helpful co-operation towards this end. The United Nations welcome the emphasis placed by Unesco upon full co-operation and participation with the United Nations in projects originating in the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other organs of the United Nations. As you know, United Nations organs have specifically requested the collaboration of Unesco in a number of fields and its participation in certain major co-operative and joint programmes. I need not enumerate them: they as well as the Secretary-General's views are before you in the different documents submitted by the Director-General to this Conference.

(109) As you are no doubt aware, the General Assembly of the United Nations, now in session in New York, is deliberating on certain projects which are also on your agenda or are connected with it. To mention only two: the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development - a question on which the Second Committee of the General Assembly took a decision yesterday afternoon. It will be my duty to keep the Director-General informed of developments in the General Assembly of the United Nations, so that you may have before you at the earliest possible moment its views and decisions.

(110) To Uruguay, a member of the United Nations, its people and Government go, with our warm thanks for their cordial hospitality, our wishes for unbroken, steady progress in their efforts for peace, social justice and freedom. We shall long remember the moving ceremony in front of this Palacio Legislativo on the opening day of this Conference, when the children of Uruguay in their distinctive, white uniforms witnessed the unfolding of the flag of their country together with the flag of the United Nations and the flags of the Member States of Unesco, a symbol which, we hope, impressed their young minds with the possibility of the friendly peaceful coexistence of different nations and cultures, the true concordia varietatis.

(111) I could not conclude these few remarks in a manner more fitting to the occasion than by quoting the question addressed about a fortnight ago by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to an illustrious audience and, beyond it, to all of us. On a solemn occasion during the ceremonies accompanying the observance of Columbia University's Bicentenary, he said:

"Who questions the value of knowledge? And yet we know that the challenging theme for the Columbia University Bicentennial - Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof - draws attention to ideals that are in need of defence. True, we all of us are quick to recognize in principle the value of knowledge. Yet we may hesitate to do what is necessary in order to open wider access to knowledge for others or to deepen our knowledge. Too often we even share in reactions that can be explained only by a fear of knowledge.

This contradiction - so prevalent in our generation, so dangerous to the peace and progress of future generations - is not a new one. Its cause is to be found in attitudes common to all men and all times.

If we fear knowledge, and act under the ban of such fear, is it not often because we fear change? In order fully and freely to accept knowledge, and what flows from knowledge, we have both to muster the courage and possess the humility that enable us to accept change."

(112) But the Secretary-General added: "We have lost the optimistic faith held by some of our predecessors that new knowledge would necessarily - almost automatically - lead to new progress in civilization. We have learned that whether changes resulting from knowledge will be for the better or worse finally depends on ourselves. The very fact that we feel this burden of responsibility and see more clearly the dangers with which we must cope, increases the temptation to resist change - and to fear knowledge. In losing the easy optimism of a preceding generation, we must not act as though we had also lost the deep conviction of our predecessors of the value of knowledge. We must act with undiminished faith in freedom of thought, freedom of research, freedom of speech - in full knowledge of the dangers involved in the changes we may set in motion, but also of our own responsibility to give that change creative direction."

(113) Pausing a moment to give thought to the ideas formulated by the Secretary-General, it might not be out of place to remember that, since the beginning of this century and, more particularly, since the end of the First World War, a chorus of voices from different quarters has not ceased to assure us that the motives which precipitate man on his course to self-destruction are inscrutable and, consequently, permanently effective. Since then the appearance of atomic weapons, prophecies of catastrophes have painted nightmarish pictures of unrelieved gloom. We need not share this deeply pessimistic, negative view of man's future, this outright negation of the valid concept of equal chances expressed in memorable words in the opening sentence of Unesco's Constitution, that peace and war alike have their origin in man's mind. For what are the facts? During this same half-century science has opened new avenues to man's knowledge about himself and about the motives of his actions and, although he resists self-knowledge with firm determination, man will have to acquire it if he is to survive.

(114) Science does not always enable us to control events, but it almost always increases man's chances to influence their course and direction.

(115) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish) I call upon the representative of Laos.

(116) Princess Souvanna PHOUMA (Laos) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, Mr. Director-General and colleagues, I must confess that I long hesitated to enter my name on the list of speakers taking part in the discussion of the report of the Director-General.

(117) I hesitated, because the calibre and eloquence of the previous speakers, the constructive comments made and the eulogies pronounced were bound to contrast with my own humble effort. I wanted to draw your attention, Mr. Director-General, to the fact that, although you left Paris - left France - on a journey to the Far East, you completely passed over, on that journey, the few Member States of Unesco which, alone in the far east of the old world, employ the French language.

(118) Lack of security, I should have thought, could hardly have been a reason for your not visiting us. You will have realized that we would have taken greater care of your life than of our own. As for educational problems, they have continued to absorb our attention no less and indeed even more than in time of peace; for though we have had other things too to think of, our rising generation has not been stopped in its growth, and has been insistently claiming the attention to which it was entitled.

(119) I think you would have been interested by the grafting of French culture and education on to a country having its own culture derived from two eminently humanistic sources, one stemming from ancient China and the other from ancient India. The remains of magnificent Buddhist monuments, and the dances inspired by ancient tradition, would at Luang Prabang have shown you, for instance, in the unfolding of the scenes of the Ramayana, the picture of Jatayous the Vulture in alliance with Rama attempting to deliver the beautiful Sida from the hands of her ravisher. Such are a few examples drawn from the artistic, religious and literary past of my country.

(120) We should have been happy to show you the lycées and schools coexisting with this ancient and deep-rooted culture, and to submit to you the pressing problems demanding quick and effective solution.

(121) In short, Mr. Director-General, my country would have been comforted by a friendly gesture, or even the intention of one, in our time of trial, which has now lasted for nearly ten years. While we were struggling to preserve the integrity of our territory and to gain our place in the sun, we should have appreciated recognition from a friend who knew us.

(122) It is because we have survived these storms that I can convey to you, today, the feelings of my country on reading the important report which you have drawn up.

(123) The tireless activity that Unesco has displayed under your leadership, the results obtained in the few years of its existence, the wide scope of the projects, the success of the work undertaken, and the increase in the number of Member States - all this provides, once more, convincing proof of the nobility and solid achievement of this magnificent and fascinating human enterprise.

(124) This success is partly due to the efforts of all the experts whose meetings and research had made it possible for Unesco to publish its very informative booklets. The report also reveals the unobtrusive but highly effective part played by the Executive Board, whose members have continued to meet in order to prepare for us a large proportion of our Conference working papers. Our thanks are due to them all.
(125) The execution of the programme has obviously, as the report shows, been a difficult matter, and it must be admitted that in most fields it has been carried out admirably. The chapter on technical assistance attracted my particular attention because, as I have already pointed out on many occasions, this form of assistance is essential to us as a means of accelerating our educational programme. When reading the list of recipients I noticed, with pleasure but surprise, the very large amount of aid granted to the first country mentioned - a country on the continent of Africa. I have no wish to embark on statistics or to draw comparisons, and went no further into the matter. But I should like to ask the representative of the friendly country in question how he managed to make himself heard and to find ... a helping hand. And I fear I must urge, Mr. Director-General, that you revise your technical assistance projects so far as my country is concerned.
(126) Laos wishes to live in peace and will certainly develop better, in the peaceful atmosphere now at last restored to it, the spirit of international understanding and human solidarity. We are, unfortunately, only too well placed to appreciate the inestimable value of such an attitude.
(127) All praise and honour in the history of humanity to those who, no sooner had a term been put to the horrors of the most terrible of wars, began to lay the foundations for the improvement, through science and culture, of the spirit and condition of man.
(128) The presence of all of us here, in a country which has given us so kindly an invitation and welcome, bears witness once again to our community of aspiration and to our world-wide friendship - a true friendship, born of repeated meetings, and transcending frontiers, oceans, races or creeds.
(129) In the name of my country I have the agreeable task of expressing to the Uruguayan Government and people my greetings and my thanks for the hospitality we are enjoying on the occasion of this eighth session of Unesco's General Conference.

(130) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Mexico.

(131) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the delegation of Mexico has particular pleasure in conveying its greetings and respects to the Government o this sister Republic of Uruguay and in expressing its most warm and cordial gratitude for the delightful hospitality extended to us, which has so richly earned our thanks.
(132) Mexico, a country where freedom and genuine democracy flourish, has been greatly impressed, in the person of its representative, by the dignified yet enthusiastic contest in which the people here are engaging for the election of the highest authorities of this sister country of Uruguay; this land, where freedom and genuine democracy likewise prevail, has thus become the spokesman of the ideals and the conscience of America. Our country is greatly interested in the constructive work of Unesco. Patzcuaro is the headquarters of the Regional Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America, known by the abbreviation CREFAL; and in Mexico City we have a Scientific and Technical Documentation Centre which is designed to provide useful scientific information and documentation for all Latin American countries. Finally, thanks to the efficient work of its National Commission for Unesco, our country is effectively helping to develop the Organization's programme, throughout our national territory, by means of special missions in each of the most important towns.
(133) Mexico has complete trust and confidence in Unesco's world-wide activities; and for that reason it hopes and desires that at no time and on no pretext will anything be done to detract from the part this Organization plays as an agency for the promotion of peace solely through education, science and culture.
(134) The world desires to live in peace, and Unesco has at its command the best known means of achieving a system of peaceful coexistence. It is therefore our duty and responsibility to do everything necessary for attaining so noble an end.
(135) Our country is very pleased at the Secretariat's decision to concentrate the financial resources of the Organization on the conduct of a very few practical programme projects, for this will lead to greater efficiency and more constructive results. We offer our congratulations.
(136) The delegation of Mexico is particularly anxious that the budget of Unesco should be as large as possible, as our distinguished compatriot, Mr. Torres Bodet, foresaw and recommended during the time when he was Director-General of the Organization. We therefore favour maintaining the present annual contributions of the Member States and using the contributions of the new Members to increase the budget, so as to expand our resources and create greater opportunities for extending and improving our work.
(137) If this should not be practicable, we hope in any case that means will be found of balancing the budget as satisfactorily as possible. We take this opportunity of extending a most cordial welcome to the representatives of the States which have recently become Members of Unesco and are taking part in the Organization's General Conference for the first time.
(138) The world has great hopes of the contribution they will make to our work, and we are confident that the concerted efforts of all will finally bring, to all individuals and peoples, renewed faith and trust in the attainment of peace by the noble paths of culture, friendly international co-operation and true goodwill.

(139) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Cambodia.

(140) Mr. KIMNY (Cambodia) (Translation from the French): Mr. President and delegates, the

Cambodian delegation wishes first to thank the Government of Uruguay and the City of Montevideo for the most friendly welcome extended to it. The generous and spontaneous hospitality we have received can only increase our admiration for this country's progress and development in all fields - economic, political, scientific and cultural. We are particularly grateful to the Uruguayan Government for enabling us, while doing our work here at Unesco's eighth session of its General Conference in the most agreeable atmosphere and surroundings, to get to know this great and beautiful country and to appreciate it better.

(141) The Cambodian delegation likewise wishes, at the outset of the Conference to render public tribute to the Unesco Secretariat for the helpful understanding it has always shown for the particularly difficult problems facing Cambodia in the fields of education, science and culture.

(142) Thanks to the valuable co-operation and assistance of its experts, we have been able to begin implementing certain parts of the Unesco programme, especially the improvement of the system of free compulsory education and the institution of fundamental and adult education.

(143) Since our country became a member of Unesco, the national liaison body has been co-operating with the Secretariat ever more closely and fruitfully. The people of Cambodia is more than ever aware of the importance of the work done, and the noble aim pursued, by this great community of nations of goodwill.

(144) We have followed the life of the Organization with the greatest interest, in times of difficulty as in periods of success; and we can record, with satisfaction, that during the past few years Unesco's action has become increasingly effective.

(145) This progress can doubtless be partly ascribed to the system of biennial sessions of the Conference; but much of the credit is due to the Secretariat and its outstanding Director-General.

(146) The task remains a vast one and the problems facing the General Conference become more varied and more considerable with each session, in proportion as the Organization itself develops.

(147) Other speakers, in particular the Director-General and the Chairman of the Executive Board, have already emphasized the scope of Unesco's accomplishments in every sphere embraced over the past nine years throughout its sphere of action, and have dwelt on the difficulties encountered and the perspectives of future action.

(148) The Cambodian delegation associates itself with the conclusions contained in the report of the Director-General. It considers that important new advances have been made and has noted, with lively satisfaction, the new trend in the Organization's programme. The excellent report of the Director-General shows that, for the first time, Unesco's action is emerging from the stage of trial and error and is now decisively entering upon that of practical achievement. The criteria and priorities adopted at the seventh session of the General Conference have been faithfully observed. Specific tasks have been defined and spheres of action delimited, in accordance with the Organization's fundamental aims. To sum up, the programme established in 1952 is well on the way to practical realization.

(149) The Cambodian delegation particularly wishes, at this point, to record its satisfaction with the very proper principles underlying the preparation of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56. I refer to the division, within the traditional sections, of each chapter into two parts - a long-term programme confined to international action for the benefit of all of the Member States, and the short-term programme designed to solve specific problems in certain States - problems which elsewhere may not exist, or at least may not arise with the same urgency. This distinction corresponds to the de facto existence of two categories of Member States - the advanced countries and the so-called under-developed countries.

(150) The Cambodian delegation is of opinion that, while the principle of mutual co-operation and assistance must prevail uniformly and absolutely among all Unesco's Member States, the problems necessarily differ from country to country and the methods to be applied in order to overcome them must also, therefore, differ in each country. The Director-General's remarks on this point are very pertinent, clear and judicious.

(151) The need to draw such a distinction has in fact long been evident; but everyone had a different view of the way in which it might be translated into fact without risking fragmentation of the programme itself. The clear-sightedness of the Executive Board and the efficiency of the Secretariat have together been instrumental in giving the programme a new trend, to the general satisfaction.

(152) On the one hand, each single Member State is now sure of receiving assistance better adapted to its own needs. On the other, by undertaking only projects based on strictly available resources, Unesco has increased its chances of successfully achieving its short-term programme.

(153) There is, however, another aspect of the question to which the Cambodian delegation wishes to draw attention - namely, the implementation by Member States of the new provisions of the programme as thus modified. Can this programme achieve real results if Unesco continues to confine itself to making more or less general recommendations, which more often than not fail to attract the notice of States, even though the latter may, on occasion, be directly concerned by them?

(154) In our opinion the Secretariat should select, from among the recommendations of the General Conference, those inspired by the internal situation of certain specific countries in the field of education, science and culture. It should draw the attention of those particular countries to the recommendations in question, closely following their subsequent implementation through an individual exchange of correspondence, and not by the general procedures adopted in the past.

(155) May I close these few remarks by expressing, in regard to the present programme as a whole, my country's confidence in the success of Unesco's action for world peace and prosperity.

(156) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Viet-Nam.

(157) Mr. VO VAN LUA (Viet-Nam) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: The delegation of Viet-Nam, although among the last to take the floor, associates itself no less warmly and sincerely with the tributes paid to the friendly feeling shown by the Uruguayan Government and people towards the delegates to the eighth session of the General Conference, here in Latin America.

(158) Our delegation is at one with all the delegates in stressing the great clear-sightedness which the Director-General and Unesco's Secretariat have shown over the preparation of the proposed programme for 1955 and 1956, and in paying tribute to the former as to the latter for the outstanding and untiring devotion they have brought to the execution of the decisions and resolutions of the seventh session of the General Conference.

(159) Indeed, since I have been a member of my country's National Commission for Unesco I have gained a very clear insight into the difficulties which the Organization has to face and surmount in the pursuit of its ideals - on the one hand, the promotion of international understanding and, on the other, the pursuit of agreement among the peoples, of lasting peace among the nations.

(160) These ideals Unesco must translate into reality by a method simple and inexpensive - the education and training of individuals' hearts and minds, I say simple and inexpensive because, in every State in the world, there are national Ministries of Education with access of budgetary resources.

(161) Nevertheless, if we read the programmes of the Organization, we see that Unesco has set itself a gigantic task, outstripping its financial and material resources and liable, to a certain extent, to create uneasiness among the nations called upon to finance Unesco's various undertakings. The reason is, and will long continue to be, the specific and differing needs of Member States, needs which the Organization is bound to try to meet, partially, if not completely.

(162) To speak in more concrete terms, and to adhere to facts, we could say, with our colleague of Cambodia, that Unesco's Member States at present comprise exceptionally advanced nations, such as the United States of America, France and Great Britain, and other nations less advanced, economically underdeveloped, and under-prepared for fruitful international co-operation, such as Viet-Nam.

(163) These differences in evolution and development give rise to different and often contradictory requirements. Viet-Nam, for instance, needs technical assistance from Unesco in order to combat the illiteracy which still, unfortunately, largely pervades its territory; it needs Unesco's technical aid in order to develop fundamental education. It thereby creates financial problems for the Organization. Other Member States, however, which are not afflicted by the same evils as Viet-Nam, are asking, for example, that Unesco concern itself with the construction of scientific research centres of international scope; these would certainly contribute to the advance of civilization but can present no immediate interest for Viet-Nam or for any other country in a similar position.

(164) All these conflicts between the needs of Member States have the result that the Organization's action is constantly expanding to cover a wide diversity of problems and daily increasing in scope, at a cost that is beyond Unesco's present financial resources.

(165) The people and Government of Viet-Nam have fully understood this situation. When, last September, the Viet-Nam National Commission for Unesco produced a programme for the establishment of a fundamental education centre with a definitely professional and technical complexion, it shrank from raising the financial issues necessarily involved. But if we avoid mention of such financial questions, that does not mean they do not exist, or that we are able to solve them with our own resources.

(166) Public opinion wishes to believe that Unesco ought to help us to solve them; it knows nothing of Unesco's budgetary difficulties, or of the specific obligations of the Organization towards its Member States. Yet public opinion - not merely in Viet-Nam, but in most of the countries of the Unesco family - creates the power and prestige of the Organization throughout the world, and contributes to the successful implementation of Unesco's doctrines and ideals.

(167) Thus from every point of view it is to Unesco's advantage to deal with the problem of how the projects launched in its name, and on its moral responsibility, are to be financed. Instead of drawing on its limited funds to complete no more than half of its difficult task, and even so at the cost of certain Member States which often have only a remote interest in the particular undertakings involved, could not the Organization devise a better solution, whereby Member States would cease to be divided, so to speak, into two clans - on the one hand the donors, on the other the receivers (or parasites).

(168) This readjustment, if it is to be fair, must be made at the cost of the beneficiary party. It has already been applied in favour of certain Member States, with assistance from various international credit organizations. Unesco need have no direct part in any such action.

(169) But the solution itself is a good one and Unesco might well adopt it, applying it generally whenever the financing work undertaken in its name and on its moral responsibility in any Member States so required. What is now accidental and exceptional would in the future become a rule, a principle of action.

(170) Before the opening of the present session of Unesco's General Conference, the question of finance was raised by certain delegates in the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. They approached this problem with the implicit intention of solving it. We hope, indeed, that it can be solved. It cannot, however, be solved by concentrating Unesco's efforts on a small number of objectives. Certain delegations have advocated such concentration; and it has, of course, the merit of wisdom and of unquestionable practical value. All the same, I wonder how the Organization could settle the choice of such objectives, if it desired that they should meet the wishes and needs of all the Member States - wishes and needs that differ so greatly from country to country, and cease

to follow the same order of priority as soon as we pass from the interests of one member of Unesco to those of another.

(171) The inevitable result of such a policy would be to sacrifice a proportion of the Member States to the rest of the Unesco family, and even to favour the aspirations of some at the expense of the majority. And Member States which felt thus injured, or disappointed in their expectations, would undoubtedly lose interest in the activities of the Organization and might, indeed, withdraw from it altogether.

(172) Thus Unesco, whose aim it is to embrace communities differing fundamentally in their needs, degree of advancement and economic and cultural development, finds itself in a cruel dilemma in face of a diversity of interests, each as legitimate as the other. The problem of financing its undertakings may now be compared to that of squaring the circle; and the dilemma cannot be solved by neglecting some Member States to the advantage of others.

(173) The many different forms of Unesco's action, and the thousand and one facets of its programme, represent an ingenious but burdensome compromise - the only one, however, which can at present satisfy all quarters, or even safeguard the Organization's very existence. Through these many-sided activities and programmes, Unesco, as the Director-General's report for 1953 and 1954 shows, has embarked upon much that is designed to prepare all men's minds and consciences for living in a better world, in an atmosphere of peace and good understanding. And in this Unesco has been successful. There is no reason why it should halt on so promising a road, why it should alter its attitude.

(174) Whatever be its fate, Viet-Nam will remain faithful to Unesco, for the Organization is pursuing one of the noblest aims of man - to inaugurate the reign of friendship and love among the peoples, and this through the medium most acceptable to man's self-respect, namely the heart and the mind.

(175) Once the intellectual and moral frontiers have been crossed, political barriers will soon fall, and the tablets of history will then record the greatest victory of Unesco, the last victory to be aimed at by the men of goodwill now assembled in this magnificent hall of Uruguayan democracy, the Palacio Legislativo under the banner of absolute community of thought, idea and feeling.

(176) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the representative of the Organization of American States.

(177) Mr. SANCHEZ REULET (Organization of American States): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. In the vibrant speech that my colleague and friend, Dr. Guillermo Nannetti, made to this assembly he reported on various aspects of the programme that Unesco and the Organization of American States are carrying out together for the purpose of combating illiteracy and furthering fundamental education in Latin America. Collaboration between these two organizations has not, however, been limited to the field of education - although this appears to be the field in which collaboration has so far been most fruitful - it has also extended to other branches of science and culture. It is now my privilege to review the activities that the two organizations have been carrying out since the last General Conference of Unesco, for the promotion of knowledge and scientific research, the protection of copyright, the improvement of libraries, the development of bibliographic studies, and the dissemination of the works of the writers and artists of the Americas.

(178) So far as the exact and natural sciences are concerned, it is well to remember, first of all, that our Section of Science and Technology has maintained constant and cordial relations with the Science Co-operation Office that functions here in Montevideo and also with Unesco's Department of Natural Sciences in Paris. The relations with the Montevideo office have been in keeping with the terms of the agreement that was signed in Washington in February of last year at the first meeting of the OAS-Unesco Joint Committee on Co-ordination and, true to the spirit of this agreement, duplication of functions has been avoided.

(179) The Science and Technology Section has also collaborated with the Mexican Scientific and Technical Documentation Centre, which institution was established by Unesco but has since become a branch of the Mexican Government, by sending it collections of specialized periodicals and information material. Through its publications, it has likewise helped to make known the work that Unesco is doing to encourage the advancement of science in Latin America. Unesco, for its part, has utilized the materials prepared by our Scientific Information Service and given them wide publicity in more than five thousand newspapers of the world.

(180) Collaboration between the two organizations should be intensified. To this end, our Section of Science and Technology hopes to be able to participate more actively in the scientific meetings and seminars organized by the Montevideo office. It would also be desirable to study the possibility of co-ordinating some of these meetings with the seminar that OAS plans to carry out in 1955-56 to consider the problem of science teaching in Latin America.

(181) The basis for collaboration in the social sciences was established at a special meeting held for this purpose in Washington in March 1953. This collaboration has so far been limited because the two organizations' programmes for this period had already been approved and were in process of execution.

(182) However, our Social Sciences Section has co-operated in the work of Unesco by sending information to the Regional Centre of Unesco at Havana on researchers, institutions, periodicals and specialized libraries in Latin America. It likewise participated in the preparations for and meetings of the round table on social science teaching that was held in Costa Rica in July of this year under the auspices of Unesco. This office has also prepared the Latin American section of the International Register of Current Team Research in the Social Sciences, for publication by Unesco in 1954. In addition, it furnishes bibliographic information on Latin America to Current Sociology and to the International Committee on Social Science Documentation.

(183) It is to be hoped that this initial collaboration will grow. OAS hopes to take part in the preparatory work of the second meeting of the round table on the teaching of the social sciences in Latin America, which Unesco plans to hold in 1955. It would also be willing to collaborate in the Meeting of Immigration Experts. In this matter, the migration studies made by the specialists of our Department of Economic and Social Affairs provide valuable background information that should be utilized.

(184) There are still other forms of collaboration to be studied. For example, there is the possibility of launching a programme for the translation into Spanish of important works in the social science field. We have a small sum set aside in our 1955-56 budget for this purpose.

(185) The Organization of American States, which has for more than sixty years been concerned with copyright protection, has participated in the work done by Unesco for the establishment of a Universal Copyright Convention. The Secretariat of OAS called a meeting of experts of the American countries for the purpose of studying the possibility of co-ordinating the principles of the planned Universal Convention with those of inter-American treaties and conventions. This meeting was held in Washington in 1952 and it was responsible for the paragraph which later became Article XVIII of the Universal Convention approved in September of that year at Geneva. This article provides that, in the event of differences between the provisions of the Universal Convention and those of inter-American conventions the most recently formulated Convention shall prevail between the contracting parties.

(186) Finally, OAS hopes to collaborate with Unesco in the publication of copyright protection laws of countries throughout the world, and to this end is prepared to compile and publish the laws of the American countries and those of Spain and Portugal.

(187) In the field of libraries and bibliography collaboration between the two organizations has been particularly close. Both agencies helped to organize the Technical Meeting of Agricultural Librarians held in Costa Rica last year at the suggestion of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. Our library - which is known as the Columbus Memorial Library - regularly provides lists and catalogue cards of various kinds to the Unesco offices in Paris and Havana and to the Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro. It also sends a regular report on important news in the field of library science in Latin America. The Columbus Memorial Library is in close touch with the Unesco specialist at the Havana Regional Office and has requested his advice at different times. This was done, for example, in the case of the Dewey Decimal Classification System, which is being translated by OAS and which it hopes to publish very soon.

(188) In connexion with bibliographical activities we should mention that our Secretariat regularly sends to Paris catalogue cards for the Index Translationum and that it has in principle accepted responsibility for the translation and publication in Spanish of Unesco's Bibliographical Handbooks.

(189) Looking to the future, OAS hopes to take part in the organization of a Conference on the Interchange of Publications, to be held in Havana in 1956, and to send a representative to the World Congress of Librarians in Brussels next year. Lastly, we hope very soon to hold an inter-American seminar for teachers of library science, under the auspices of both organizations, in accordance with the recommendation made by the Sao Paulo Conference of Librarians.

(190) Although there is no express agreement between Unesco and OAS for the promotion and publicizing of musical activities, the Music Section of the Pan-American Union has for years attended meetings of the International Music Council, which, as we know, is supported by Unesco. In accordance with a recommendation of the Inter-American Cultural Council, this section is at this moment taking steps for the establishment of an Inter-American Music Council that will function as an integral part of the world organization and bring all the countries of the Hemisphere together at its seat.

(191) Unfortunately, in the field of fine arts, there has not as yet been any real collaboration between the offices concerned. It is timely, therefore, to recall the recommendations that were made at the meeting held by the Co-ordinating Committee in Washington in February of last year with respect to the organization of circulating exhibits, the furnishing of slides on American art and the publication of guides to public collections in the American countries. Here I might mention that OAS is now preparing the third volume of these guides, which will cover Mexico, the Central American countries and the Caribbean region.

(192) A cultural activity in which collaboration between the two organizations is beginning to produce excellent results is the programme for the translation and publication, in French and English, of representative works of Latin American literature and thought. As we know, this programme was started by Unesco on a recommendation made by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1946 to the effect that it was necessary to start a programme for the translation of the classics, especially those of countries whose literature was least known. This programme, in so far as Latin American literature is concerned, took shape in the publication in French of three works: Enriquillo, by Manuel de Jesus Galván, an Anthology of Mexican Poetry, compiled by Octavio Paz, and a volume of the Paginas Escogidas of Martí. Further, OAS had for some time expressed its desire to collaborate in the development of this programme. As a result of negotiations between the respective offices, an agreement was finally reached by which the two organizations would assume joint responsibility for the translation programme. Under this agreement, Unesco will from now on be directly responsible for the publication of the works in French and OAS for their publication in English. In this agreement OAS has also undertaken to present a list of works whose translation is most desirable and to furnish Unesco with their respective texts, which obligation it has been meticulously fulfilling.

(193) My Organization has signed a contract with the University of Indiana for the publication in the United States of America of the three aforementioned works. Up to now, Enriquillo (the English title of

which is The Cross and the Sword) is the only one that has been published, but the Anthology of Mexican Poetry and the Martí volume will be released within the next twelve months. We are now negotiating for the publication of two more volumes: Los últimos días coloniales en el Alto Perú by Gabriel René-Moreno, and Tabaré by the great Uruguayan poet Zorrilla de San Martín. The translation of all the aforesaid works was the responsibility of Unesco. OAS has also assumed responsibility for a new translation of the Comentaries Reales by Inca Garcilaso and has started to negotiate for the translation and publication of a volume of Cuentos by Monteiro Lobato and Viajes by Sarmiento.

(194) I regret having taken up more time than I should have with an extremely detailed and almost bureaucratic account of the activities that are being carried out jointly in Latin America by Unesco and OAS in the various branches of science and culture. But small, everyday activities are as important in the life of man as the exploits of great heroes.

(195) The noble aim of Unesco is to ensure justice, freedom and peace, through education, science and culture. And it is also the purpose that inspires the countries of the Organization of American States. But the realization of this ideal, this hope, this grand dream necessarily lies in the hands of a legion of obscure heroes - teachers, writers, artists, scientists, thinkers - and to these we must finally add all men of goodwill. We are gathered here on this soil of Uruguay, in this land that is receiving us so generously, and in an atmosphere of freedom, tolerance and democratic dignity, to give impetus to this idea, this hope, this grand dream.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

# TENTH PLENARY MEETING

*17 November 1954 at 3.45 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Discussion of the Director-General's Report (end): Speeches by the delegates of Liberia, Honduras, Bolivia and Nicaragua . . 152
Reply by the Director-General . . . . . 157

## DISCUSSION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Head of the delegation of Liberia.

(2) Mr. KNIGHT (Liberia): Mr. President and fellow delegates: The delegation of Liberia would have liked to take a far larger share than this in the lively, inspiring and most profitable debate on the reports of the Executive Board and the Director-General, so befittingly commented upon by the delegates who have preceded me.

(3) The pattern of mutual understanding and joint co-operation that has characterized the contacts, intercourse and activities between the Secretariat and my Government and the mutual benefits already derived therefrom are too important and spectacular not to be at least amplified before this assembly. Even these brief remarks do not, in the opinion of my Government and delegation, adequately convey their gratitude for the interest and assistance accorded us by the Director-General, through the Secretariat's technical assistance programme.

(4) My delegation had hoped that by now, our Chairman, Professor Massaquoi, would have arrived with such views, comments and suggestions as our Government would desire the delegation to offer during the general debate. But owing perhaps, to an extended schedule of the visit to the United States of America, paid at the kind invitation of President Eisenhower, by our illustrious Chief of State, accompanied by Professor Massaquoi, it seems, however, that our Chairman will only arrive within the next five or ten days.

(5) The delegation of Liberia could not permit this debate to terminate without recording the layman's views and considerations of the ultimate meaning and objectives of our honoured institution. So far as the cultivation and development of human relations are concerned, we are completely convinced that Unesco is the only solid foundation of a lasting universal peace.

(6) We are privileged to have been accredited to the seventh session of the General Conference, which has now passed into history as a most critical stage in Unesco's development, if not the real test of its will to survive. Even the most prejudiced, if there be any, might unhesitatingly join in the chorus of praise and commendation, first, to Dr. Taylor, whose difficult and unenviable lot it was to fill the unfortunate breach in the walls of Unesco's solidarity, occasioned by the sudden resignation of Dr. Torres Bodet, and the very serious repercussions that followed. Secondly, to Dr. Luther Evans, our resourceful, progressive and highly specialized Director-General.

(7) The glowing tributes paid to these eminent intellectuals and administrators by previous speakers are no mere platitudes; they are a genuine acknowledgment of gratitude for universal humanitarian services well performed. My country and delegation most enthusiastically and sincerely join in this chorus.

(8) With particular regard to specific projects jointly undertaken by Unesco, through its technical assistance services, and my Government, the report of the Director-General contains an up-to-date account. In the considered view of the Liberian Government and people, Unesco has demonstrated the kind of co-operation that could be emulated with advantage internationally, by the successful

accomplishment of certain limited projects carried out in Liberia. Since applying for technical assistance, my Government, in pursuance of its policy of contributing liberally to, if not far in excess of, any outside aid and assistance made available, has appropriated and expended a large part of its annual revenue on JULEP, teacher training, science teaching at the University of Liberia, on fundamental education and technical training, while an even larger contribution and increased activities are contemplated for 1955.

(9) While looking hopefully to the continuation by Unesco of the above projects and to the possibility of a sizeable increase in funds and activities, more than justified by the special needs of Liberia, I should like to emphasize that, ever since its foundation, barring two decades of colonial existence under a private and limited American company, Liberia and its Government were completely lacking in the means and economic backing to develop its culture and to spread education among the masses of its population until 12 years ago, and even then development was on a very moderate and limited scale. The national progress could not stand comparison with that of Liberia's neighbours, Sierra Leone and the French Guinea and Ivory Coast, which have enjoyed a preponderance of economic support, centuries of cultural and educational experience and facilities made freely available to them. These basic facts should be taken into consideration in any fair and unbiased appraisal of my country's present needs and of what it has thus far achieved in the way of political, economic and cultural advancement.

(10) The decision of the seventh session of the General Conference of Unesco to convene its eighth and current session on the great South American continent, and at Montevideo, capital of the model, traditionally peace-loving country of Uruguay, is, in our humble estimation, a wise step towards the goal of selling Unesco directly to the peoples of the world, so as to win their abiding faith and confidence.

(11) In view of what looks like a healthy change in the international climate, it is more than a coincidence in time that this freedom-loving country and its capital are playing the rôle of host to the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco, at this important psychological juncture in the evolution of a world community.

(12) In our considered opinion, the enjoyment by Uruguay of this privilege and honour is merited and testifies to international esteem for, and recognition of, the invaluable contribution its Government and people have made culturally, socially and politically to the cultivation of universal goodwill, understanding, co-operation and peace.

(13) For us, it is a great privilege to be associated with our distinguished colleagues of Member States in their laudable efforts to work at this General Conference for the spiritual and cultural reawakening, the enlightenment and development of mankind. These efforts, if persevered in, will be recognized by future historians and coming generations as the first hopeful ray of light in the dawn of an era of lasting world peace and happiness.

(14) Our country has placed unswerving faith in Unesco from its very beginnings, when it was generally regarded as an experiment, and our Government and people have since confirmed that faith in terms of concrete activity. We pledge Liberia's continued collaboration and co-operation with Member States, the Executive Board and the Secretariat, in the execution of the ambitious but rewarding task of implanting virtue and truth in the minds and consciences of mankind through a universal Unesco.

(15) From the particular viewpoint of those areas of the African continent embracing the British Colony and Protectorate of Sierra Leone, the French overseas territories of Guinea and Ivory Coast, the British Colony of the Gold Coast and the sole sovereign State of Liberia, one of the outstanding events of this General Conference is the unanimous admission to associate membership of Sierra Leone and the Gold Coast. It was a very great pleasure indeed to my country and delegation to join in the enthusiastic welcome that was accorded the distinguished representatives of these two strategic, culturally advanced and progressive West African areas of the British Commonwealth of Nations, at the third plenary meeting of this Conference. The Liberian Government and delegation therefore offer their sincere congratulations to Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and its accredited delegation at this Conference, upon this enlightened act, which we hope will eventuate, in the not too distant future, in the admission of these two areas as full-fledged members of the Organization. Having had the honour and privilege to serve for these many years as the only fully qualified spokesmen and advocates of the African masses inhabiting the West Coast, it will be for us a day of profound joy when other fully qualified countries of our region are permitted to take their rightful places in the galaxy of free nations.

(16) To our generous, hospitable and friendly hosts, the Government and people of Uruguay, we express the sincere appreciation and gratitude of ourselves and of our Government and people, for the kindness and cordiality so spontaneously extended to us, in common with our colleagues of other Member States. We shall leave Montevideo with pleasant and unfading memories, and shall not fail to report these acts of generosity and hospitality to our Government and people.

(17) May we, one and all, great and small, leave these halls, constructed as it would seem, upon foundations of international solidarity, edified and kindled by the singleness of purpose, the high endeavour and firm determination shown in the task of raising a super-structure of goodwill, sympathetic understanding, co-operation and universal fraternity in the minds of our respective peoples, thus heralding the dawn of an era of lasting peace and happiness for all.

(18) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Professor Bardales, Head of the delegation of Honduras.

(19) Mr. BARDALES (Honduras) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, ladies and gentlemen: It is with deep

satisfaction that the delegation of Honduras, on behalf of its Government, expresses its very sincere gratitude to the Government and people of Uruguay for the kind hospitality offered to us during our stay in the Uruguayan capital, on the occasion of the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference. At the same time it fervently trusts that the democracy embodied in the Constitution of Uruguay, guaranteed by the Government and the Executive Power, and daily reflected in the civic life of the Uruguayan people, may go on from strength to strength as an example and pattern for the nations of the world.

(20) The object of the present debate is to pass judgment upon the work accomplished by Unesco during the most recent period of its activity and the Government of Honduras is happy to express its appreciation of the numerous achievements sponsored and directed by Unesco in the various Member States. Unesco's objective is nothing less than the improvement of education throughout the world so that there may be a better type of humanity in every quarter of the globe.

(21) Of the many activities of Unesco, some are of outstanding importance. Such, for example, is the activity known as fundamental education, the greatest of all because it reaches down to the masses, to all the humble folk throughout the world.

(22) The object of fundamental education is to instil certain minima of knowledge, attitudes, habits and interests, so as to raise the intellectual and social level of the world. This activity, in which Unesco has always been fittingly assisted by the Organization of American States, through the Department of Education, is one of those which receives the most sympathy and support from the Government of Honduras.

(23) The reason is not far to seek. The work has not been confined to solving the problems of training teachers but has also dealt with new techniques in the preparation of materials and the selective organization of curricula, so that teaching methods and fundamental education in general may be more effective in improving the lot of the simple country dweller.

(24) In Latin America this work enjoys the distinguished co-operation of the Regional Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America at Patzcuaro, whose particular responsibility is the training of the necessary staff for the fundamental education campaigns and programmes in the Western Hemisphere.

(25) Honduras, which for various reasons has hitherto been unable to associate with Unesco in carrying out a project on any aspect of education, has had an opportunity of taking part in fundamental education by means of the fellowships which are a special feature of CREFAL. A team of five professors and another of ten teachers are now undergoing a course of training. With the help of the team of teachers, we have set up the National Fundamental Education Centre at Cedros, which began its work with an intensive course for training a group of teachers from our own country and giving instruction in the techniques of fundamental education. When the course was finished, the Ministry of Public Education posted the teachers at strategic points throughout the country; there are now five fundamental education zones, in which these teachers are working for the betterment of the rural inhabitants.

(26) Honduras has not only benefited in this way by the activities of Unesco, but it has also been busily engaged, in agreement with Unesco, in training a larger number of primary teachers, for which purpose it has inaugurated a big scheme of scholarships for the training of primary school teachers. The scheme includes the selection and training of candidates and even acts as an employment agency, offering them good opportunities, so that they shall not later be tempted to leave the profession.

(27) In addition, Honduras has been taking a great interest in the training of its secondary schoolmasters. Here, too, it has taken account of Unesco directives and has launched an interesting scholarship scheme for training secondary teachers outside the country. It has also instituted a permanent system of refresher courses for secondary teachers by means of summer schools and extension courses on a national scale.

(28) Unesco's plans for the improvement of education include other activities, such as the interchange of information and documents on various aspects of education, and the organization of seminars and the publishing of handbooks of value to teachers. In this way it has striven to perfect the teaching profession in all the Member States of the Organization.

(29) It has been said in this Conference that the National Commissions constitute an essential element in giving effect to the work of Unesco. With that we agree, and we only regret that the National Commissions, being composed of people sometimes heavily burdened with other official duties, do not have sufficient time to devote themselves, body and soul, to exercising the responsibility which they hold conjointly with Unesco. It is to be hoped that the Member States will in due course see to it that the National Commissions are composed of capable persons with time at their disposal to dedicate themselves to the educational work of their countries, and that the Member States will also make sufficient funds available to the National Commissions for the promotion of national education programmes.

(30) We believe it to be a fact that Unesco has done important work in the world on behalf of education, which was formerly looked down upon and treated, perhaps, as the Cinderella of the public services. Unesco has succeeded in interesting governments in education, and not the governments only, but the peoples, the community, the public. It has awakened a new conscience in the teaching profession, has made them aware of their dignity as schoolmasters, and has taught them the significance, the value and the mission of national education in the guidance of peoples and the destiny of nations. And it has taught the school that its task is something beyond the simple rôle of making the masses literate, by bringing it to realize that, if a school is really to be a school, it must serve the interests of the community.

(31) I pray that Unesco will continue to work

tenaciously for the extension of its educational programme and that in this splendid task the Member States may offer it still greater co-operation as a result of the present meeting of the General Conference.

(32) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Head of the delegation of Bolivia.

(33) Mr. SANGINEZ URIERTE (Bolivia) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, ladies and gentlemen: The Republic of Uruguay, the cradle of liberty, has welcomed to its midst delegations from all over the world, who, after travelling hundreds of miles, are now met together to partake of the bread of the spirit, namely, education, science and culture. It would be difficult to imagine any other capital city excelling Montevideo in offering us such a cordial and fraternal atmosphere. On behalf of the Government of Bolivia, therefore, I wish to express our appreciation to the Government, the people and the press of this great country, pre-eminent among all the nations of the world by its democratic tradition and its love of freedom and justice.

(34) Bolivia, notwithstanding its 129 years of independence, has only recently given birth to a life and autonomy of its own, since the Revolution of April 1952 swept the National Revolutionary Movement into power. Cast in an antiquated mould, our culture and education were the toys of vested interests, the fortunate lot of certain privileged groups. The popular revolution finally ousted the oppressors - the big mining concerns and feudalism - and the Government became dedicated solely to the service of the people.

(35) Thus, in 1952, so far as educational matters were concerned, the country was disorganized and had no funds to cover the most urgent needs; and it was a long time since the human element - the teacher - had been chosen as for a high calling. The entire edifice had to be started again from the foundations and, as a result of a supreme decree there was set up a commission for the reform of education, whose report is now being studied by the Government.

(36) Of all Latin American countries, Bolivia has the highest percentage of illiteracy: among adult country dwellers it reaches 84%, representing about 865,000 illiterates. Of the rural school age population from 5 to 19 years of age, 63% do not attend school, that is to say about 465,000 children and adolescents. That is why enormous importance has been attached to fundamental education.

(37) In the report of the Director-General and the Executive Board of Unesco, mention is made of the help received by Bolivia through the assistance of two experts of the Experimental School at Miraflores (La Paz), which has enabled the professional training of teachers to be improved and broadened, and made more practical. Through this school pass hundreds of teachers, trained in fundamental education and with a genuinely practical and pedagogic outlook.

(38) Fundamental education is governed in our country by geography and the historical past, which is reflected in our traditions, our social, economic and political movements and in the soul and individuality of the people; it must therefore derive its inspiration and sustenance from these sources and seek its own national, regional and local ends.

(39) Its work is eminently social: it is the complete education of the community, since its action not only embraces all the components of the community - men and women, young and old, the home, the economy, recreation, health, and the spread of literacy, but also includes the aspirations and desires of the community, its eagerness for political, economic and social progress and for the formation of a national consciousness.

(40) The Agrarian Reform which has been decreed in Bolivia has incorporated about two million rural inhabitants into the life of the nation by making them proprietors, who produce and, by the same token, consume. In addition, it has created in them a greater interest in the education of their children, with the result that the school population has appreciably increased, thus raising the serious problem of the shortage of teachers, premises, furniture and educational equipment.

(41) The revolutionary movement has gone so deep among the people that there has been an enormous increase in the interest shown by the working classes in instruction in the new book learning. Their keenness is for professional and technical instruction, for further education, and more extensive specialized classes. The demand for new establishments is surprising and contrasts sharply with the shortage of funds available for the fulfilment of this compelling obligation.

(42) May I therefore be allowed to urge that Unesco's fundamental education project pay greater attention to countries which, like Bolivia, have a high percentage of illiterates, both adult and juvenile, and are thus obliged to give their instruction a practical trend.

(43) At Sirs-el-Layyan (Egypt), in Thailand, and in Africa - in the non-self-governing dependent territories of Britain and France - fundamental education is producing excellent results, as may be deduced from the Director-General's report, and it is also contributing to the solution of social and economic problems.

(44) So sincerely progressive is the present government in an essentially popular and rural sense, that the plan for combating illiteracy has had three interesting effects. Decrees and other legislation now stipulate that: (a) all those who aspire to a university degree must teach at least ten persons to read and write before they are granted the desired diploma; (b) under the educational Reform Act every person who has become literate must similarly teach one other person to read and write, and (c) everyone attending teachers' training colleges and establishments must teach not less than ten persons to read and write before being officially awarded a diploma.

(45) It is worthy of notice that there is a five-year plan for the systematic wiping out of illiteracy. Special funds for this purpose have to be provided out of the national budget, but still greater support will be needed in view of the magnitude of the problem.

(46) In Bolivia, everything is overshadowed by one important fact: up to 9 April 1952, education was restricted to certain classes in a privileged economic position and certain ages only. All those who were unable to continue their secondary studies were destined to swell the ranks of the destitute, for lack of opportunity for further study; courses in practical, technical, industrial, commercial, and agricultural subjects, stock-breeding, etc. were non-existent. Furthermore, the traditional secondary school teaching was theoretical, bookish and unimaginative: it provided only a feeble preparation for the university - a university run on academic and highly theoretical lines, standing quite aloof from the national, social and economic life of Bolivia. After the revolution secondary education became much more diverse: there was an increase in the number of vocational schools for women and of industrial schools in various districts; new sections were formed, dealing with stock-breeding, horticulture and forestry, as well as petroleum engineering; commercial colleges, schools of accountancy and instruction centres for Customs officials were opened. With a clear sense of direction, public education forms a co-ordinated ideal that is essentially social and democratic. It is an education for all ages and classes, education designed to increase the productivity and industrialization of the country, to improve its economic diversity and train technicians and skilled workers in all branches.

(47) The profound effect of the national revolution, especially since the agrarian reform, is amply proved by the pressure of the rural population in favour of schools, founding them at their own expense and building them with their own hands, in rough and ready style it is true, but to such purpose that in about 18 months some 3,000 small village schools have been constructed in this way.

(48) In Bolivia, just as in other countries, primary, secondary, technical and university education is absolutely free - a clear proof that, despite enormous economic difficulties, the State is making every effort to educate the people. Thirty per cent of the nation's general budget is allocated to education.

(49) An American from the United States said recently that countries - he was referring to Latin America - must begin by aiding themselves, by working out their own salvation. This the Government of Bolivia has been doing, but in view of the incontrovertible facts reflected in the illiteracy figures, it is to be hoped that Unesco will extend its assistance programme to countries like mine by affording them greater economic, educational and cultural aid, by granting scholarships, by providing them with better techniques for rural education, and by trying to extend its future action to the great masses of the people who in many places are totally unaware of Unesco's existence. A million Bolivian illiterates, ripe for education, are awaiting the help of Unesco.

(50) I am grateful to the Director-General for the interest he has shown in Bolivian affairs and I hope that next time he visits my country he will obtain complete first-hand knowledge of our educational difficulties, to our subsequent advantage in finding a better and juster solution of the grave problem with which we are faced.

(51) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Nicaragua.

(52) Mr. SACASA (Nicaragua) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: Nicaragua is a small country in Central America, which lives and works and strives to achieve its ambitions in the very heart of this great continent of liberty and hope. Today it pays warm tribute to the native land of Artigas, and is happy to acknowledge publicly the manner in which the Republic of Uruguay has once again given proof of its democratic traditions by inviting Unesco to hold the eighth session of its General Conference in this city of Montevideo, that blossoms like a garden on the banks of the River Plate, burial place of heroes and nursery of brilliant minds. And here we meet within the walls of this magnificent Parliament building, an assembly of governments and peoples, uniting their thoughts and efforts to bring about a future of universal peace and brotherhood through the strong and effective development of education, science and culture.

(53) With unshakable faith, the Government presided over by General Anastasio Somoza has ushered in a new era of important achievements in the field of education by giving top priority to the development of the primary schools, where instruction is compulsory and free. Its main purpose is to raise the educational standards of the great mass of our rural inhabitants. It also fosters the national campaign against illiteracy, and gives general application to the principles and practices of modern pedagogics, which have reached their highest expression in Unesco's scheme of fundamental education.

(54) With a population of one million three hundred thousand inhabitants, my country is beginning to consolidate its economy under the protection of a stable peace: it is mechanizing its agriculture and taking the first steps to organize its youthful industries. For the time being, however, it cannot have enough school centres to enable it to develop its general culture, nor does it possess an adequate number of books, reviews and periodicals from our own presses. On the other hand, we are rightly proud to announce before this assembly of Unesco that the Nicaraguan State schools are making every effort to form the minds of our citizens and give them a strength and clarity of thought which influence the spirit, shaping, purifying and improving it, and imbuing it with devotion for the highest ideals; preparing it also for the exercise of freedom and citizenship, of respect for different or antagonistic ideologies and for its own, whether in the political, social, philosophical, religious or cultural fields. At the same time we are trying to create a firm national consciousness, with no tendency to narrow-mindedness, but rather with a fullness of judgment and goodwill that will lead the Nicaraguan to understand the American, the European, the African, the Asiatic and the Oceanian, and to love them as himself, and will make him a citizen of the world, the brother of all mankind,

without discrimination of colour, race or tongue.
(55) The Nicaraguan delegation, in taking its seat in this great assembly, does so in the loftiest spirit of co-operation and in the desire to add its modest contribution to the noble labours of Unesco, whose aims are proof that it intends to consolidate and render more fruitful the progressive movement which is now influencing intellectual and spiritual life in Nicaragua. My delegation also hopes that Unesco's future programme will contain duly defined and concrete measures of assistance to the less developed, less wealthy and less powerful countries, thus giving the smaller nations an acceptable and generous message of courage.
(56) In the three years that have elapsed since Nicaragua joined Unesco, the country has been able to meet its moral and financial commitments and has succeeded in working, within the limits of its capacity, to bring about real national prosperity and harmony among the nations, in the desire that these may be reflected in the material well-being and happiness of man, in his dual aspect as an individual and a member of society. We are at all times ready to co-operate in any action which consists not merely of high sounding proposals, but of their practical realization, in conformity with the ambitions and guiding principles of the Nicaraguan motherland, which are in harmony with the ideals of this honourable Organization of the United Nations.
(57) The Unesco National Commission in Nicaragua, with the staunch support of the Ministry of Education, has applied itself to studying the programmes and activities of the Organization, in order to plan its work in accordance with the directives of Unesco and with the opportunities they offer in relation to the needs of our own nation, especially in the fields of education and technical assistance. With regard to the latter point, I am happy to acknowledge the benefits conferred on my country by the Regional Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America (CREFAL), which is supported by Unesco, the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Government of Mexico, and which has been instrumental in securing us 15 fellowships, with the result that, after intensive training for two years, ten of our schoolmasters have already returned to Nicaragua and have begun, with conspicuous success, their difficult work of popular education and the training of other teachers. At the same time I have pleasure in stating that our Government and Unesco last October signed an agreement on technical assistance, with the object of making available to my country the services of two experts, one in urban education and the other in rural and fundamental education. We shall later urge that the mission be completed by the addition of other experts to deal respectively with school administration and the training of secondary teachers.
(58) I also consider this the proper place to state that the Nicaraguan delegation, or rather our Government, firmly supported the Government of its sister republic of Honduras in sponsoring the project to celebrate an annual Culture Week, an idea originally put forward by the scientific and literary group set up by the Union of Latin American Universities.
(59) Before concluding I should like to say that my delegation warmly joins in the tribute of appreciation and gratitude paid to the efficient work of Dr. Luther H. Evans, Director-General of Unesco - a work which is demonstrated in the concise and clear report he has presented.
(60) And, finally, allow me on this solemn occasion to lift up my voice in prayer to the God of the nations, that Unesco may daily grow in wisdom and stature; that its ideals may penetrate ever more deeply into the conscience of the peoples and guide and regulate the counsels of governments; that over the whole wide face of the earth the banner of Unesco may fly triumphant; and that under every sky, men and nations may forget their quarrels in growing tolerance and brotherhood, and, devoting themselves solely to the arts of progress and culture, may raise their voices in hymns of peace, accomplishing in their minds and hearts the manifest destiny of humanity, whose birthright it is to live dignified lives in freedom from fear and want.

**REPLY BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

(61) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the Director-General.

(62) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President, honourable delegates, I do not feel that I have been under heavy fire from the comments you have made. I have taken note of points where you have criticized or raised questions but, before I comment on them, I wish to say how deeply gratified my colleagues of the Secretariat and I are at the unanimous expressions of confidence in the principles of Unesco and of faith in the future of the Organization, made by delegates in their speeches of the last few days. This creates for all of us, Secretariat and delegates alike, a fine atmosphere in which to do the work of this Conference. This reaffirmation of faith, it seems to me, is very important for all of us and it is also very important for the peoples of all the Member States.
(63) I wish to thank delegates for the kind remarks they have made about the report and, in general, about the policies which the Secretariat has followed and the actions it has taken in implementation of the current programme and in the drafting of the new one. I wish to express my personal appreciation to those delegates who mentioned that I have visited their respective countries in the past two years, and I wish to explain to those delegates who have expressed regret that I have not visited them, that I hope to do so in the near future. It has been impossible for me to visit all countries. I assure you that the principal reason has been the harshness of the time schedule and the fact that I have tried to follow a pattern of geographical distribution. I not only have to secure a geographical distribution of the Secretariat, but also a geographical distribution of the Director-General! I have already expressed the pleasure I had in taking members of the Executive Board, including the Chairman, with me on some of these visits and I should like to thank those of you who have mentioned the visits of the Board members.

(64) It is a matter of very great pleasure to my colleagues and myself that a number of delegates have spoken in favourable terms of the efforts which they have noted on the part of the Secretariat to make the application of the programme and also the development of the new programme more genuinely responsive to the needs of Member States, as Member States themselves understand those needs. I said in introducing the report that that has been our main objective and I would like to point out, in answer to remarks by one or two delegates, that responding to the needs of Member States does not necessarily mean responding only to economic desires, responding only to material requirements. Many of these efforts are efforts to respond to spiritual needs, to things of the mind, to things of the heart. Let us not, therefore, make a terminological error, an error of conception, and identify responsiveness to Member States' needs and requests with the granting of economic or purely material aid.

(65) We not only, as some delegates have noted, try to be responsive to the requirements of Member States, but we have also tried to be responsive to the requirements of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, the Organization of American States, the Council of Europe and other agencies and groups. I am glad that a number of delegates mentioned this fact, because it is important for these other organizations to know that we not only have tried to be co-operative, but that the Conference recognizes that they have responded and have co-operated with us.

(66) I am glad that some speakers pointed out that, when they commented on the report of the Director-General, they were commenting on the work of an organization and not a person, and that the work that is reported here is the work of a staff of zealous people, many of them with highly specialized talents, who have all worked as a team to carry out the wishes of the General Conference. I hope when you use the term Director-General you will have in mind that you are talking about 800 persons who work in the Secretariat in Paris, as well as a number who work in the field. The keynote of our efforts to work as a homogeneous group in the Secretariat is not collegiate confusion of responsibility but rather strong and smooth team work with a great deal of initiative and independence of thought on the part of all members of the team, and a great deal of harmony in carrying out a policy or a directive once it is agreed upon.

(67) Some delegates have referred to certain of our shortcomings. One delegate referred to lapses in administration, others have said that sometimes we seem still to be too bureaucratic minded, and adopt too much an attitude of omniscience. The Secretariat is striving not to give any basis for a belief that it regards itself as high and mighty or that it regards Member States as the public knocking on its doors. We do, of course, have a burden of work which we are not always able to transact as rapidly and as well as we would wish. Also, we may have been guilty on occasions of errors of judgment or of some other kind of failure in administration, but it is our belief that these mistakes are decreasing and, as we find the causes of them, we are genuinely trying to improve our administrative organization, our administrative procedures and the spirit in which we operate the machinery. The best way to clear up these matters is to be told about them so that we can work on them in the friendliest spirit of co-operation.

(68) I appreciate the fact that a number of delegates have commended the Executive Board. The Executive Board, with which I have been very well acquainted either as a member or as Director-General since 1948, has, in my opinion, played a more significant rôle in the affairs of Unesco in the past year than at any time since I have been closely acquainted with it. It took the courageous decision at about the time of my election, to take a good look at the state of Unesco's programme, Unesco's organization, Unesco's accomplishments and to try and think out some general conclusions as to what ought to be done about certain of the weaknesses and failures of the Organization. The results of that effort have already been reported to you, and certain of these results will be before you in your consideration of the programme and the budget. I merely wish to say at this time that I concur with the Board in its efforts and in its objective and that I have co-operated with it as closely as possible. I took the liberty of asking the Board to assume a strong leadership rôle in the work of the Organization - that is, as the representative of the Conference, to give me guidance on some of the larger decisions that have to be made as to the directions the Organization should follow in the future. I think this has been highly beneficial to the Organization, and I hope in the future to be able to work with the Board in the closest kind of co-operation and I hope that it will give leadership to the future sessions of the General Conference, as well as guidance to me in interpreting the will of the past Conference. To have this organ, half-way between the Director-General and the Conference, is, in my opinion, one of the great sources of strength of the Organization.

(69) Much was said by delegates in welcome to the new Member States, and I was pleased to hear that welcome. It was to me a sort of ex post facto authorization of what my colleagues and I had already done to help in every way possible to integrate the new Member States in the work of the Organization. We have done everything we could to give all legitimate aid to the new Member States, in learning about our programme, in learning about our procedures, which to a new Member State are very complicated, and I am very glad that the Conference has carried out the same policy which we felt sure in advance it would wish us to carry out.

(70) Some reference has been made to the relationship between the Director-General's report (including the Executive Board's report) and the reports of Member States. The Chairman of the Board himself pointed out that perhaps we have not as yet developed the best feasible relationship between them. I do not have anything to suggest on this point except that the Secretariat is ready to discuss this problem with appropriate organs of the Conference, with a possibility of developing a closer internal and organic relationship between these major documents. I feel certain that eventually the

Secretariat's report ought to include more information about what is going on in Member States, in direct execution of Unesco projects and programmes, but one has to move cautiously, for obviously whole educational programmes of Member States are in some cases influenced by Unesco's advice, and one cannot include the progress of the whole educational programme of a country in a Unesco report of its own activity. But perhaps there is something more we could do to integrate into the account of our own activities, in terms of the reporting itself, the activities of Member States. The Secretariat is very glad to explore this possibility with you.

(71) It has been a pleasure to us to have some of the information given in Member States' reports supplemented by the reports delegates have made at these meetings, and we are also glad that many of the reports of what has been happening in Member States have contained references to what Unesco has contributed. I would observe to delegates who have some doubt about the technical aid, special project trend in the new programme and budget proposals, that most of the references of Member States to Unesco activities which have given them assistance in their own educational, scientific and cultural programmes, have been to technical assistance projects; not all of them, by any means, but most of the projects mentioned, those of which delegations have shown themselves most conscious, have been of the technical aid type. I do not mean that technical aid ought to encompass our entire programme, but I do mean to bring a fact to your notice which I think is significant for your later discussion of the new draft programme and budget.

(72) A number of speakers mentioned the failure of the Secretariat to achieve an adequate geographical distribution in the staff and there were suggestions as to what we should do about language qualifications. I am very sympathetic to this attitude and to these suggestions and will study the matter seriously. I wish to report, in relation to the present situation, that we have made real efforts in the past two years to increase the representation of certain countries which are either not represented at all or are not adequately represented on the staff. We have taken steps forward, and steps backward, for some of our good people from countries insufficiently represented have been taken back from us by their governments, and we have had to start all over again. We applaud governments' taking such persons back in some cases, because frequently the return of one of our employees to his own country is one of the best ways of developing effective liaison between that country and Unesco, and also one of the best ways for Unesco to assist the country.

(73) This leads me to the suggestion that the Turkish delegate made, which he and I talked over when I was in Turkey recently, that perhaps we ought to have posts in the Secretariat where we bring in persons for two or three years, with a definite understanding that at the end of that term they will go back to their old posts or to other posts in their government. I also call your attention to the fact that our possibilities of redressing maldistribution on a geographical basis are very limited at the present time, and there are certain proposals before you, to be considered later on, which are calculated to assist in the solution of this problem.

(74) A great deal has been said in your comments about our failure to do all we should do to encourage National Commissions, and, beyond them to get our message across to the people. I will not speak about either of these things at this time, except to say that, as regards both, we are far from doing a satisfactory job, in the opinion of the Secretariat, but, also as regards both, we definitely need some clarification from you as to exactly what our programme should be. We will try to pose those problems in sharper outline when we discuss the relevant chapters in the proposed programme.

(75) It has been a great pleasure to me to have so many delegates mention the centres of fundamental education at Patzcuaro and Sirs-el-Layyan. Since the report before you was written, I have visited both of these centres, Sirs-el-Layyan in September, and Patzcuaro in October. I had previously visited Patzcuaro, but this was my first visit to Sirs-el-Layyan. I can tell you quite candidly that I agree with the delegates who mentioned these centres, that they are, as far as we can tell at this early stage, doing a really successful job.

(76) Mention has also been made of our work for the Arab refugees from Palestine and in Korea. I think we ought to acknowledge, perhaps publicly on some occasion, that, as regards both of those programmes, Unesco is just a tiny tail wagging a great big dog. We are with our very few experts, at relatively small cost, helping in the expenditure of enormous sums of money in the countries concerned, sums that come from other sources. In the case of the Arab refugees, it is the United Nations Relief and Works Agency that is in charge and it is spending millions of dollars each year on the education of the children. Unesco is providing the educational leaders for that programme and, if we are able to do something successful and useful, it is because of the intelligent and devoted management by the people who are in charge of UNRWA. In Korea it is the United Nations Korean Rehabilitation Agency which is really doing the job, and Unesco is merely giving expert advice. I hope that we may find during the discussions in the Programme Commission that we can do more than we have proposed in regard to the Arab refugees' programme, and I would like also to say that we stand ready to do more than we have been called upon so far to do in Korea. Our relations with those those agencies are good, and I look confidently for increased success in our work in those two important fields.

(77) The Swiss delegate said that we ought to do more in our reports to tell Member States where they were falling short in certain fields of work, such as the ratification of Unesco conventions. I would like to discuss later exactly how far we should go in this regard, for we might easily raise controversial issues and create delicate situations with Member States if we did too much. To be sure of our ground in making any such comments, we should have to be in possession of a lot more information than we now have in most of these cases. Perhaps also our report ought not to emphasize anyone's failures, except the failures of the Secretariat. In relations with Member States, we

ought to point to the positive side of achievement. Of course, in talking about our positive achievements we are sometimes referring to successes scored against barriers that Member States have erected; and in that case we are giving factual statements.

(78) One or two references were made to publications and, as at every General Conference, beginning with the second one, Unesco publications have been criticized, I would like to say that, in my opinion, great strides have been made, particularly in the past two years, in improving the mechanisms by which we review our publications before they are printed in order to make sure that we do not issue publications that are not of high quality, or that, for one reason or another, do not need to be published. I believe, if you were to make a critical examination of our publications of the past year or so, that you would find very few useless or low quality publications. We have established very good machinery for checking our manuscripts before publication, and we have also invited Member States to co-operate with us in having specialists in various fields review publications and give us a critical evaluation of them. These critical evaluations are very helpful to us in two ways, and I would appeal to Member States to co-operate with us in this matter. They give us an outside judgment of our work, a judgment by the best intellectuals of the world in the fields in which the respective publications fall. Secondly, when these learned persons find that a publication is good, their good evaluation of it spreads to other intellectuals in the field and the publication sells a lot better and has a lot more influence.

(79) Despite my statement the other day, some delegates expressed concern at the way I was treating the staff of Unesco. I do not want to go into that again but I can genuinely affirm that I do not believe, since I have been Director-General, that I have ever interfered with anyone's freedom of conscience or have in any other way violated, or even threatened, any rights which a member of the staff as an international civil servant ought to have.

(80) Mr. President and delegates, I am going to reply in the Programme Commission to many comments that were made here on programme matters and I hope that you will not feel offended if I have not addressed myself to them here. I am taking your comments on the programme seriously and shall reply to them on another occasion.

(81) In concluding, may I observe how pleased I am that some of the delegates made laudatory references to Dr. Torres Bodet, my eminent predecessor, and to Dr. Taylor, who held the fort so well in the six months between Dr. Torres Bodet's term and my own.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.

# ELEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

*22 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Communications by the President . . . . . 160
Statement by the observer for Paraguay . . . . . 161
Second Report of the Credentials Committee . . . . . 162
Report of the Administrative Commission on Item 9.3.1 of the revised agenda (document 8C/JUR/2) and discussion thereon: Speeches by the delegates of Panama, France, Switzerland, Haiti, Italy, German Federal Republic, Denmark, United States of America, Lebanon, Uruguay, Colombia, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Japan, Laos, Egypt and the United Kingdom . . . . . 162

**COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT**

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Ladies and gentlemen, the General Committee regrets to announce the death of a member of the Belgian delegation, Professor de Thibault. In view of this sad news, and as a token of the grief which the General Conference must surely feel - as it is

felt by the General Committee - and as a mark of our condolence and sympathy with his colleagues in the Belgian delegation, I suggest to the Conference that we should all rise to our feet for one minute's silence as homage to our departed friend.
(2) I call upon the delegate of Belgium.

(3) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is with deep emotion that I thank the President for the tribute he has just paid to Mr. Ivan de Thibault.
(4) A talented, charming and genial man, Mr. de Thibault, who had a brilliant civil service career behind him, had specialized in problems of technical assistance, and had been appointed to speak in the discussions to be held on this subject during the present Conference. From the first he was charmed by this beautiful country; the Uruguayan beaches cast their spell over him. He loved the sea, and it was the sea which drew him to his tragic end. The accident, which took place on Saturday at about 6 o'clock and brought consternation upon the Belgian delegation and the entire Conference, appears to have been due to a heart attack.
(5) As we were away from Montevideo for our week-end relaxation, we were not able to inform our friends in all the delegations of the blow which had befallen us, before the ceremony of burial which took place locally on Sunday at 5 o'clock. On behalf of my country, I wish to thank the Minister of National Defence, who kindly arranged to be represented at the ceremony. I would also thank the Director-General and his staff, who on Sunday travelled to Punta del Este in order to be with us in that sad hour. Finally, I should like to thank all those of you who have since been kind enough to present their condolences to our delegation. May the memory of Mr. de Thibault bring us closer together than ever before in the pursuit of the ideal for which he came here to battle by our side.

(6) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Ladies and gentlemen, the General Committee regrets to inform the General Conference that, according to information received today, the death has occurred of Mr. Andrei Vishinsky, Vice-President of the General Assembly of the United Nations and First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union.
(7) I call upon the delegate of India.

(8) Mr. KABIR (India): Mr. President, fellow delegates. It is my melancholy duty to move on behalf of this Conference a sincere vote of condolence at the sad loss which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has suffered in the death of Mr. Andrei Vishinsky. It is not necessary for me to speak at length of his services; he has been one of the foremost figures in the international field, and in the last few days he had been playing an important part in bringing the different nations together. By his death, the United Nations and the cause of peace have suffered a loss, and Unesco, as an associate of the United Nations, expresses its sorrow on that account.

(9) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The proposal of the delegate of India is before the meeting for consideration. The General Committee understands that the vote we are about to take will be in the form of a communication from the General Conference to the Soviet Government, expressing our sorrow at the death of Mr. Andrei Vishinsky.
(10) If there is no opposition, I take it that the motion is approved.

(11) Agreed.

### STATEMENT BY THE OBSERVER FOR PARAGUAY

(12) I call upon the observer of the Republic of Paraguay.

(13) Mr. RAMIREZ (Paraguay) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Republic of Paraguay, and in accordance with my instructions, I have great pleasure in announcing to this international assembly, which is fraught with such consequence to the world, that my Government, exercising the right it enjoys as a founder member of the United Nations, formally communicates to this eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco its firm intention to adhere to this Organization, as soon as the requirements of its domestic legislation have been satisfied.
(14) Paraguay could no longer continue outside this Organization, which is developing close spiritual ties between the peoples as a means of opposing the floods which threaten to sweep away the rights of men. Moreover, these high objectives now being pursued throughout the world are in perfect harmony with the history of Paraguay.
(15) Unesco has undertaken to develop education, science and culture because through them it is seeking peace, freedom and justice, principles which must be upheld if this stricken world is to receive a new legal and social structure.
(16) As you know, it was in the land of the Guarani that the first shout of liberty was heard on 11 March 1542, during an act of rebellion by the Paraguayan people. To the cry of Liberty! Liberty! they deposed the governor, who was later taken to Spain on board the caraval Comuneros, built at Asuncion. In many periods and in various ways this idea has pervaded our national thinking.
(17) Paraguay, at the imperious command of those fundamental and universal ideas, has sacrificed her own existence and with the blood of her sons has sealed her devotion to those ideals. The exaltation of historic deeds far from being vainglorious, is a mere statement of fact.
(18) Education in Paraguay, according to the great Alberdi, became compulsory as long ago as 1857, a time when it was by no means so in the majority of European countries. With its feet firmly planted in history Paraguay can embark without hesitation on the course traced by Unesco. A love of education, of peace and of respect for international agreements is deeply rooted in the Paraguayan people. Its fortunes may have swayed this way and that, as often happens in the lives of nations and individuals; yet always its long-established belief in those standard principles of human life has remained unshaken.

Thus the universal values which survive through the ages are being fortified by the constructive efforts of this great international Organization, which is called upon to transform the world and make possible peaceful coexistence through culture, education and science.

(19) These brief remarks explain why my country is joining Unesco, to carry out with its fellows a realistic and concerted action to bring about a radical change in international relations, taking those same principles as a basis for the future. It is doing so with a full sense of responsibility, at this eighth session of the General Conference now taking place in this friendly country, whose institutions are buttressed by freedom and democracy in the service of peace and the brotherhood of man.

SECOND REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

(20) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Credentials Committee.

(21) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) (Chairman of the Credentials Committee) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in conformity with the authorization conferred upon the Chairman of the Credentials Committee at its first meeting, I now submit this second report so that the President, if he thinks fit, may place it before the General Conference for consideration.

(22) Since the first meeting of the Credentials Committee the following countries, which had already deposited provisional credentials, have now submitted powers found in good and due form, in accordance with Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Honduras, Korea, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands and the Philippines. Powers found in good and due form, in accordance with Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, have also been received from Saudi-Arabia, which when the first meeting of the Committee was held had still not deposited any credentials at all.

(23) It is recommended that the General Conference consider as fully valid the credentials submitted by the delegations of the aforementioned Member States and that these delegations be permitted to take part in the eighth session of the General Conference.

(24) Letters or telegrams have been received accrediting the delegations of Bolivia and Syria. It is recommended that the General Conference consider these documents as provisional credentials of the representatives of those Member States.

(25) Powers have also been received accrediting an observer of Paraguay and a representative of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. It is recommended that the General Conference accept their credentials.

(26) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The report just submitted is open for discussion. If there is no objection, I will take it as approved.

(27) Approved.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION ON ITEM 9.3.1 OF THE REVISED AGENDA (document 8C/JUR/2) AND DISCUSSION THEREON

(28) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission.

(29) Mr. ERIKSSON (Sweden) (Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission): Mr. President, fellow delegates, this report covers only item 9.3.1 of the revised agenda, which concerns the structure of the Executive Board, and therefore also draft amendments to Article V of the Constitution and to the Rules of Procedure relating to the Executive Board. The matter in question was discussed at several meetings of the Administrative Commission and was also referred to the Legal Committee. As the decision of the Administrative Commission on the report of the Legal Committee could only be taken this morning, I am sorry to say that we have not been able to prepare a written report on the subject. I wish, however, to draw your attention to the second report of the Legal Committee, 8C/JUR/2. This document contains, from the second half of page 1, starting with the word Constitution, the text approved by the Administrative Commission for submission to this plenary meeting of the Conference. The only change made by the Administrative Commission is, in fact, in the French edition under A - Composition, paragraph 4, the last line, where the word portion has been changed to durée.

(30) The draft amendment to the Constitution, Article V, was passed by 45 votes for, 6 against, and no abstentions. The consequent amendments to the Rules of Procedure were passed unanimously. The Commission has also decided to request the Legal Committee to interpret the text in paragraph 3 of Article V, concerning the eligibility of members of the Executive Board.

(31) With this introduction I will read the text as it was adopted by the Administrative Commission. I start with the part concerning the Constitution, Article V, Executive Board.

"A - Composition

1. The Executive Board shall be elected by the General Conference from among the delegates appointed by the Member States and shall consist of twenty-two members, each of whom shall represent the government of the State of which he is a national. The President of the General Conference shall sit ex officio in an advisory capacity on the Executive Board.

2. . . . . .

3. . . . . .

4. In the event of the death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board, his replacement for the remainder of his term shall be appointed by the Executive Board on the nomination of the government of the State the former member represented. The government making the nomination and the Executive Board shall have regard to the factors set forth in paragraph 2 of this Article.

B.- Functions

12. Although the members of the Executive Board are representative of their respective governments, they shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the General Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole.

C - Transitional Provisions

13. The term of office of the members of the Executive Board during the eighth session of the General Conference shall end at the close of the eighth session of the General Conference. At the eighth session of the General Conference, twenty-two members shall be elected to the Executive Board pursuant to the provisions of this Article, of whom one half shall retire at the close of the ninth session of the General Conference, the retiring members being chosen by the drawing of lots. Thereafter, eleven members shall be elected at each ordinary session of the General Conference.

Rules of Procedure

XVII. Election of members of the Executive Board

Rule 95 - Elections

1. At each of its ordinary sessions, the General Conference shall elect by secret ballot eleven members of the Executive Board.
2. Only a delegate nominated by the government of the State of which he is a national for election to the Executive Board may stand for election.
3. . . . . .

Rule 95, A - Transitional provision

The term of office of the members of the Executive Board during the eighth session of the General Conference shall end at the close of the eighth session of the General Conference. At the eighth session of the General Conference, twenty-two members shall be elected to the Executive Board pursuant to the provisions of Article V of the Constitution, of whom one half shall retire at the close of the ninth session of the General Conference, the retiring members being chosen by the drawing of lots. Thereafter, eleven members shall be elected at each ordinary session of the General Conference.

Rule 98 - Death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board

In the event of the death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board his replacement for the remainder of his term shall be appointed by the Executive Board on the nomination of the government of the State the former member represented. The government making the nomination and the Executive Board shall have regard to the factors set forth in Article V, A. 2 of the Constitution."

(32) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The report which has just been read is open for discussion. I call upon the delegate of Panama.

(33) Mr. AMADO BURGOS (Panama) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, through absence, the Panamanian delegation was unable to take part in the debates of the Administrative Commission, and is grateful for being allowed this opportunity to express a few ideas on the resolution we are now considering.
(34) We do not come as censors: we have the highest respect for all the governments and delegations represented here. We regard the problem, not as a governmental or political, but as a cultural one, and we know that in all countries and delegations, irrespective of the way they vote, there are people who sincerely hold opposite views.
(35) There are some Unesco matters which appear to be of purely administrative importance. In fact, however, they have world-wide repercussions. They have, of course, no repercussions on the millions of men who still, unhappily, lead lives of spiritual and material impoverishment. Perhaps they have certain repercussions, in a distorted way, on those millions of citizens whose governments restrict their freedom of intercourse with the outside world; but assuredly they find an echo in the hearts of those other millions of men and women everywhere in the world, who are sustained by faith and hope; in those millions of intellectuals, professional men and research workers, who have hitherto been the strongest bastion of freedom of thought and action. And they have also found an echo in the most authoritative organs of the daily press, with their millions of readers, in the more serious publications, in institutes, academies, assemblies, higher education centres and universities all over the earth. Therefore the decisions taken on these matters are heavy with consequence. Sometimes, in the ever more arduous struggle against totalitarian excesses, whether from the left or the right, they bring fresh armament to bear; and at other times they depress and discourage the best forces of humanity, of that humanity which has demanded and is still demanding an International Declaration of Human Rights, and which has suffered and is still suffering unforeseen disappointments.
(36) I am no fanatic, neither am I prejudiced, but when I have the honour of speaking before this distinguished gathering, in which America's hopes and desires for freedom in its sublimest forms are centred, I feel bound to ask myself whether this is really the time or the place to approve an amendment which has been branded, in the Executive Board of Unesco, by one of the most eminent authorities in Europe, as retrograde. I wonder whether this session of the General Conference has not the right, perhaps even the duty, in the light of those eternal principles of free humanity, free investigation, free education, also to look upon those millions of men of whom I just spoke and to repeat before them the exemplary words of Artigas, which are sculptured in the marble of this Palace: "My authority comes from you and ceases in your sovereign presence".
(37) The delegation of Panama, a small country with big problems, supports the arguments which have led the representatives of Uruguay, Belgium, Denmark, France, Haiti, Switzerland and Yugoslavia to object to the transformation of the Executive

Board into a political body. To these arguments could be added those brought forward in Paris in November 1952. In alluding to them I have no intention of levelling the slightest reproach at the contrast between an opinion freely held at that time and the resolution which is being voted today. Neither the circumstances nor the arguments have changed, but as the representative of a government I know that I myself may be faced with a similar situation. I allude to them in order to say to the other delegations: read these arguments and then you will understand how governments, for reasons which are no doubt legitimate, but of immediate concern, can exert their influence to modify decisions on matters of permanent value. I should further like to reply to a statement which has been made more than once in these debates. It has been maintained that governments are inherently good. Governments may be a necessity, but frequent interventions by governments, constant political interventions in problems of education, science and culture, are as a general rule pernicious. To uphold the contrary view is tantamount to repudiating the best traditions of the universities and cultural centres of Europe and America.

(38) Hitherto governments have exercised, and they still exercise, three distinct forms of legitimate influence upon this Organization. They have exercised it by nominating the delegations to sessions of the General Conference, which in its turn directs the Organization. They have exercised it by restricting the election of members of the Executive Board to members of the delegations appointed by the governments themselves. Finally, they have exercised it by accrediting permanent representatives in Paris. This, apparently, is not enough. It is desired that even the men appointed to execute the decisions shall be subordinate to the demands of the policy of their respective governments. It is desired that every vestige of universality shall disappear, de facto if not de jure. The members of the Executive Board will change in accordance with changes of government. And this is called realism. It has been claimed that the members of the Board already act as government representatives. The delegation of Panama does not believe it. On 18 November 1952, Mr. Verniers, of Belgium, refuted this assertion. He said that for five years he had been a member of the Executive Board, that he had never asked for instructions from Brussels and that his Government had never permitted itself the slightest suggestion, even in cases where opinions and votes were not to its liking. This is the type of international civil servant whom it is our duty to train, to support and to protect, instead of abandoning and destroying him.

(39) The considerations which have led the Panamanian delegation to oppose the amendment to the structure of the Executive Board are based entirely on arguments of principle and arguments of experience, which I will briefly expound. The United Nations, without doubt, constitutes an international court; but this is not, and cannot be, its most important function, however much the great Powers have desired to proclaim it as such. Essentially the United Nations is the great act of faith of the twentieth century. Through its Specialized Agencies it is seeking, in matters of health, labour, food, education, science and culture, to provide a better life for man, who today is threatened, more seriously than by nuclear fission, by those aberrations of thought which, since the middle of the nineteenth century, have regarded him not as an end in himself, but as a means, an instrument or a cog in a wheel of immediate purpose, whether that of a business concern, or of a State and a government. It is urgent to prevent the further spread of this wrong-headedness; it is urgent to strip education of materialism, with its insistence on the useful, the mechanical, the immediate. If materialism continues to flourish, we shall arrive at the negation of all spiritual values; we shall witness the decline of our heritage, both aesthetic and moral, and the breeding of a mentality which is fertile ground for those political extremes repudiated by our civilizations. The intervention of governments in the Executive Board of Unesco seems to the delegation of Panama, on a long-term view, to be a disconcerting step in the wrong direction.

(40) The practical arguments are also numerous. They have already been expounded in masterly fashion by other delegates. I will only add that I have had an opportunity of learning from experience the disadvantages of transforming international civil servants into government representatives. For three years in Geneva I represented the Panamanian Merchant Fleet at the International Labour Organization. The Rules of Procedure of ILO did not require that members of the Governing Body should be representatives of governments, but, when some of them thought and spoke in that capacity, the objectivity of its decisions vanished. In the end I found it quicker and less difficult to refer matters to them through the Chanceries themselves or by some indirect channel. Such are the indecisions, complications, delays and superfluities resulting from the suppression or even the weakening of the function of international civil servants in organizations of this kind.

(41) When large nations try to stop smaller peoples from making tragic mistakes, it is customary for a cry to go up in some quarters about the need for realism. Realism is doubtless a healthy and a balanced attitude of mind, which may well be applied to things and facts; but it is out of place in the moral sphere, in the principles of right and in the demands of the spirit. We, the small nations, shall be realists if we understand that the Great Powers of the twentieth century must necessarily regard problems from angles considerably different from ours, if we acknowledge that they can steer the activities of Unesco at their own free weill, whenever they turn a deaf ear to the voices of distinguished men, both ours and theirs. They have on their side the importance of their financial contributions, their superior initiative, their own material greatness and strength. But the Great Powers will be realists in their turn if, instead of measuring the extent of their own reserves, they pay more attention to gauging the deep distrust felt by many peoples equally deserving respect for certain aspects of materialistic and utilitarian civilization. They will be realists if they understand that the demands of liberty and culture, as every people conceives and defends them, must not be confused with the

condescension of governments. Lastly, they will be realists if they reject or at the very least defer the plan to reduce Unesco to the level of other international institutions of a governmental nature; if they do not permit government authority to eclipse the assertions of culture.
(42) The universities and higher education centres have prospered only where governments have had no peg on which to hang their hats, nor have even left their visiting cards. Let us not forget this when we come to the vote.

(43) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of France.

(44) Mr. BERTHOIN (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the significance of today's debate must appear to me decisive, and the force of my conviction be great indeed, if, at this stage, when the result already seems a foregone conclusion, I mount this rostrum to make known the views of France.
(45) But we should surely be misunderstood if we were silent at a moment when you are about to take a decision on a text which apparently marks a new departure, introducing a far-reaching innovation into one of the basic principles of the Charter that unites us.
(46) There is no need at this juncture to trace the background of the resolutions on which we have to vote, nor to recall in detail the exhaustive discussions that have taken place in our Administrative Commission. I shall do no more than crave your indulgence while I demonstrate, by means of a comparison that I should like to make as clear and concise as possible, the distinction between the present procedure and the one now proposed - a distinction which applies to the letter, if not to the spirit.
(47) What actually happens under the present system? And what may happen if there is disagreement between a member of the Executive Board and the government of his country? Let us assume that a delegate of a particular government - appointed, therefore, by his government - an outstanding personality of high culture and reputation is appointed a member of the Executive Board. From that moment he may be said to be outside the scope of national control. But, be it observed, he is outside it only for a temporary period, at most for four years. If his government ceases to nominate him as a delegate to our Conference, he is then de facto no longer eligible to serve on the Executive Board. Thus national control, national sanctions, can be completely and unreservedly exercised, should the occasion arise. So far, I imagine that everyone present must agree with what I am saying.
(48) But let us get away from our texts, from our legal procedure and interpretation, and let us look at the matter from the moral standpoint. Let us consider the duties of the man on whom his government has conferred the signal honour of nominating him to take his seat among us and who, ipso facto, being already unofficially proposed by his government, receives the additional honour, the major distinction of being called to sit on the Executive Board. It may be that this man finds himself in disagreement, during his term of office, with some new policy started in his own country. Or it may be that, for reasons of his own, he has turned his back on the general policy of his government, not of course - let me make this quite clear - within the normal framework of party politics, which are a credit to genuine democracies, but because he is fundamentally opposed to the régime itself. In that case I say that this man, if he does not want to lose his self-respect and the respect of his fellow men, if he simply wishes to be honest, must resign from the office which, directly or indirectly, he holds under the government of his country.
(49) Indeed, if we did not respect these rules of elementary morality, by what right could we claim to be elevating the conscience of mankind and pointing the way for the peoples of the world? Nevertheless, that would appear to be the danger that Unesco, by the amendment in question, is trying to provide against.
(50) Let us see, then, what will happen if you adopt the new text. What was hitherto done unofficially will henceforth be done in the broad light of day. A government will say: I propose that such and such a delegate shall represent me on the Board, with the approval of the General Conference. But there comes along a new government, which considers that it is not represented by the nominee of its predecessor, and asks him to resign. Suppose the representative refuses: what can the government do? Nothing, except take note of the refusal and wait until his term of office expires, that is to say, exactly what it would be obliged to do under the present system. Of course, there will now be a direct official link where previously there was only a moral link. Are we quite certain that, for us, the moral link would not prove the stronger and that what the authors and supporters of the amendment desire would be any better guarantee? In fact, we are given the first and the middle term of a syllogism, but not the conclusion; and the conclusion, as you all must feel, is the recall from office. Happily, however, it was formally stated in the Commission that recall is impossible. So much for the new security the proposed text offers our governments!
(51) But what a price we are going to pay for this new security! We are going to proclaim to the world, in the most solemn way we can, that we have no confidence in those distinguished men whom our Charter desired to make the permanent Board of our Organization. We are going to proclaim that, by becoming direct representatives of the governments appointing them, and only to a lesser degree the representatives of the others, the members of the Executive Board will no longer be free men. Unesco's policy will be settled outside Unesco by prior consultations, by the inevitable arrangements between governments. Doubtless the framework will be maintained and the façade preserved, but within or behind will be only what political expediency has decided to place there. Admittedly, generosity may still be there, but do we want to set up a form of international paternalism? Is that to be the inspiration of our acts and the guide to our conduct? I am thinking just now of certain small countries, small in territory or strength, but as great as the others in everything else -

countries which I shall have learned to know and to love through coming here. I am thinking of the atmosphere in which we now live, in this beautiful country, where all of us are learning to be citizens of the world. I am thinking of the manifold contacts we make each day. Among us there are, in reality, neither small nor great nations any more, there are only human beings with equal rights; here are neither rich nor poor, but all are rich - inexhaustibly rich - in trust and friendship; here there are neither believers nor infidels, but we are all devotees of a single faith which makes all our hearts beat as one. Even when the language barrier prevents us from exchanging our thoughts, when lips must remain silent, looks can speak, understand one another and bring about the deep communion of souls.

(52) Let us make the most of the time that is left, for the future that awaits us will no longer have the same inspiration nor the same atmosphere. Inevitably, the disappearance of that institutional independence to which members of the Executive Board may today lay claim, if necessary, vis-à-vis their respective governments, and which enables the governments themselves to resist any too pressing interventions that may be directed against them, will imperceptibly, perhaps very rapidly, cause Unesco to become a kind of closed shop in which assorted coalitions of satellites will ultimately be formed and will consequently oppose one another. Between today's and tomorrow's position there will be all the difference, illustrated in such masterly fashion by Bergson, between closed morality and open morality. Intellectual co-operation, the fount of understanding and conciliation, is threatened with penetration and domination by political considerations which it was hitherto our duty to ignore. Tomorrow we shall not even have the right to ignore them.

(53) And all this - I hope that I am wrong, but my fears are grave - all this may come upon us much more quickly than we think. In order to avoid difficulties, governments may feel obliged to send to the General Conference men selected not only for their intellectual distinction but also - let us be frank - for their natural docility. Astuteness and skill may be placed on the same footing as intrinsic worth. Political and financial considerations will soon outweigh the others. The vicious circle of cause and effect will inexorably drag us into a situation which each of us, in the depth of his heart, can only dread.

(54) You all know the traditional attitude of France and no one will be surprised if she asks you to weigh your decision very carefully. That decision will certainly be fraught with many consequences for the future of Unesco. At a time when so much advice has been lavished on my country counselling her to embark upon the path of what is called supra-nationalism - which is still the best path to the future - why, when timid attempts were made to introduce the supra-national idea into our Organization, is it now desired to suppress it?

(55) I need not add that, if the concept of universality were to suffer a setback as a result of your vote, France would in no way change her traditional attitude. She would only feel regret that into this temple of the mind a spirit had entered that seemed to her to run counter to her hopes for the future of the Organization and that here, where all that is best and noblest in the human mind is concentrated together, all that wealth of the spirit may one day be at the mercy of the temporal fluctuations and political contingencies to which our governments are inevitably subjected.

(56) Before I step down from this rostrum, where each of us has an obligation to speak with a freedom we do not always enjoy elsewhere - and we all know to what a great and noble people we owe that freedom - let me tell you about something that happened to me a short while ago.

(57) One evening, I opened at random an old book containing some of the finest pages of ancient story. It was one of those books whose yellowed leaves one turns with mingled humility and respect. My eyes fell upon a passage from a Philippic in which the greatest orator of all time addresses his fellow citizens. As usual, he spoke severely, he warned them against taking the line of least resistance, against losing their self-respect; he reminded them of the general moral principles whose untroubled sway endures throughout the centuries and the abandonment of which was to spell the doom of sacred Attica. And then, as if he felt that to carry his audience with him, he must speak from the very depths of his soul, Demosthenes cried: "Athenians, I should like to please you, but I had rather save you!"

(58) My friends, may that noble sentiment guide the vote we shall shortly take. Heaven send that, in departing from the straight and trustful path, we do not quench the pure flame of freedom and hope that men of goodwill have entrusted to our protection!

(59) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Switzerland.

(60) Mr. de SALIS (Switzerland) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I ask your permission to explain the attitude of the Swiss delegation, which will shortly vote in favour of the status quo, that is to say against the amendment by the United States of America on the reform of the Executive Board.

(61) Our representative in the Administrative Commission has already explained, in the meeting of 16 November, why the Government of my country has instructed us to uphold the present system as regards the election and responsibilities of members of the Executive Board. I can therefore be brief.

(62) You know that our delegation to the General Conference has constantly defended the existing provisions of Unesco's Constitution. We are naturally sorry that a fairly high proportion of delegations from friendly countries do not share our views on this important question. But, after studying their arguments closely, we still do not feel able to change our point of view.

(63) First of all, we would emphasize that no express criticism has been levelled at the Executive Board in its present form. On the contrary, this Conference has paid tribute to its positive achievements. It is asserted, however, that we shall reinforce the authority of the Board and simplify its task if we decide that in future its members shall represent the government of the State of which they

are nationals, whereas hitherto they have been elected in a personal capacity and are responsible only to the General Conference.
(64) Has the Executive Board itself ever made any pronouncement on this question which directly concerns it? If it has, its views are not known to us. Although, in one way, such discretion is understandable, we consider that an essential element is thus lacking, if we are to arrive at a sound judgment of the situation. For we are about to take a vote, and still we do not know what the Executive Board thinks about this revision of the Constitution.
(65) I beg you to believe that the supporters of the status quo are not acting out of sheer obstinacy and have no thought of making an empty gesture when they warn the Conference against a decision which, in our view, violates the independence of the Executive Board. It is certainly not our intention to play the part of prophets of disaster. As good democrats we shall accept the majority decision. We shall join in the future work of the Organization in the same spirit we have always shown.
(66) But Switzerland has always defended the independence of international organizations vis-à-vis their Member States. It considers that the fewer political and governmental influences there are in the field of education, science and culture, the better. Democracy, as we understand it, is moreover closely akin to certain democratic practices in America and the British Commonwealth, in that it believes in the efficacy of the principles of self-government and responsible government, and has confidence in the men who freely assume the responsibilities of public office. If we are not in a position to support the proposed amendment submitted by the American delegation, the reason is that we would have liked to see the practice of responsible government upheld, as well as a certain individual liberty for members of the Executive Board. This seems to us to be a guarantee of the objectivity of the deliberations and decisions expected of the Executive Board.
(67) Furthermore, the more those decisions are characterized by the spirit of independence and by the desire for objectivity, the greater will be the confidence in Unesco displayed by educators, scientists and cultural representatives everywhere in the world, and the easier it will be for us to fulfil our task of spreading the gospel of international understanding and the brotherhood of man.
(68) Mr. President, perhaps the ascendancy of the sovereign State is a sign of the times. We could have desired that Unesco might still be able to sail for some time sheltered from the winds that blow from that direction, so as the better to gain the open sea.
(69) The New York Times, in an article dated from Montevideo, said a few days ago that our Organization "has to face an issue that may seriously change the Organization's character". This appraisal of our present situation seems to us correct. It would indeed appear probable that the decision this Conference is called upon to take by a two-thirds majority may seriously change the character of our Organization. This, then, is the very reason why the Swiss delegation has been anxious to explain its vote, in the course of a debate the freedom and frankness of which are infinitely valuable.
(70) Our country will remain faithful to the idea of Unesco and to Unesco itself. Even though its structure be modified, Unesco can count upon us as a faithful partner. So far as in us lies, we intend to co-operate fully in the work undertaken towards achieving the aims of this world organization.

(71) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Haiti.

(72) Mr. LALEAU (Haiti) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be brief. I wish merely to indicate the position of the Haitian delegation in regard to the United States proposal, as I have already done, by an unequivocal vote, in the Administrative Commission. We are resolutely against the amendment. We are convinced that this proposal, which turns members of the Executive Board, from being delegates of Unesco, into direct representatives of their governments, jeopardizes the independence of the Board and weakens the very foundations of the Organization.
(73) Unesco is an association, not of governments, but of the peoples of the world, developing under the aegis of education, science and culture, all of which transcend the boundaries of States. In this it is akin to the United Nations, from which it sprang; and the United Nations did not hesitate - and this was an innovation in international relations - to proclaim clearly in the first words of the San Francisco Charter that it constitutes, and intends to remain, a bond and a pact between men of goodwill in all the countries of the world, and not only between their leaders. "We the peoples of the United Nations", it is written.
(74) The fact is that governments succeed one another and are not always alike. It would not be at all surprising if the man who today represents one of them on the Board were tomorrow to see its successor withdraw from him that confidence which is essential to the loyal exercise of his functions. This would naturally lead to a conflict between that government and Unesco, which would be harmful not only to the prestige so vital to our Organization, but also to the faith which it must inspire in all who have enthusiastically adhered to it.
(75) I do not like being a prophet either, especially a prophet of disaster. My name is not Cassandra. But if my fears of today were to become tomorrow's reality, we should certainly not be glad at it. Sometimes it is very painful to be right. But perhaps we, the delegation of Haiti, would then be able to cry: "We are innocent of the blood of this just man ...".
(76) It costs us something, however, to oppose the resolution proposed by the United States delegation. In tragic circumstances, not more than a few weeks ago, the American Government and people flew to our aid with a spontaneity and generosity which stamped them as brothers rather than as mere good neighbours. But gratitude springs from the soul and does not mean subjugation of thought. We found it hard to restrain our feelings, but we managed to do so, and it is the promptings of our conscience that cause us to maintain in this plenary meeting the attitude we adopted in the Administrative Commission.
(77) Remember that what you are staking with

such apparent nonchalance is the very future of Unesco.

(78) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Italy.

(79) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI (Italy) (Translation from the French): I asked to speak only in order to explain my vote, since I do not want to prolong this discussion by repeating the arguments already put forward by the Italian delegation in support of the proposed amendment to the composition of the Executive Board.
(80) I am anxious, however, to throw a little more light on our attitude, since we have been told by certain friendly delegations that we are upholding State control against liberty of culture.
(81) Let it be clearly understood that we have in no way changed our point of view. We have been, we are today, and we shall be tomorrow in favour of free cultural expression. We are not making a choice today between individuals and the State. As things are now, if the General Conference wanted a certain eminent person in the sphere of science or culture, who was doing useful work for peace and human rights - in short, for the aims of Unesco - to become a member of the Executive Board, it could not do so unless that person had already been selected as a candidate by his government and unless he belonged to the delegation of some Member State.
(82) If this is to be regarded as a fault, it is to be ascribed to the original Constitution and not to this amendment. Nor shall we be called upon to vote in any sense for the Member States; it is not they who will be the direct holders of the offices concerned, in spite of what has been published in certain newspapers.
(83) As in the past, the General Conference must endeavour, to the best of its knowledge, to see that the Executive Board is composed of persons in the educational, scientific and cultural world who fittingly represent the various disciplines and cultures. It has been truly and accurately said that the beginning and end of the mandate held by members of the Executive Board remain unchanged.
(84) The change that we are supporting is above all intended to have an effect during the operation of that mandate, by strengthening the position of the Board in the exercise of its functions, which will be the same as before, and it will thus give the Director-General, in regard to the preparation and execution of the programme, some indications which may provide him with the firmer basis for which he has so often expressed a desire.
(85) In short, we are not trying to enable governments to give instructions beyond what they are, in fact, able to give today; our main interest - on the lines of the principle of government representation and its still more strongly implied commitment for Member States - is to co-operate in the work of Unesco.
(86) We even think that the members of the Executive Board cannot fail, in their new status, to have an increased influence on their governments.
(87) There is one further point I should like to emphasize: it is not because we have no confidence in the Executive Board or in the work it has accomplished that we have adopted our present attitude; far from it. We should certainly not wish to increase its influence, as we are doing, if that were the case, since we are persuaded that the amendment will not mean any change in the quality of the persons elected to the Board.
(88) Indeed, it is for these very reasons and as a tribute to the qualities of the retiring members of the Board, that we voted for the amendment submitted by Japan, to retain on the Board the ten members whose term does not expire until the next session.
(89) Since this motion did not obtain the required majority, we have supported in its turn the proposal put forward today, transitional provisions being necessary in any event. In any case, I should like to take this opportunity of renewing the expression of our gratitude to the retiring Board.
(90) We do not think the proposed amendment will bring about governmental control of Unesco to any greater degree than at present, because Unesco is in any event an organization of States; especially since, as I already said in the general debate, Italy desires to see a more lively co-operation between the free forces of culture, and this can be achieved in still larger measure if there is closer and more active co-operation between National Commissions. Those are the reasons why the Italian delegation will vote in favour of the amendment tabled by the Administrative Commission.

(91) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the German Federal Republic.

(92) Mr. LOEFFLER (German Federal Republic) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the German delegation I should like to explain why we shall vote for the amendment. I will admit that no decision has caused us so much heart-burning as this. It involves a number of vitally important questions. Under the present system, paragraph 12 of Article V of the Unesco Constitution provides that the members of the Executive Board shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the General Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole and not as representatives of their respective governments. Clearly the idea is to make them representatives of Unesco as such, that is to say, to provide a strong expression of the special juridical and sociological character of this world organization. Some have regarded this as an expression of the autonomy of the cultural life of the world united in Unesco; the recognition, in fact, of the principle that culture is not an instrument of political power or of the State, but that it must be free from all political and governmental commitments. It is, however, understood that this principle, which colours the entire philosophy of Unesco, is in no way modified by the amendment in question. The special experience we possess of the relations between culture and the State enables us to make that point.
(93) Secondly, we would insist that the amendment must not lead to any change in the qualifications demanded of persons nominated for the Executive Board. There must be no substitution of mere

government officials for personalities holding leading positions in the cultural life of their countries and of the world. The fact that also, according to the amendment, the election of members is to be the province of the General Conference, should be a guarantee of that.
(94) Consequently, the amendment, in our view, simply means making the governments jointly responsible with their nationals who, on their proposal, have been elected to the Executive Board. If the amendment is adopted, the Board will continue to be subordinate to the General Conference, and, in particular, when there is a conflict between an instruction given by the Conference and instruction received from a government, the former will have priority.
(95) To sum up, the amendment is simply the organizational expression of the fact that Unesco is an association of States, and that those States, by adhering to Unesco, have accepted the obligation to safeguard and protect the freedom of cultural life.

(96) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Denmark.

(97) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark): Mr. President, fellow delegates; as I mount this rostrum, I realize that the vote we are about to take on this issue is probably decided beforehand, since most of the delegations will vote according to instructions from their government. To that extent all interventions in this debate may be in vain. However, as the proposal makes a radical change in the spirit of our Constitution, it is perhaps not quite useless that the views of those who do not agree with the United States proposals on this important issue shall be put before the meeting.
(98) In that respect, I fear that future meetings of the Executive Board, if this proposal is adopted, will be somewhat similar to the debate in which we are involved this afternoon. On important questions the members of the Board will arrive with definite briefings from their governments, and words spoken in the debate will be spoken in vain. It will only be on minor issues that members of the Board will be able to bring their own judgment to bear. The Board will - more or less - become an instrument of Foreign Ministries. This was certainly not the intention of the founders of Unesco. When we met in London in 1945, it was the expressed intention of the Conference - and it was specifically supported by the delegation of that country which now moves the change - that we should, as far as possible, keep Unesco outside day-to-day politics, and should entrust the conduct of affairs between Conferences to independent representatives of the cultures of the different areas of the world, who would at the same time represent the main fields of the mind which are Unesco's domain.
(99) What then has brought about the change of views? In the discussion which has been going on these days I have never heard any criticism levelled at the work done by the Board in these eight or nine years, a point which was stressed just now by the delegate of Switzerland. In all these years I have followed the work of the Board closely, although it is only in the last two years that I have gained inside experience as a member of the Board. With this experience I venture to say that some of the documents placed before this Conference by the Board, and to which some of the speakers have paid tribute, bear witness to the fact that the Board has not only dealt with current administrative detail, but has tried - without governmental instructions and without preconceived ideas - to do some amount of thinking on the fundamental problems of Unesco. It is my conviction that these discussions would hardly have been possible in this harmonious and open-minded way, if the members of the Board had had to check whether their views were agreeable to their governments.
(100) I feel convinced that the constituent Conference of 1945 wanted the Board to watch conscientiously over the vital interests of Unesco by not making it a governmental agency.
(101) I know full well that the proposal has changed at different stages. Its effects have to some degree been mitigated by providing that members are to be chosen from among delegates to the General Conference, a provision to which the honourable delegate of Italy has just referred. It may well be that this mitigation of the original proposal was decisive in changing the minds of delegations, but it should not conceal the spirit behind it.
(102) The authors of the proposal have pointed to the kind of persons that will be chosen as members even under the new regulations and, unless future experience shows the contrary, I anticipate, and I am glad to say so here, that the Conference will carry out that provision in the spirit in which it is intended. But I also realize that the double rôle which members are supposed to play as government representatives and at the same time spokesmen of the General Conference may lead to difficulties and conflict.
(103) The honourable delegate of Germany said a moment ago that, if there were a conflict between the intentions of the Conference and the intentions of the government of the State from which the member of the Board came, then the intention of the General Conference would prevail. I hope he is right, but I do not find at any point in the proposal put before us any guarantee of that. The proposal before us simply states that the member is the representative of his government and has at the same time to act on behalf of the Conference as a whole.
(104) Let me only mention one point in this respect. We prescribe regulations about how to proceed if a member of the Board dies or resigns. We are not told what will happen if a government which has a member on the Board should resign. I shall not embark on that; I put the question to you, ladies and gentlemen.
(105) In spite of all human shortcomings I still feel that Unesco would be best served by a team of 22 people who would act according to their own conscience and to the best of their judgment, bearing in mind at all times the interests of Unesco as a whole.

(106) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the United States of America.

(107) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: There is one point I should like to make clear first of all. The proposals now before this plenary meeting are not the proposals of the United States of America. They were originally the proposals of the delegations of four countries, the United Kingdom, Brazil, Australia and the United States of America. They have since become the proposals of the Administrative Commission of our Conference. They have become the proposals of 45 delegations which voted for this change this very morning.

(108) We are the first to recognize that the decision before us is a very important one. It deserves our most careful consideration, and I submit that the Administrative Commission gave these proposals the most careful consideration extending over a long series of meetings. We were not stampeded by bursts of oratory into the report which is now before us. No one was dragged into a decision against his better judgment by outside pressures on the part of any big States. I wish, at least in this our Organization, in Unesco, that we could get away from this notion of big and small. In the area of culture that difference, as we see it, does not exist. The size of a country, or its military or economic power, is no indication of its cultural achievements. It is those who talk about the big and the small who attempt to bring political considerations into our midst. My delegation as a delegation objects to that notion, in Unesco above all. No, there was no oratory there was no dragging in of anyone. What the Administrative Commission did was to consider most carefully what was best for our Organization - what was best for the future of Unesco - what was best for the advance of education, science and culture in the world.

(109) We started with a discussion of the reasons in favour of a change in the present arrangements. It was realized that the Executive Board is the very heart of Unesco. It is the one representative body that meets frequently; it is the only representative body that meets more than every second year. We recognized also that this Board has extremely heavy responsibilities in the administrative field, in the financial field and in the development of rules and regulations,without which no organization can function. All these are matters of primary interest to governments. We further recognized that this Board is frequently confronted with major political issues. It is the Board which recommends, for instance, to this General Conference which countries are eligible for membership. And, most important of all, we recognized that it is the responsibility of the Board in co-operation with the Director-General to carry out the programme which we meet every two years to define.

(110) Thus the Executive Board is at the very heart of our Organization. The fact that we now meet only every second year makes the Board all the more important. And we realized that no body composed of 20 or 22 or even 30 individuals could carry these heavy responsibilities without help - the help of experts, financial experts, programme experts and others. As long as the Board is composed of individuals serving in their own capacity, these expert services which governments can provide are not available to us.

(111) We recognized also that, if this change were made, if this Board should in future be composed of government representatives, it would gain in stability, the whole Organization would gain in stability. There would be more continuity in our work.

(112) Even at this Conference we have been struck by the fact that a good many decisions and recommendations of the Board did not find favour with this Conference. This is no criticism of the Board. What is important is that the Board, composed as it is at the present time, in no way commits governments, that there is very often a hiatus between the Board and this Conference, which is composed of governments; for after all we are an intergovernmental organization.

(113) That brings me to the last point, which I believe weighed very heavily with many of those who finally voted for this change in the Administrative Commission. If this change is made as we see it, it will increase the confidence of governments in the Organization. Or to put it differently, more constructively, it will increase the sense of responsibility of governments for this Organization. Let us be quite frank. At the present time, Unesco in many countries is a stepchild of their governments, they do not feel responsible for it. When it comes to the Food and Agriculture Organization or the International Labour Organization, or others, there is a keener sense of responsibility than governments show with regard to Unesco. We believe that, if the change is made as here suggested, that situation will change, that we shall get more enlightened support for the important work which Unesco is doing.

(114) At the same time, we are, of course, not unsympathetic to the apprehensions of those who feel that Unesco might become an intergovernmental organization where the dead hand of bureaucracy kills all creative impulses, kills the life of the spirit. It is for this very reason and in order to allay these fears that it is proposed to preserve paragraph 2 of Article V. I want to make it quite clear that that paragraph will remain in our Constitution. It means that the General Conference will continue to be bound by the Constitution to endeavour to include persons competent in the arts, the humanities, the sciences, education and the diffusion of ideas. We do not want just government officials to run this Board. We want to be quite sure that the men and women who serve on the Board, from here on, will continue to be outstanding men in their respective fields. And the Conference itself has it in its hands to guard over that, because it is not States that will be elected. The Conference will continue to elect individuals, and the Conference will be free to reject the candidate of any government who does not measure up to the high criteria which are set for membership of the Board. Finally, the amendment, as now proposed, also provides that the members of the Executive Board, while being representative of their respective governments, shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the General Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole. They are responsible, not only to their respective governments, they are responsible to this Conference. They are entrusted

with carrying out the policies as set by the Conference every two years. It does seem to us that these are important safeguards and ought to allay the fears of those who still continue to be opposed to the change that is now before this Conference.

(115) A few words in conclusion. The one thing that struck my delegation, and I am sure it must have struck other delegations, is the implication that was quite clear in a good many of the speeches to which we have listened this afternoon; and that is that government in itself is evil, that government is hostile to the arts, hostile to education, opposed to the sciences and destructive of the spirit. Where, may I ask, would education be, where would science be, where would culture be today without governments? Should we have free and compulsory education in most parts of the world? Would it be possible, as it is in more and more countries, for a boy or girl to begin his education at the age of three or four in kindergarten and go through the whole educational system free up to the university, without governments? Of course not. And I am not talking of the developed countries alone. I have had the privilege to visit a great many of the so-called underdeveloped countries. I have seen the magnificent efforts which are being made there to build schools, to develop laboratories, to facilitate culture in every way, to give the people libraries, and it is being done in nine cases out of ten by governments. No, we cannot take the view that government is evil, that government is destructive of everything that we cherish.

(116) Several speeches this afternoon expressed the surprising notion that government and freedom are incompatible. To us who come from the democratic countries that notion is just incomprehensible. We just do not understand what is meant by it, for democratic government, as we understand it, has the supreme task of safeguarding the freedom of the individual, of making it possible for the individual to grow to his full stature. Naturally, government is not only responsible for scientists and educators and other cultural leaders, governments represent all the people; but then Unesco is an organization of all the people. Unless we are able to help meet the educational and cultural aspirations of everyone in our various countries, high or low, educated or uneducated, we shall fail in our task. In order to succeed, we need more, much more, support from governments than we have had in the past. We believe that such support will be forthcoming if the amendment before us is carried, and it is in that hope we trust that the amendment will meet with the favour of this Conference. In this way we shall really be better able to respond to the hopes of all the people who aspire to freedom, to educational and cultural achievement, who aspire to peace.

(117) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Lebanon.

(118) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) (Translation from the French): The attitude of the Lebanese delegation to the amendments of the Unesco Constitution has not changed since the last session of the General Conference. During the discussion in the Administrative Commission, the Lebanese delegation, by putting repeated questions to the Chairman of the Commission and the representative of the Director-General, tried to obtain some clarification of obscure points in the amendment proposed by the United States of America.

(119) We find that in the document submitted to us by the Legal Committee today, the same obscurities persist. They are to be found in the following paragraph: "The Committee noted that none of the draft provisions submitted to it was at variance or in conflict with the Constitution or the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference".

(120) Twice we put this question to the Legal Committee and the Administrative Commission. The members of the Executive Board, it is said, shall represent the General Conference, but shall exercise their functions on instructions given by their governments. Twice, therefore, we asked the question: how can the exercise of an essentially international function be reconciled with submission to instructions given by particular governments?

(121) As you know, the Organization, during the interval between sessions, is governed by its two organs, the Secretariat and the Executive Board. You recognize the immunity of the Secretariat, because it is exercising an international function, and its staff members are independent of their governments.

(122) But does the second organ, the Executive Board, which is entrusted with supervising the work of the Secretariat and of ensuring the operation of the Organization during the interval between sessions, also exercise an international function? If so, how can the exercise of that function be reconciled with stipulations and instructions given by particular governments? Again, at the bottom of the page, paragraph 4, we read: "In the event of the death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board, his replacement for the remainder of his term shall be appointed by the Executive Board on the nomination of the government of the State the former member represented". If the government of which the former member was a representative is already out of office, what happens? If the government has changed, whom will the new member of the Executive Board represent?

(123) Thus, there are obscurities in the text submitted to us by the Legal Committee and ambiguities in the report of the Administrative Commission. That is why the Lebanese delegation abstained from voting in the Commission. Today we have our backs to the wall. We are now dealing with a final text. The obscurities and ambiguities remain, and the Lebanese delegation must therefore vote against this text.

(124) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Uruguay.

(125) Dr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, Uruguay has explained why it must oppose the amendment originally tabled by the United States of America and since supported by Australia, the United Kingdom and Brazil. I am a believer in persuasion and not in mere repetition. I shall not repeat the speech I made in the Administrative Commission, but should like to summarize

the grounds on which our attitude is based.
(126) Let me say in all sincerity that we have the greatest respect for the nation that has proposed this reform and for the delegations, or perhaps I should rather say many of the delegations, that support it, representing, as they do, peoples admired by Uruguay for their legitimate historical pre-eminence, for their defence of human freedom against totalitarianism, and for their contribution to civilization and culture. To all these countries Uruguay owes a debt of gratitude and special solidarity, because they are honourably fulfilling the aims of Unesco.
(127) Our attitude is the result of mature reflection, of the certainty in our minds that the proposed amendment is a mistake which may have fateful consequences. We fully understand the contrary viewpoint; our action does not spring from the vanity of mentors, nor is our position childishly censorious. It would be a grave injustice to claim that the supporters of the reform are trying to debase Unesco's aims. But, though we are sure that it is not so, we cannot rid our minds of the certainty that the amendment is a mistake.
(128) We know the reasons for it; we have heard the arguments in favour of the reform: we are all aware it may be said that the governments intervene in Unesco because they nominate the delegates, because they consult with their permanent representatives, because it is the General Conference, with its government delegations, which draws up the programme and fixes the budget. Moreover, we all know what is meant by political authority, which does what it can and must, and at times exerts its influence to do certain things not in conformity with normal juridical precepts.
(129) Faced with this fact, you will say to us: if governments are already exerting their influence in this way, why do you not agree to this amendment, which merely regularizes an existing situation, makes us recognize things as they are and puts an end to a comedy that talks about stimulating the social factors affecting education and culture, whereas we all know that Unesco is pervaded by governmental action.
(130) Such unwillingness to think the matter out, when faced with definite facts, is not realistic and will not bear good fruit in influencing the behaviour of mankind. Laws are not made by giving way to human conduct; laws are not a chronicle, they are a plan inspired by ideals, encouraging men to do their duty, but not forcing them to behave in accordance with the general line of conduct. In Unesco those defects are predominant, and our duty should be to eliminate them. But in my opinion they will not be eliminated, they will become more pronounced, by increasing governmental action. Our aim should be to effect a reform which opens wide the doors of Unesco to education, science and culture, the offspring of social spontaneity, so that Unesco may forge an international public opinion capable of overcoming all political excesses.
(131) If we need a conference of governments, we already have the United Nations, and experience teaches us that infallibility is not always the guiding light of government delegates, nor are governments themselves always a guarantee of efficiency.
(132) We want this Organization to use education, science and culture as watchwords for the world, so that all peoples may be governed democratically, so that there may be universal protection of human rights and national self-determination, transfused with strong and virile sentiments and enlightened thought. Thus tyrannies may cease, surviving only as a terrible memory of a tragic period.
(133) Unesco can accomplish this aim because it is a body where the free thought of all peoples can meet. I do not think this aim can be achieved by increasing the influence of governmental delegates. I know that Unesco is not a totalitarian court of law, but neither can it be a hospitable home for the accomplices of totalitarianism.
(134) Government delegates, in their new status of semi-ambassadors, will dissipate their energies and efforts in the suavities demanded by protocol and in a mutual exchange of compliments. But there is a reverse side to the picture: the peoples will still be subjected to political terror, and they will look at us amazed, in a kind of stupor, when we offer them, as a sort of intellectual entertainment, these academic theses promising a better world, whilst they on their side are divided and follow temporary occupations in the armed camps imposed upon them by a world that is always on the verge of the tragedy of war in the atmosphere of cold fear so well described by the delegate of India. But our hopes go much further. The United States delegate said it is not true that authority is always a terrible instrument; he added that in the democracies there is identity, or perhaps it would be better to say close relationship, between people, nation and system of government. But the democracies have learned their creed by distinguishing between man, society and the instruments of authority. And we, under a democratic State, living fully as democrats, desire to see self-governing schools, self-governing universities, independent of the political power. Our eminent thinker, that great teacher Vaz Ferreira, once said: "A university under political direction is such a disgrace that I would prefer to have no university at all".
(135) That is the spirit we want to see in Unesco. It does not matter to us that the governments appoint delegates and maintain permanent representatives. Our desire is to see a proper relationship established between education, science and culture, as the free expression of thought, untrammelled by any governmental pressure. In this spirit, and with no wish to anger anyone, we have come here to Unesco and defended the attitude of Uruguay.
(136) We want to see peace between the peoples. I share the hope of those who believe it to be a good augury that here, in the Commissions and sessions of the General Conference of Unesco, we are united in what I shall call brotherly conclave; we support the view that man, the people as a collection of individual human beings, affirm by their political organization a constant urge to evolve and to abide by certain principles, and that the authorities cannot be the exclusive centre of invention and the creative impulse.
(137) We meet in brotherly conclave with those who contend that an essential condition for

establishing justice among men is the dictatorship of class or party, and who affirm that the State is the sole fount of social life, saying that education, science and culture must never be divorced from authority as the generator of minds, as the means of imposing a political creed.

(138) I accept the idea of a conclave and I believe that it may be very useful; but we shall the better exchange impressions, discuss and examine our conduct and indulge in mutual criticism - which is very salutary - if here in Unesco we do not act so much as governmental delegates, if we do not balk Unesco's work by the vain compliments of protocol - and if we all remember what we ourselves have learned since the colonial days under Spanish rule - the wise maxim: the State is as much bound by the law as any individual.

(139) Let us strive for world peace without forgetting the edict of Unesco that it is a duty for all States to join the Organization. Unesco does not affirm the principle of autocracy: it states that the peoples must strive to assert the principle of democracy. Unesco does not say that the ideas of the government must be imposed upon the people by force; but it does say that Unesco, by means of education, will enhance the dignity of man and will watch over the liberty of the peoples.

(140) What we desire is the union of the world on the basis of this creed. There we have the foundations of a coherent ideological bloc. It is not by opposing one dictatorship to other dictatorships that we shall, by some miracle, bring into being a democracy which is the protector of human dignity.

(141) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Colombia.

(142) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it was not my intention to intervene in this debate. I had already put forward a few brief considerations in the Administrative Commission, which studied this problem exhaustively. But in fact, the procession of eloquent speakers, the emphasis, the oratory that has flowed from this rostrum gave me a feeling that if some of us, after careful reflection and considerable mental effort, had agreed that the formula suggested was a prudent and sensible one, we may perhaps have made an irreparable mistake.

(143) But I must frankly confess that the whole course of the debate, the arguments put forward by men of such eminence, by first-class minds, by distinguished professors, like the speaker who has just resumed his seat, and by members of parliament and other public figures, have simply brought us back, after all this deliberation, to my starting point. What are you after? What does the formula approved by the great majority - two-thirds - of the Administrative Commission really set out to do? Is it to strike a final blow at this Organization we have all loved from its foundation? Is it to direct it along tortuous paths which will finally land it in the slough of despond? I do not believe it.

(144) This formula springs from a lively concern for the very future of Unesco. It originated with nations who have been fighting for the concepts so often mentioned in the course of this debate: freedom and democracy. How could it possibly be imagined that distinguished peoples who gave their high patronage to this Organization in its early days, should be waiting around the corner to deal it a treacherous blow? The idea is preposterous. What, then, is the amendment aiming at? At something very natural, logical and rational: it is aiming at co-operation and harmony; it does not want Unesco to be a loose unilateral organization following a chance road in search of its own destiny, without the support of those who could support it, and detached from those institutions called governments. What hard things have been said about governments! Why, this afternoon, has authority been arraigned at the bar of this Organization? Is not government, is not authority the climax of a long series of historical endeavours to prevent the peoples from being plunged into disorder and anarchy? Does not government precisely represent the culmination of that prolonged effort to construct the modern legal order?

(145) How can we talk of strengthening Unesco if we do not seek a method of co-operation between State authority and the free action of the peoples? That, and nothing else, is the purpose of the amendment.

(146) Perhaps some of you have been imagining that Unesco would one day be converted into a sort of international Ministry of Education to replace and supersede the work of governments and education authorities. The representative of the United States of America brought out this point very astutely when he asked where an organization would be in that event. He is right, and any motion to the following effect will be supported by my delegation: that in this Organization the highest values of the spirit must be congregated; that the representatives of free and autonomous cultural organizations from all over the world must assemble here; that for this reason we have other institutions within the Organization, such as the international non-governmental organizations with consultative status, which constitute a legion within the Unesco camp.

(147) But why, at the same time as we increase the action of those special autonomous organizations along these universal lines, do we not also try to strike a balance as regards the support of governments?

(148) Those of us who have followed the activities and efforts of Unesco have noticed how in recent years - and we have a most up-to-date example of this - it would be fatal to the aims of the Organization if there were a complete separation between government support and the aims of Unesco.

(149) But does the representation of governments run counter to the free democratic character of the Organization? Are not governments the authentic representatives of the will of their peoples - at any rate in most cases and in the majority of the delegations here present?

(150) It has also been argued that the new system may lower the intellectual level of the Executive Board. I would ask you this: if at this moment, or tomorrow, by approving this amendment, we proceed to elect the Executive Board, who are the

candidates going to be? They will be chosen from among yourselves. You are the leaders of world culture; you represent, or at least we must presume that you represent, the cultural currents of your respective peoples.
(151) The Board, then, will be elected from the delegates to this Conference; and this process is to be continued in the future. Why, then, should the Executive Board lose in intellectual quality? I cannot understand the reasoning of some of the delegates who have spoken from this rostrum, such as my distinguished friend Mgr Maroun, who said that the Executive Board will have an international function that cannot be exercised by members representing governments. Such an argument would also apply to the other international bodies composed of representatives of governments. Does the fact that a body is composed of government spokesmen mean that it cannot possibly exercise an international function? I, for one, do not believe it.
(152) The course of this debate has actually given greater peace of mind to those of us who support the motion. We have defended it entirely of our own free will, because, just as we support this amendment now under discussion, on which we are going to vote this afternoon, so also, as far as my delegation is concerned, we have been and perhaps still are in disagreement on many other points with the originators of this motion. With the same freedom and independence that we say no to proposals of similar origin but different content, we shall vote for the present amendment.
(153) I believe that in so doing we can set our minds at rest. This is a compromise between autonomy, which is the special strength of associations functioning in any country, and the necessary support of governments. It is a harmonious and balanced solution, and it alone will guarantee the future progress of the Organization.

(154) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Belgium.

(155) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, William the Silent, at a critical period of his life, said that it was not necessary to hope in order to act, nor to succeed in order to persevere. The advocates of the status quo in the organization of the Executive Board have not so far succeeded, but they are persevering and they keep on hoping.
(156) I wish merely to explain why Belgium intends to vote for the status quo, in the hope that our conviction will sweep the remaining waverers into our camp. I shall not therefore repeat the arguments already put forward at some length by the Belgian delegate in the Administrative Commission.
(157) The Belgian Government considers that it is of prime importance for international understanding and the consolidation of peace that Unesco should preserve much greater independence vis-à-vis the Member States than does any other international organization. The tributes paid to Mr. Verniers, who was for a long time a member of the Executive Board, enable me to say that Belgium has special experience of the Board and that her traditional freedom of thought gives her a very special reason for intervening in this debate.
(158) We believe that if a better world is to be built it is of tremendous importance that there should be constant and trustful co-operation between governments and the men who devote their lives to science, education and culture.
(159) Doubtless, as has been said here, the support of governments is indispensable in all three fields. No one dreams of disputing this, but we live in a time when, all over the world, free men are striving, often at the risk of their lives, to defend the independence of those moral forces which are the true greatness of nations, against the efforts of many governments to enslave the mind. These men are trying to induce the peoples to clasp hands across the frontiers, despite the political differences which divide their governments. At such a time it would be paradoxical if, at the instance of those Member States which most loudly proclaim their devotion to liberty, we were to amend our Charter in a direction which, whatever one may say, threatens to turn the Executive Board into a battlefield where national doctrines will confront one another, instead of making it a sanctuary where, sheltered from political passion and pressure, scientists, educators and artists from all over the world can collaborate. Not only would such a decision considerably strengthen the number of sceptics and the arguments of our detractors, but it might also destroy the faith and enthusiasm of Unesco's most ardent defenders. In the hope of improving our material organization we are in danger of stifling the very spirit which Unesco is intended to defend.

(160) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Yugoslavia.

(161) Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I only wish in a few words to explain the vote of the Yugoslav delegation, for our delegate has already explained our viewpoint in the Administrative Commission.
(162) We agree with those delegations which consider that it is not necessary to revise the Constitution. We are led to take this view for the same reasons as the other delegations who have expressed themselves against the amendment and we have no desire to repeat the same arguments.
(163) I should simply like to add two things. The delegation of Yugoslavia has special reasons for voting against, because in my country a constitutional reform is in progress, as a result of which the State will have an ever decreasing influence on certain aspects of life and work. In this respect a beginning has been made with culture, science and education.
(164) In these fields a wide degree of decentralization is being effected, and we have at present no central body in the Federation, no central ministry for problems of education, science and culture. Educational, scientific and cultural work has become completely self-governing, and there are special organizations, associations and other bodies which enjoy complete independence, being governed and

administered by themselves without any State intervention.
(165) Moreover, two currents are to be observed in the present-day life of States: one favours the development of State power in political, cultural and economic life; the other encourages the participation of the citizens, that is to say of society, in political, cultural and economic life. The Yugoslav delegation considers that Unesco should support the latter current.
(166) For these reasons the Yugoslav delegation will vote against the alteration of the Constitution, but it will also respect the vote of the majority of the General Conference, and in the future, as in the past, will give full support to Unesco to assist it in carrying out its obligations.

(167) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Japan.

(168) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, since the sixth session of the General Conference the Japanese delegation has always supported the idea of altering the composition of the Executive Board, or rather of altering the status of its members. It did not take this view because it thought the Executive Board ineffective or of inadequate composition, but because it believed that more responsible decisions, in greater conformity with the wishes of Member States and of the General Conference, could be taken by the Executive Board if its members could request instructions from their governments on certain matters.
(169) My Government not only supported the original proposal of the Governments of Brazil, Australia, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, but also, in the desire to arrive at as perfect an arrangement as possible, submitted, in accordance with the terms of the Constitution, a motion to modify the original amendment on two points.
(170) The first point made in our proposal was to increase the number of members of the Executive Board from 20 to 22. This, to our great satisfaction, was accepted by the Administrative Commission, and it is now embodied in the text before you.
(171) By adopting the proposed amendment we shall have a Board of 22 members. This increase in the size of the Board is justified by the increase in the total number of Member States. During the discussion in the Administrative Commission opinions were expressed in favour of raising the figure to 24. That, however, was impossible because no formal motion had been tabled in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution and Rules of Procedure. It will be for the next session of the General Conference to consider whether the number of members could be further increased. But I am happy to note that at least our proposal for 22 members has been included in the present amendment.
(172) The second part of our proposal dealt with the transitional provisions, which would allow the present members of the Executive Board whose term has not yet expired to retain their seats in certain conditions, in the new capacity of government representatives, thus preserving continuity in the Board. In the Administrative Commission this motion, although it received the assent of a fairly large majority, was nevertheless not adopted because it was not approved by a two-thirds majority. In this connexion I feel bound to cast certain doubts on the procedure adopted by the Commission. I consider that, to enable the Commission to work out a better text, the choice between two texts should be voted by simple majority, the two-thirds majority rule being applied only when the text as a whole is under consideration. I say this because I feel that the procedure is worthy of more detailed study for future cases when constitutional amendments are presented.
(173) I am sorry that the second part of our proposal was not accepted by the Administrative Commission, but the Japanese delegation has no intention of reverting to this question at a plenary meeting and will vote for the text as it stands. Moreover, the object of the Japanese proposal on the transitional provisions will partly be met through the interpretation given to paragraph 3 of Article V. As the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission has mentioned, I hope that the interpretation of this doubtful point will be considered first by the Legal Committee and then by the Administrative Commission, and possibly by the General Conference before the close of the present session.

(174) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Laos.

(175) Princess SOUVANNA PHOUMA (Laos): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that many of the delegations must share the distress I feel myself. Now that we are about to decide between two different schools of thought, we cannot but regret that the large countries so categorically ranged in opposite camps have not been able, during the period of over two years since this question was first broached, to find some common ground in order to avoid the split with which we are faced today.
(176) Many small nations like the one I have the honour to represent are faced with a trial of conscience and are, I venture to say, hesitating about the decision they are asked to take. They are well aware of the risk they may run when the members of the Executive Board no longer represent all the nations, but primarily, and in the end exclusively, the countries of which they are the direct representatives.
(177) A great scholar from a small country has very little chance of ever being a member of the Executive Board in its new form, which in practice gives the Board a political complexion, whereas under the procedure still in force he may be chosen simply on account of his personal distinction.
(178) We would ask the large countries to spare us the necessity of making a choice, to give some thought to the way this painful problem affects us, to take fresh counsel together and - since there is really no desperate urgency - to agree, as a magnanimous gesture, to defer the decision to the General Conference two years hence. We would ask them to submit to that Conference a text which would be likely to receive a unanimous vote - for such, surely, is their real duty - and you may perhaps feel that a very small nation, whose soul is as great as that of the others, might fittingly submit such a proposal to the Conference.

(179) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Switzerland, on a point of order.

(180) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) (Translation from the French): On behalf of the Swiss delegation I have the honour to second the motion submitted by the representative of Laos.

(181) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the motion submitted by the delegate of Laos, seconded by the delegate of Switzerland, has priority. Two speakers are permitted, one for and the other against the motion. I call upon the delegate of the United States of America to speak on the motion.

(182) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America): My delegation is opposed to this motion of adjournment. We have every sympathy with the difficulties, not only of small, but of big countries. We also have our scruples of conscience, but we thought them out, over the last four years, for this motion for a change in the structure of the Executive Board was first put forward in 1951. We have discussed it already at two General Conferences and it took up a great deal of time at both. We believe that every argument for or against has been brought forward and we have listened carefully both to the pros and to the cons. We know what the elements in the situation are and we feel that the time of choice, the time of decision, has come. It will not serve the interests of this great Organization if in Conference after Conference we come back to the same issues. The time to decide is now, and for this reason we are opposed, and strongly opposed, to the motion by the distinguished representative of Laos.

(183) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of Belgium.

(184) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): Mr. President and fellow delegates, you are aware of the attitude which our country has adopted to the problem now under consideration. We support the motion submitted here by the delegate of Laos. We consider, indeed, that so vital a question, which will have such far-reaching effects on the structure of our Organization and may well jeopardize its very principles, merits further reflection. I am convinced that an appeal for more time to consider this problem will not fall on deaf ears.
(185) It was also said a few minutes ago by the delegate of Lebanon that in the texts submitted to you there were some provisions which threatened to produce disputes in an Executive Board composed in the manner suggested. I therefore think that it would be wise to reflect still longer upon this amendment and to postpone any amendment to our Charter until one of the next General Conferences, when the powers which stood sponsor at the birth of this Organization will have had more time to study the proposed insertion. This all too short Conference has given us insufficient opportunity for such reflection. I therefore confidently ask you to support the motion just submitted by the delegate of Laos.

(186) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the debate on the motion by the delegate of Laos is closed. If no delegates object, the vote on the motion to adjourn the matter under discussion will be taken by roll-call. I call upon the delegate of Switzerland.

(187) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) (Translation from the French): I am very sorry, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, that I must suddenly appear as a stickler for legality, but our Rules of Procedure, in Rule 83, state that "normal voting shall be by a show of hands or by standing".
(188) The word normal is interpreted by the Swiss delegation, naturally enough I think, as follows: that it rests with this Assembly, the sovereign Plenary Assembly, to decide upon some other method of voting, at its discretion. On behalf of the Swiss delegation I have the honour to propose that the vote on the motion now before you be taken by secret ballot.

(189) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The proposal submitted by the delegate of Switzerland is before the Conference. The question is: that the vote on the motion to adjourn the matter under discussion be taken by secret ballot.
(190) For the information of delegates in regard to the matter raised by the delegate of Switzerland, I will read the text of Rule 87.

"Secret ballot

1. The election of the Director-General and members of the Executive Board shall be by secret ballot, as set forth in Rules 95 and 100.
2. All other elections and decisions relating to individuals shall be voted on by secret ballot whenever five or more members shall so request or if the President so decides."

(191) The Chair rules that the motion by the delegate of Laos now under discussion does not fall within the above provisions. If the Conference is of a contrary opinion, I hope that it will express its views. In view of the Rule which has just been read out, I must insist on the procedure already proposed, namely that voting shall be by roll-call.

(192) The vote was taken by roll-call.

Voted for: Belgium, Denmark, France, Haiti, India, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Panama, Switzerland, Syria, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.
Voted against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Burma (Union of), Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Korea, Libya, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Salvador, Saudi-Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa,

United Kingdom, United States of America, Viet-Nam.

Abstentions: Monaco, Mexico, Thailand, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Absent: Afghanistan, Ecuador, Luxembourg, Nepal, Peru, Venezuela.

(193) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The result of the voting is as follows: 13 votes in favour; 41 votes against; abstentions 6; absent 6. The motion is accordingly rejected and the debate on the substantive motion will continue. I call upon the delegate of Egypt.

(194) Mr. AWAD (Egypt): I do not intend to take up much of the Conference's time at this late hour and I certainly shall not emulate the oratory and eloquence to which we have been exposed this afternoon. I can only describe what I have witnessed here today as a storm in a teacup. Never in the history of Unesco as an organization has a matter that has been thrashed out so thoroughly in the Commission taken up so much time of the General Conference. I am very glad to speak as an old associate of this Organization, as one who has always represented his country and his government year after year, no matter how the government and its politics have changed. Governments are not as stupid as they have been represented this afternoon. I can see among my colleagues here delegates who have been my colleagues for the last eight years, delegates from Denmark, from Sweden, from Norway and from Lebanon. From the very beginning they have always been there, although their governments have changed, their parties have changed. In Lebanon there has even been a revolution, yet the same delegate enjoys the confidence of his government. This is as it should be. The delegate of Lebanon should always enjoy the confidence of his government, no matter what government, what party, what revolution may come, because he is a good Unesco man. It is a good thing that a delegate should always enjoy the confidence of his government. What good is a member of the Executive Board, to the Executive Board and to Unesco and to his government, if he has lost the confidence of his government?

(195) Honourable delegates, let us refrain from representing governments as one camp and the Executive Board as another camp. We are an international and an intergovernmental organization. If we enjoy the confidence of our government, it will help us to promote the cause of Unesco, to collaborate more closely in its work and to induce our governments to behave as Unesco wants them to behave. We have all read in the report of the Director-General a very pregnant sentence, that, from now onwards, the future of Unesco will be concerned with work done in the individual countries and not carried out at Headquarters in Paris. This passage has caught my attention and the admiration of my colleagues and, if the future work of Unesco lies in the individual countries, how could you possibly carry out such work if you are going to put the government of those countries out of sympathy with Unesco?

(196) I therefore hope that all delegates present will vote for the amendment and, seeing that we are in such an enormous majority, let us do so unanimously. After all, what is proposed to us is nothing very new: a simple formality to strengthen the hands of the Executive Board and to make it a more useful and practical and effective instrument for promoting the work of Unesco.

(197) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(198) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the United Kingdom has long been in favour of the motion adopted by a large majority in the Administrative Commission. I, like the delegate of Egypt, appreciated the eloquence with which the opposing viewpoint was presented. But in all these brilliant speeches from the lips of highly distinguished orators I have not heard a single new argument which had not already been considered at length in the Administrative Commission.

(199) The United Kingdom delegation does not take the view that the proposal of the Administrative Commission will radically change the character of the Organization. On the contrary, it should strengthen the Organization through the continuous confidence and full support of the governments. We of the United Kingdom delegation do not anticipate any revolutionary changes, but we do anticipate that the General Conference will have at its disposal a more effective instrument with which to carry out its plans.

(200) The United Kingdom delegation believes that in this way we shall invest the Organization with added authority and influence. We do not believe that the Executive Board will become a political body, but that in the widest possible way, and in view of the high qualities of its present members, it will be placed in a better position to carry out the wishes of its superior body, the General Conference.

(201) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The debate is closed. Delegates are reminded that by virtue of Rule 81, section (b), of the Rules of Procedure, approval of the amendment requires a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

(202) If no delegation requests a vote on each paragraph separately, the Chair proposes that the vote be taken jointly on all the paragraphs of the amendment, and that in view of the nature of the subject, voting shall be by roll-call.

(203) The vote was taken by roll-call.

Voted for: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Burma (Union of), Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Korea, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua,

Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Salvador, Saudi-Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America, Viet-Nam.

Voted against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Haiti, Lebanon, Panama, Switzerland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Abstentions: India, Laos, Monaco.

Absent: Afghanistan, Ecuador, Luxembourg, Nepal, Peru, Venezuela.

(204) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The result of the vote is as follows: for the amendment, 49; against 9; abstentions 3, absent 6. Having obtained the two-thirds majority required by the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, the amendment submitted by the Commission is approved.

(205) In accordance with the motion just adopted, it will be necessary to amend the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. Rule 95 now reads:

1. At each of its ordinary sessions, the General Conference shall elect by secret ballot eleven members of the Executive Board.

2. Only a delegate nominated by the government of the State of which he is a national for election to the Executive Board may stand for election.

Rule 95, A - Transitional provision

The term of office of the members of the Executive Board during the eighth session of the General Conference shall end at the close of the eighth session of the General Conference. At the eighth session of the General Conference, twenty-two members shall be elected to the Executive Board pursuant to the provisions of Article V of the Constitution, of whom one-half shall retire at the close of the ninth session of the General Conference, the retiring members being chosen by the drawing of lots. Thereafter, eleven members shall be elected at each ordinary session of the General Conference.

And Rule 93, Death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board

In the event of the death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board his replacement for the remainder of his term shall be appointed by the Executive Board on the nomination of the government of the State the former member represented. The government making the nomination and the Executive Board shall have regard to the factors set forth in Article V, A. 2 of the Constitution.

(206) I call upon the delegate of Belgium.

(207) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): In order to harmonize the texts before you, in the French text of Article 98 the word portion should be replaced by the word durée, as it was in the text of Article V, paragraph 4 of the Constitution.

(208) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If there is no objection by the Conference, the modification just proposed will be made.

(209) As a result of the amendments to the Constitution which have just been approved, the General Conference must proceed at its present session to elect the 22 members of the Executive Board, each one of whom will represent the government of his State. The election will take place in conformity with Article V of the Constitution and with Rules of Procedure Nos. 30, 95 and 96.

(210) I propose that the Nominations Committee meet for this purpose in the afternoon of 6 December and the morning of 7 December, and that the election take place at the plenary meeting on Tuesday afternoon, 7 December.

(211) It is therefore hoped that all delegations will have received the necessary instructions from their governments in time for these meetings. Nominations may be submitted at any time up to and including the meetings of the Nominations Committee and the plenary meetings. However, for the convenience of delegations, the Secretariat will publish all nominations received in advance and will have brief biographies of the candidates distributed. It is hoped that all nominations will be submitted not later than Saturday, 4 December.

(212) A few nominations, which appear in document 8C/NOM/20, have already been announced. With few exceptions, however, these nominations were submitted with a view to the election of members of the Board appointed in a personal capacity, an election which would have taken place if the amendments to the Constitution had not been adopted. Only a small number are also valid for election as government representatives. Delegations which have submitted nominations, without indicating whether the candidate is proposed as a government representative are therefore asked to confirm those nominations if they so desire. Delegations wishing to put forward candidates for the Executive Board and to have their nominations communicated in advance to the meeting of the Nominations Committee, should send in the names through the Secretariat.

(213) If there is no objection, the procedure is approved.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

# TWELFTH PLENARY MEETING

*24 November 1954 at 11 a.m.*

*President:* Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI (Italy)

CONTENTS

Payment of arrears of contributions (document 8C/ADM/30 Add.1). China's right to vote . . . . . 179
Scale of contributions and methods of financing the budget in 1955-56 (document 8C/ADM/33) . . . . . 180

**PAYMENT OF ARREARS OF CONTRIBUTIONS (doc 8C/ADM/30 Add.1)**

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): The General Committee decided this morning to hold a plenary meeting to discuss two items on the agenda: (1) The payment of arrears of contributions and China's right to vote (document 8C/ADM/30 Add.1); (2) The scale of contributions and the methods of financing the budget for 1955 and 1956. I call on the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission.

(2) Mr. ERIKSSON (Sweden) (Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission): Mr. President, fellow delegates, owing to changes in the meetings scheduled, I am not able to present a written report on this first item just mentioned by the President. I hope, however, that you will be willing to accept this oral report.
(3) I will first take the arrears of contributions - requests from Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland.
(4) The Administrative Commission recommends the adoption of the draft resolutions contained in this document, subject to the following changes:
The words "... each of the ordinary sessions of the General Conference" should be substituted for "... each session of the General Conference", in paragraph (iii) of each resolution. There are also some small drafting changes in the French text, concerning paragraph 1 of each resolution.
(5) The Commission has also considered the introductory remarks and recommends their adoption, subject to the following changes: on page 2, the end of the second paragraph should read: "... in implementing the current programme or in formulating future programmes of the Organization". On the same page, add at the end of the second paragraph: "Neither should such an arrangement constitute a precedent". This resolution, of which we have recommended the adoption, includes full voting rights for the three countries concerned: Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland. I would add that the delegates of these countries have informed the Administrative Commission that their Governments accept these arrangements for the payment of their arrears.

China's right to vote

(6) The next point is the voting rights of China. The Administrative Commission recommends that the General Conference adopt the following resolution:
"The General Conference
Decides to permit the Chinese delegation to vote during the present session of the Conference in pursuance of Article IV, 8 (c) of the Constitution".
(7) That is exactly the same wording as was adopted by the General Conference last time.

(8) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): I call on the delegate of the Union of Burma.

(9) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma): Concerning the arrears of contributions, we were discussing the right to vote in the case of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland. I note, in document 8C/ADM/30, Add.1, that these countries are paying their debts. Czechoslovakia is paying back in nine years, Hungary in ten years and Poland in twelve years. In the opinion of the Burmese delegation, it is evident that these countries are genuine in their desire to pay back; it is a matter of time and the particular manner in which this payment will be made. So in the name of the delegation of the Union of Burma, I am in favour of their being given the right to vote.
(10) With regard to the debts of the Kuomintang Chinese Government, I do not see the same sincerity, and I am not quite sure, under these circumstances, whether I could support their desire to vote. It may be that I am prejudiced by the fact that the Kuomintang Chinese Government is still carrying on an act of war, affecting, amongst other things, cultural buildings and sites on Burmese territory today. However, for the moment

I will try to ignore these incidents. But I am still thinking in terms of the technical requirements of the Constitution. Here is a country which, in my opinion, does not show real evidence of a desire to pay back its debt, and I think, in such a case, we should be mindful of the requirements of our Constitution; therefore I, for one, shall not vote for the recommendation that the Kuomintang Chinese Government be given the right to vote in the proceedings to come.

(11) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): I call on the delegate of Brazil.

(12) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) (Translation from the French): Mr. President and delegates, the Brazilian delegation fully supports the request made to us to give the right to vote to the countries which are in arrears with their contributions - Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland. The Brazilian Government commends the formula that has been so skilfully found and the efforts made by these countries to meet their obligations towards our Organization.
(13) The Brazilian Government similarly supports the request put forward by the Chinese Government, which has been represented in this Organization since its inception.
(14) In the Committees and Commissions where these two questions have been discussed, political reservations have been made by various parties against various motions, and these may be found in the records. I had hoped that at this plenary meeting we could make an effort to reach mutual understanding and not reopen these bitter questions, all of which have left their trace in the records and on each of which individual delegates have commented as instructed by their governments. I would like to see a unanimous gesture of mutual concession and to hope that we might keep as far as possible out of our discussions reservations that might be more appropriately raised and debated in the United Nations. I should like to appeal for unbroken unanimity so that we can work in harmony with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and China.

(15) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): If no one wishes to speak I declare the discussion closed and we shall proceed to the vote.
(16) We shall now vote on the question of Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia. If there is no opposition, the vote will be taken by roll-call.

(17) The vote was taken by roll-call.

Voted in favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma (Union of), Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, German Federal Republic, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi-Arabia, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Abstained: Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Korea, Spain, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Viet-Nam.

Absent: Afghanistan, Laos, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Venezuela.

(18) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): The result of the voting is as follows: in favour: 48, against: nil; abstentions: 11; absent: 8.
(19) The delegations of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary are henceforth admitted to the vote.
(20) We shall now take a vote on the question of the voting rights of the Chinese delegation. The vote will be taken by roll-call and will be on the right of China to vote.

(21) The vote was taken by roll-call.

Voted in favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Korea, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi-Arabia, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet-Nam.

Voted against: Burma (Union of), Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Abstained: Canada, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Switzerland, Syria, United Kingdom.

Absent: Afghanistan, Laos, Luxembourg, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Venezuela.

(22) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): The result of the voting is as follows: 42 in favour; 12 against; 9 abstentions; 7 absent.
(23) The resolution granting the Chinese delegation *the right to vote at the present session of the Conference* is therefore adopted.
(24) Before taking the second item on the agenda I should like to make it clear that the vote taken on the admission to the right to vote of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland covers approval of the report of the Administrative Commission on the scale of contributions.

## SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND METHODS OF FINANCING THE BUDGET IN 1955-56 (doc. 8C/ADM/33)

(25) I call on the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission.

(26) Mr. ERIKSSON (Sweden) (Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission): Mr. President, fellow delegates; you have received this morning the first interim report of the Administrative Commission on matters relating to the ceiling of the budget for 1955-56 - see document 8C/ADM/33.

You will find in that report, under paragraph 1, Scale of Contributions, that the Administrative Commission recommends the adoption of the draft resolution which appears on page 5 of document 8C/ADM/31. That is the second interim report of the Committee on Contributions, on Scale of Contributions.

(27) I will take the main points in that report. We recommend that the scale of contributions for Member States for 1955 and 1956 shall be calculated on the basis of the scale of contributions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations for the year 1955, suitably adjusted to take into consideration the difference in membership between Unesco and the United Nations, the principle that no one Member State should in normal times contribute more than one-third of the budgetary appropriations of Unesco, and the principle that in normal times the per capita contributions of any Member State should not exceed the per capita contribution of the Member State which bears the highest assessment.

(28) Member States of Unesco, according to Point 2, who are members of the United Nations shall be included in the scale on the basis of their percentages in the United Nations scale of assessments.

(29) Member States of Unesco who are not members of the United Nations shall be included in the scale on the basis of their theoretical probable percentages in the United Nations scale. You will find those countries listed under Point 3.

(30) The resolution further recommends that the General Conference of Unesco shall give full effect to the principle of per capita limitations. This concerns five countries which are listed under Point 4.

(31) Numbers 5, 6 and 7 are in accordance with resolutions adopted by other sessions of the General Conference. A new point is added under No. 8: we recommend that the contribution of Associate Members shall be assessed at 60% of the minimum percentage assessment of Member States and those contributions shall be accounted for as miscellaneous income.

(32) Paragraph 2 of our interim report concerns methods of financing the budget. There you have the report of the Committee on Contributions on methods of financing the budget (8C/ADM/32). The Administrative Commission has considered this report and adopted the following resolution:

"While agreeing to finance the budget for 1955-56 in accordance with the Financial Regulations, recommends that surpluses from 1947 to 1952 in an amount of $603,600 be retained instead of being returned to Member States, pending a decision of the ninth session of the General Conference."

(33) The effect of such a decision is that the following sums would be available for the financing of the budget of 1955-56:

Miscellaneous Revenue ..... $ 389,614
Assessments on new Member States .. $1,228,216

(34) The rest of paragraph 2, down to Point 6 included, is more or less to help you put in the figures which we shall be voting on. I will not go into any details. If anyone wants any information, they may get it from the Secretariat. The main thing is, as far as the Administrative Commission's recommendations go, that we have $1,617,830 for the 1955-56 budget and that $603,600 will be retained, instead of being returned to Member States, pending decision of the ninth session of the General Conference.

(35) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): I thank the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission. The discussion on the scale of contributions is now open. I call on the delegate of Jordan.

(36) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan): I just want to refer to No. 7 in the resolution on the scale of contributions. I feel that this paragraph should either be deleted altogether or the introduction of three decimal places in the scale of contributions should be accepted. It would be impossible to adjust the figure unless three decimal places were used. I do not speak on this point for Jordan, I feel I am speaking for 49 countries which have to pay more than they should.

(37) As regards No. 8 of the same resolution, I feel that, if the minimum contribution should be .04%, the figure 50 should take the place of the figure 60, for if you put the figure 60 then you would have to use three decimal places. My remarks are not a formal proposal; but are intended to explain why I did not wish to vote on paragraph 7 of the resolution.

(38) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): I call on the delegate of Turkey.

(39) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey)(Translation from the French): The compromise solution just proposed by the Committee on Contributions for the settlement of arrears of contributions by payment in instalments does not seem to us a convincing one. I am addressing this assembly with the sole intention of calling your attention to the fact that the method proposed for payment of the two annual sums falling due in 1955 and 1956 is a deviation from the general principle laid down in resolution 17.3 adopted by the seventh session of the General Conference.

(40) I may add that the arguments advanced by the governments of the three countries in question would apply equally to all Member States in general and to certain States in particular.

(41) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): I call on the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(42) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, the Soviet Union delegation has already explained in the Administrative Commission why it is unable to support the draft resolution approving the scale of contributions levied on Member States of Unesco, which has now been submitted to the plenary meeting for examination, and which in fact is based on the scale of contributions adopted by the United Nations.

(43) At sessions of the General Assembly and in the United Nations Contributions Committee the Soviet Union delegation has advanced relevant

arguments demonstrating that, in fixing the proportion of the contributions from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR to the United Nations, insufficient account was taken of the following facts: first, the enormous destruction suffered by the economy of the Soviet Union during the Second World War and the fact that several branches of the Soviet economy are not yet completely rehabilitated; secondly, the difficulties experienced in obtaining foreign currencies, due, as we all know, to the artificial barriers erected by certain countries in the sphere of international trade, thirdly, in determining the scale of contributions to the United Nations, no account was taken of the fact that the Soviet Union had joined a number of international organizations, such as the International Labour Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which entailed additional expenditure in foreign currencies by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

(44) The Soviet Union delegation considers that the above factors should also be taken into account when determining the share of contributions to Unesco to be paid by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR. The Soviet Union delegation considers that the rates of contribution to Unesco of the countries in question would be correctly assessed as follows: Soviet Union - 10 per cent, Ukrainian SSR - 1 per cent, Byelorussian SSR - 0.45 per cent. A proposal in this sense was submitted for the consideration of the Administrative Commission, but failed to gain the necessary support. The section of the draft resolution concerning the scale of contributions provides for increases in the contributions to be paid by the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR which the Soviet Union delegation cannot accept. Further, the Administrative Commission, when dealing with the scale of contributions, discussed the question of the amounts to be contributed by the United States of America. The proposal submitted to the Administrative Commission that the contribution of the United States of America should remain at its previous level, namely, 33.3 per cent, was not adopted. The Soviet Union delegation considers that there were no grounds for this decision, and for this reason also objects to the scale of contributions submitted for approval by the plenary meeting. In view of the above considerations the Soviet Union delegation will vote against the scale of contributions and the relevant draft resolution submitted by the Administrative Commission for the consideration of the plenary meeting.

(45) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): We shall now vote by show of hands on the report of the Administrative Commission on the scale of contributions.

(46) The scale of contributions is adopted by 47 votes in favour, 10 against and 2 abstentions.

(47) I call on the delegate of Greece.

(48) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece)(Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we have pointed out to the Administrative Commission the illogicality of the proposal that the former member countries which have now rejoined the Organization should pay their contributions in local currencies; we can see no reason for this change in the method of payment since nothing special has happened in the meantime.

(49) At the plenary meeting we pointed out that the Greek delegation fully endorsed the point of view put forward by the Turkish delegation.

(50) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the French): We shall now proceed to a vote by show of hands on the second item on the agenda: methods of financing the budget.

(51) The method of financing the budget was adopted by 50 votes in favour, 3 against and 6 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

# THIRTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

*24 November 1954 at 6 p.m.*

*President*. Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Examination of the report of the Programme and Budget Commission and provisional decision on the maximum assessment level and on the total budget figure for 1955 and 1956. 183

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the Rapporteur of the Programme and Budget Commission.

(2) Mr. HOPE (United States of America) (Rapporteur of the Programme and Budget Commission): Mr. President, honourable delegates, the document to which I now refer is 8C/ADM/33. I would remind you that at this morning's plenary meeting of the General Conference you voted upon No. 1, scale of contributions, and No. 2, methods of financing the budget. The Programme and Budget Commission, which met this afternoon, has heard the report of the Administrative Commission upon that document and has considered the framework of recommendations which are intended to fix the maximum contributions of Member States for the financial period 1955-56. On the subject voted upon by the Commission, I have the following report to make to you.

"The Commission recommends that the following resolution be adopted by the General Conference:

"The General Conference resolves that:

(1) The maximum assessment level to be used to finance the provisional budget shown in paragraph 3, is $20,000,000.

(2) In accordance with Financial Regulation 5.2, the following adjustments are to be made to the provisional gross budget level for the two-year period 1955-56:

Miscellaneous Income ..... $ 389,614

Contributions of new Member States .. $1,228,216

which makes a total of ..... $1,617,830

(3) In the light of the adjustments mentioned in paragraph 2 above, the provisional gross budget level for the two-year period 1955-56 is $21,617,830

(4) Since it is anticipated that the contributions which may not be receivable in respect of 1955-56 will amount to 5.06% of the assessment level, the provisional spending budget is $20,605,830.

(5) Budget surpluses relating to the years 1947 to 1952, which at the present time amount to $603,600, shall be retained, instead of being returned to Member States, pending a decision of the General Conference at its ninth session.

(6) Any changes may be made to the figures given above for the provisional gross and spending levels and incorporated in the Appropriation Resolution provided that the above-mentioned assessment level shall not be increased."

(3) I now turn to Part 3 of document 8C/ADM/33. I shall not read it in its entirety, but shall merely report to you that it was passed in full, namely, (a), (b), (c) and (d) - Parts I, III and IV of the budget. These three parts are to be found on pages 2 and 3 of the document. This was approved in the Programme and Budget Commission this afternoon.

(4) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The discussion is open on the report just read to us. If no one wishes to speak, a vote will be taken.

(5) The report of the Programme and Budget Commission was approved by 47 votes in favour, 14 against and 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 6.22 p.m.

# FOURTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

*6 December 1954 at 3.45 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Report by the Credentials Committee . . . . . 184
Consideration and adoption of amendments to Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference and to Rules 13, 14 and 17 of the Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Secret Ballot (documents 8C/JUR/5, 8C/JUR/5 Corrigendum and 8C/DIV/133) . . . . . 184

## REPORT BY THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Mr. Bernal Jimenez, Chairman of the Credentials Committee.

(2) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) (Chairman of the Credentials Committee) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, since the oral statement made by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee at the eleventh plenary meeting of the General Conference, on 22 November 1954, credentials have been received for the Luxembourg delegation which are in accordance with the provisions of Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. The General Conference is, therefore, recommended to regard the credentials of this Member State as fully in order, and to admit the Luxembourg delegation to the eighth session of the General Conference.
(3) A cable has also been received, accrediting a Peruvian delegate. It is recommended that this cable be regarded, according to the customary practice, as provisionally accrediting that delegate, and that the Peruvian representative be admitted to the present session of the General Conference, subject to the later submission of credentials in due form.
(4) For the rest, the Credentials Committee finds that all the delegates attending the General Conference are now entitled to vote at the forthcoming elections.

(5) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I put to the meeting the report just submitted by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee regarding the credentials of Luxembourg and Peru.

(6) Approved.

(7) The delegates of Luxembourg and Peru are thus admitted to the General Conference, subject to the conditions set forth by the Chairman of the Committee.

## CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO RULES 88 AND 89 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AND TO RULES 13, 14 AND 17 OF THE RULES FOR THE CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS BY SECRET BALLOT

(documents 8C/JUR/5, 8C/JUR/5 Corr. and 8C/DIV/133)

(8) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on Mr. Saba, the Legal Adviser, to make a statement regarding the majority required for the election of the members of the Executive Board, the validity of ballot papers containing fewer names than there are persons to be elected, and the eligibility of candidates whose names are not included in the list drawn up by the Nominations Committee (documents 8C/JUR/5 and 8C/JUR/5 Corr.).

(9) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) (Translation from the French): The Legal Committee was asked by the General Committee for an opinion on the three following questions concerning the election of members of the Executive Board:

Majority required for the election of members of the Executive Board;

Validity of ballot papers which contain fewer names than there are persons to be elected;

Eligibility of candidates not included in the list prepared by the Nominations Committee.

(10) The Legal Committee has considered these questions and submitted a report to the General Committee, which has decided to put that report before the General Conference with a view to the adoption of certain amendments which the Legal Committee considers to be necessary. With regard to the first point - the majority required for the election of members of the Executive Board - there was found to be a discrepancy between Article IV, paragraph 8, sub-paragraph (a) of the Constitution

and Rule 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. The Constitution states that, except in cases where a two-thirds majority is required, the General Conference shall make its decisions by a simple majority - half plus one of the votes recorded - whereas Rule 89 of the Rules of Procedure states that when a second vote is taken candidates who obtain pluralities shall be elected. In other words, according to the Rules of Procedure, it would be possible for a candidate to be elected by a number of votes which, though higher than the number obtained by any other candidate, was less than half plus one of the actual votes recorded. Abstentions, I must remind you, do not count.

(11) The Legal Committee took the view that procedure should be governed solely by the provisions of the Constitution, that being the authoritative source and the document which the General Conference should always follow. The Committee felt, therefore, that the Rules of Procedure should be amended, and consequently wishes to submit the following resolution to the General Conference for approval:

"The General Conference

I. Decides to substitute the following for Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference:

Rule 88 - Election of a single person

When a single elective place is to be filled and no candidate obtains in the first ballot the majority required, additional ballots shall be taken which shall be restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If in the third ballot the votes are equally divided, the President shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots.

Rule 89 - Election of two or more persons

When two or more elective places are to be filled at one time under the same conditions, those candidates obtaining in the first ballot the majority required shall be elected. If the number of candidates obtaining such majority is less than the number of places to be filled, there shall be additional ballots to fill the remaining places, the voting being restricted to the candidates obtaining the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, to a number not more than twice the places remaining to be filled."

(12) That is the actual wording used in the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(13) The second part of the Legal Committee's proposal, embodied in the same resolution, runs as follows:

"II. Decides to substitute the following for the last sentence of Rule 17 of the Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Secret Ballot, adopted by the General Conference at its sixth session:

Half plus one of the votes recorded shall constitute the majority required under Article IV. 8 (a) of the Constitution and Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference."

(14) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): It is for the Conference to decide whether it wishes to discuss the Legal Adviser's report point by point, or to hear it right through. I suggest that it be taken point by point, for the sake of clarity. If the Conference has no objection, we will adopt that course. In that case, we will now consider part I of the report presented by the Legal Adviser.

(15) Part I of the report, as amended by document 8C/JUR/5 Corr., was approved unanimously.

(16) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) (Translation from the French): The second question relates to the validity of ballot papers containing fewer names than there are persons to be elected. The Legal Committee found that, under Rule 14 of the Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Secret Ballot (8C/DIV/133), ballot papers containing the same number of names as there are persons to be elected, or fewer names, shall be valid. However, the Committee took the view that this provision should be amended. It accordingly proposes the following resolution for adoption by the General Conference:

"The General Conference,

Decides to amend as follows, Rules 13 and 14 of the Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Secret Ballot:

Rule 13:

After paragraph (b), add the following:

(c) Ballot papers on which the name of any one candidate appears more than once;

(d) Ballot papers on which there are fewer names than there are persons to be elected".

(17) I should remind you that Rule 13 begins with the words:

"The following shall be considered invalid". The suggestion now made to the Conference is, therefore, that ballot papers on which the name of any one candidate appears more than once, or on which there are fewer names than there are persons to be elected, shall be considered invalid.

(18) The draft resolution now submitted to you continues as follows:

"Delete Rule 14.

Renumber Rules 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 accordingly".

(19) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Guatemala.

(20) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) (Translation from the Spanish): The delegation of Guatemala does not support the insertion of clause (d), suggested by the Legal Committee as an amendment to Rule 13. Under the terms of this amendment, the number of names on the ballot paper must exactly correspond to the number of seats to be filled.

(21) My delegation objects to this amendment, because it is contrary to the parliamentary procedure generally adopted in international organizations. No delegation can be compelled to vote for the full number of candidates. That is an optional matter, for the decision of each individual delegation.

(22) Any delegation, in any international organization, is entitled to vote for whatever number of candidates it may think fit, always provided that it does not

exceed the number of seats vacant; but in no circumstances can any delegation be forced to vote for the entire number of vacant seats. Cases might arise in which delegations wished to vote for some candidates and not for others.
(23) If clause (d) were accepted as an amendment, as proposed by the Legal Committee, it might lead us into serious difficulties, now or at some future time. For instance, should a delegation, for some reason, not wish to vote for a particular candidate or candidates, it would be forced to abstain from voting altogether. The delegations would thus be compelled to choose between abstaining altogether, or voting for all the candidates, including those whom, for some reason, they do not approve or wish to support. I feel that the Legal Committee's proposal, while undoubtedly made with the best of intentions, seriously restricts the delegations' right to vote as they judge fit.
(24) Moreover, it might happen, even in the forthcoming ballot, that some of the candidates withdrew, so that only 22 would be left. If this rule were adopted, every delegation would then be forced, willy-nilly, to vote for all the candidates. This restricts freedom of expression and freedom of voting, the sovereign right of each delegation to vote for the candidates it prefers or considers most suitable. My delegation therefore considers that the existing rule should not be amended in the manner suggested. And I should like to ask beforehand that this resolution be put to the vote, paragraph by paragraph, and that clause (d) be the subject of a separate vote, because, for the reasons I have given, the delegation of Guatemala will vote against it.

(25) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Legal Committee.

(26) Mr. AWAD (Egypt) (Chairman of the Legal Committee): With regard to what was said by the delegate of Guatemala this matter was very carefully debated and considered in the Legal Committee. It was taken into account that the right of delegates to put any number of names, no matter how few, might possibly be abused and that this would give undue weight to certain candidates, giving them a much greater chance and thus depriving others of the same chance. After all, the number of candidates is something like double the number of seats to be filled, and it should surely be possible for any voter to choose half of the names in front of him.
(27) Thus the Legal Committee went deliberately into the question and decided that there would be considerable abuse if delegates were not required to give the exact number of candidates on their ballot sheet.

(28) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish). I call upon the delegate of Switzerland.

(29) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) (Translation from the French): The Swiss delegation supports the proposal made by the delegation of Guatemala. So far as we know, the procedure just suggested by the Legal Committee is not followed in any democratic system of balloting; we know of no precedent for it, and we therefore support the Guatemalan delegation in asking for the deletion of the clause which would compel the delegations to record a number of votes equal to the number of seats to be filled.

(30) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If no one wishes to speak, we will proceed to vote, paragraph by paragraph. A vote will first be taken on the paragraphs which have not given rise to discussion.
(31) I call upon the Legal Adviser.

(32) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) (Translation from the French): I should like to make two small observations on points to which delegations have called my attention.
(33) The first of these concerns the proposed wording of Rule 13 of the Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Secret Ballot, which refers to "ballot papers on which there are fewer names than there are persons to be elected". It has been pointed out to me that the words "on which there are fewer names" are too vague, and that the words "of candidates" should be added, to ensure that names other than those of candidates shall not be entered in order to bring the total up to 22. This is a pertinent comment.
(34) My second observation concerns the proposed text of Rule 17. This states that "Half plus one of the votes recorded shall constitute the majority required under Article IV. 8 (a) of the Constitution and Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference". Owing to a typographical error in the Corrigendum, this text is included in the second part of the report of the Legal Committee, whereas in reality it belongs to the first part. I mentioned this when dealing with the first point, and you have already approved it.

(35) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I shall now take a vote on the proposals of the Legal Committee, with the exception of clause (d), to which the Guatemalan delegation, seconded by the Swiss delegation, objects.

(36) Approved unanimously.

(37) A vote was then taken on clause (d) which was adopted by 27 votes to 24, with 3 abstentions.

(38) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Legal Adviser.

(39) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) (Translation from the French): The third question submitted to the Legal Committee concerns the eligibility of candidates not included in the list prepared by the Nominations Committee. In this connexion, the Committee noted that, as a result of the amendment made by the General Conference, at its present session, to Rule 95 of its Rules of Procedure, the provision that only candidates nominated either by the Nominations Committee or by two delegations, may stand for election, is annulled.
(40) The Committee takes the view that any nomination put forward by a government in accordance with the new text of Article 95 is valid, even if the

candidate's name does not appear in the list submitted to the General Conference by the Nominations Committee. It also considers that it is in order to submit a nomination up to the time when the ballot is opened in the General Conference.
(41) This last part of the report, Mr. President, does not entail any resolution; it is merely an opinion expressed by the Legal Committee, which the General Conference is free to accept or to reject.

(42) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The report you have just heard is now open to debate. If no one wishes to speak, I shall take a vote on the interpretation proposed by the Legal Adviser.
(43) Will those in favour please signify their approval?

(44) Adopted.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.

# FIFTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

*7 December 1954 at 4 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Report of the Nominations Committee on the election of members of the Executive Board . . . . . 187
Decision on the place of the Ninth Session of the General Conference, on the report of the Executive Board (document 8C/6) . . . . . 189
Election of 22 members of the Executive Board (documents 8C/DIV/145, 8C/DIV/133) . . . . . 194

## REPORT OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Nominations Committee.

(2) Mr. KABIR (India) (Chairman of the Nominations Committee): Mr. President and fellow delegates: I present to you the report of the Nominations Committee.
(3) At the meeting held this morning it was found that the number of Member States entitled to vote was 72. Four were absent. Of the votes cast one was an abstention and one was invalid; there were therefore 66 valid votes recorded; consequently, the number of votes constituting the required majority was 34.
(4) After the ballot was counted the Nominations Committee put forward the following 22 candidates as persons who have the recommendations of the Committee. In addition, two more candidates secured the required number of votes:

1. Mr. Raadi of Iran, 65 votes; 2. Mr. Secco Ellauri of Uruguay, 64 votes; 3. Mr. Martinez Cobo of Ecuador, 64 votes; 4. Mr. Spilhaus of the United States of America, 64 votes; 5. Mr. Ferrara Marino of Cuba, 62 votes; 6. Mr. Laugier of France, 62 votes; 7. Mr. Sharif of Pakistan, 62 votes; 8. Mr. Awad of Egypt, 61 votes; 9. Mr. Berredo Carneiro of Brazil, 61 votes; 10. Mr. Mudaliar of India, 60 votes; 11. Sir Ben Bowen Thomas of the United Kingdom, 60 votes; 12. Mr. Veronese of Italy, 58 votes; 13. Mr. Haguiwara of Japan, 55 votes; 14. Mr. Estelrich of Spain, 54 votes; 15. Mgr Maroun of Lebanon, 53 votes; 16. Mr. Massaquoi of Liberia, 53 votes; 17. Mrs. Schlueter-Hermkes of Germany, 51 votes; 18. Mr. Bender of the Netherlands, 48 votes; 19. Mr. Nielsen of Denmark, 44 votes; 20. Mr. Solodovnikov of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 42 votes; 21. Mr. Johannes of Indonesia, 41 votes; 22. Mr. Malakul of Thailand, 41 votes.

(5) These are the twenty-two recommendations. In addition, there are Mr. Piaget of Switzerland, who secured 39 votes, and Mrs. Rodriguez of the Philippines, with 35 votes
(6) The Nominations Committee also wanted it to be brought to the notice of the Conference that the Conference might decide on the appropriate procedure

to be adopted when the number of candidates securing more than the requisite number of votes exceeds the number of vacancies.

(7) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): After hearing the report presented by the Chairman of the Nominations Committee, I think that, with regard to the question he raised at the end, there are two courses open to us: either the Rules of Procedure can be amended or, should the Conference prefer, a simple vote can be taken, on the understanding that if in any ballot the number of candidates securing the majority required exceeds the number of vacancies, the candidates obtaining the largest number of votes shall be elected.
(8) However, if two or more of the candidates obtaining the largest number of votes obtain the same number and are competing for one or more vacancies, a new vote will be taken. The Conference will decide whether this procedure is correct and, if it decides to adopt it, will do so by a simple vote. In order to shorten the proceedings, I propose that, if the Conference has no objection, a vote be taken on the procedure just suggested.

(9) Approved, with one abstention.

(10) Before we come to the election, I would like to ask whether any of the candidates whose names were read out by the Chairman of the Nominations Committee wish to withdraw or whether they all maintain their candidature.
(11) In the latter case, we will proceed with the election, in accordance with the report of the Chairman of the Nominations Committee.
(12) I call upon the delegate of Switzerland.

(13) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) (Translation from the French): In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, and in view of the large number of votes secured this morning in the Nominations Committee by the Swiss candidate, Mr. Piaget, I should like to say that the Swiss delegation feels it to be its duty to support the candidature of Mr. Piaget, which was put forward by the Swiss Government. Mr. Piaget is therefore a candidate for the Executive Board.

(14) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, I attended the meeting of the General Committee, at which you yourself presided, and, if I understand rightly, document 8C/NOM/40 was approved. Page 2 of that document contains the following:

2. Ballot papers

Delegations will be able to choose one or other of the following two methods of voting:
(i) Delegations wishing to vote for the 22 candidates presented by the Nominations Committee will place in an envelope the list of the 22 names presented by the Committee:
(ii) Delegates wishing to vote for candidates not on the list presented by the Nominations Committee may use the full list of candidates as a ballot paper, placing a mark opposite the names of 22 candidates.

(15) In fact I have only found one list, with 30 names; the list containing 22 names has not been distributed to delegations. I should like to know whether this decision by the General Committee has been annulled.

(16) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The Secretariat informs me that, owing to the hour at which the meeting of the Nominations Committee ended and its resolutions were approved, there was no time to prepare the lists; also, that the Nominations Committee presented 24 names, and not 22.
(17) I therefore suggest that the full list of candidates be used, as the Conference decided, by placing a mark opposite the names of 22 candidates. If the Conference agrees, this procedure will be followed. I call upon the delegate of Poland.

(18) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): Mr. President, it might appear from what you said that we have to vote only for those 22 or 24 candidates who obtained the majority this morning. I should like to make it clear that we are completely free to vote for any delegate who is a candidate on the list before us. I stress this because I still maintain the nomination of the Polish delegate, Professor Wierbłowski, who was voted upon this morning.

(19) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): That is correct. Delegates may vote for any candidate whom they think suitable, from among those on the list of thirty.
(20) I call upon the delegate of Japan.

(21) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, you have just said that the Nominations Committee had proposed 24 names. If I understood the Chairman of the Nominations Committee aright, he mentioned 22 names, adding that two more candidates had secured the required number of votes; the number of names proposed is therefore 22 and not 24. In these circumstances I do not understand why there is no list of 22 names, as mentioned in document 8C/NOM/40, which was approved by the General Committee. If the Secretariat has not had time to prepare this second list, I formally propose that the meeting should be adjourned.

(22) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Nominations Committee.

(23) Mr. KABIR (India) (Chairman of the Nominations Committee): Mr. President and fellow delegates, I want to make it clear, as I also stated in the morning, that no elections have been held by the Nominations Committee. Therefore you cannot say that anybody has been elected there. The Nominations Committee, on the results of the ballot, has proposed 22 names for the consideration of the General Conference. In addition, it has reported that two other candidates secured more than the required majority.

(24) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the

Spanish): I call upon the representative of Cuba.

(25) Mr. ICHASO (Cuba) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, the Cuban delegation supports the Japanese delegation's view that it is essential, for purposes of the vote, to have two lists - one containing the 22 names approved by the Nominations Committee and the other containing the names of all the candidates - so that delegations can choose between two methods of voting, the first following the Committee's proposal and the second completely independent. But the procedure itself has been settled; we have approved it; and I do not think that the Conference should go back on its decision. The reason that the Secretariat has not had time to distribute the list does not seem to me to be adequate. I think that the meeting should be adjourned so that the Secretariat can prepare and distribute the list. We shall then be able to vote properly. I submit this proposal formally to the Conference.

(26) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The question is before the Conference for its consideration. As the Japanese delegate's motion, which has just been supported by the Cuban representative, was the earlier, it is submitted to the Conference; it is, that the meeting adjourn in order that the work of the Nominations Committee may be completed and the two lists prepared.
(27) We will now vote on the adjournment of this meeting for one hour in order that the Nominations Committee may complete its work.

(28) The Japanese delegate's motion is approved, by 35 votes in favour, 20 against and 5 abstentions.

(29) I call upon the delegate of Canada.

(30) Mr. PIERCE (Canada): I should like to know whether we were voting on the adjournment of this question only or of the whole meeting. We have other questions on the agenda.

(31) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If the Conference thinks that it can continue with the consideration of the other items on the agenda, it is for it so to decide.
(32) I call upon the delegate of Egypt.

(33) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt): I beg to move that we continue our work and do not interrupt it at the present moment. We had enough of the election question this morning, sitting for three and a half hours on it. It would be useful to get on with our work, and I am sure the Secretariat will do their very best to get the new list prepared for us while we continue. In that way we shall not waste time.

(34) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If there is no objection, the meeting will continue.

**DECISION ON THE PLACE OF THE NINTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE, ON THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD** (document 8C/6)

(35) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Executive Board to make a statement on item 16 of the revised agenda.

(36) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board): Mr. President, fellow delegates, the Rules of Procedure lay down that on the proposal of the Executive Board the General Conference, during its ordinary session, shall fix the seat of the next session. You have in document 8C/6 the resolution of the Executive Board:

"The Executive Board

Considering Rules 2 and 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference,

Considering that the Government of India, by letter dated 20 August 1954, invited the Organization to hold its ninth session in 1956 in New Delhi, India,

Considering the report (document 39 EX/5) on division of responsibilities and costs of a session of the General Conference between the host country and the Organization and on material facilities available in New Delhi,

Recommends to the General Conference that it hold its ninth session in New Delhi, India,

Recommends that this session should open in November 1956."

(37) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The Executive Board's proposal is before the Conference.
(38) I call upon the delegate of Brazil.

(39) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, fellow delegates, when this question was discussed by the Administrative Commission I ventured to say that the Latin American countries claimed the honour and pleasure of being the first to support the proposal that the next session of the General Conference should be held in New Delhi.
(40) In so doing they would be giving a token of their gratitude towards all the delegations which had travelled from the confines of Asia to these far regions of Latin America, to pool their efforts and ideals in a spirit of international co-operation. I ventured to recall that it is by moving about the world in this way that Unesco impresses itself on the minds of the peoples, and I also referred to the similarity in their economic and moral development which, for centuries past, has bridged the great distances between the peoples of Asia and the peoples of America.

(41) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the United States of America.

(42) Mrs. HEFFELFINGER (United States of America): Mr. President and fellow delegates: It gives me great personal pleasure to tell you that the United States of America whole-heartedly supports the Government of India's invitation to hold the ninth session of the General Conference of Unesco in New Delhi. My delegation looks forward with enthusiasm to bringing the people of the United States of America, through their delegation to that

Conference, into close touch with the people of India and, in consequence, to conveying to the people of India our warmest expressions of friendship and regard.

(43) The selection of a place in Asia convenient to all Asians is a fitting recognition of the great contribution which the people of Asia make to the work of Unesco. It causes us to realize the great contribution they have made in the past, and will continue to make in the future. We are all well aware of the significant contribution to man's progress which has been made by the peoples of Asia, particularly in the spiritual and cultural spheres.

(44) We in the United States of America are proud that our culture is the result of an accumulation of the cultures of the world, brought to our country by each of the representatives of Unesco here. We are proud of the fact that the United States of America is a land and a people which are receptive to new ideas, spiritual, cultural and otherwise, and we have confidence in the building of our great country through these ideas. We are anxious to know the peoples of Asia, even better than we do now, and we believe that this will bring about the betterment of mankind and will further peace. In asking that our next General Conference be held in a country of Asia, it seems to me that we are taking a tremendous step towards bringing the peoples of the world closer together in bonds of friendship, goodwill and mutual confidence. This may help to bring us nearer to that great ideal of peace which all of us so ardently believe in. I take great pleasure in seconding the motion put by Brazil to hold the ninth session of the General Conference in New Delhi.

(45) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Uruguay.

(46) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, fellow delegates, our delegation warmly supports the proposal that the next session of the General Conference of Unesco be held in New Delhi. I should also mention that the Executive Board of Unesco, when it considered this question, decided by a unanimous vote in favour of the proposal. To those who may, for apparently serious reasons, have doubts concerning the wisdom and legitimacy of this request by India, it should be pointed out that, superficially, there would seem to be two objections to it - one legal and the other financial.

(47) The legal obstacle is the following. The Constitution, by which we are bound, originally stipulated that sessions of the Conference should be held alternately in Paris and elsewhere. A new system was later introduced, under which sessions of the Conference could, but would not necessarily, as at first, be held away from Paris. According to this system, it would therefore appear that since on this occasion the Conference is held in Montevideo, it should be held next time in Paris. That, it seems to me, is the legal obstacle. The other, which has come to light during our deliberations, is financial. If the Conference were held in Paris it would involve less expense; if it were held in New Delhi it would apparently be extremely expensive. If it were held in Paris the estimated expenditure would be $234,000, as against $548,000 for New Delhi. A comparison of these figures shows that the holding of the Conference in India would entail an increase of more than $300,000 in Unesco's budget, over which we have kept such careful watch.

(48) But these two obstacles are in fact illusory. Neither is really valid on this occasion. The legal objection does not hold for the simple reason that the Unesco headquarters building in Paris cannot be finished in 1956; and according to Secretariat spokesmen, the present Unesco building is no longer adequate for sessions of the Conference, which are attended by steadily larger numbers. The new building will not be ready, and any attempt to expedite its construction would entail an extra cost comparable to, or even higher than, the $300,000 increase involved in holding the Conference in New Delhi.

(49) Further, with regard to this figure - if there is still any room for hesitation - I do not think it quite accurate. I believe that the Secretariat, with understandable caution, has calculated the figures at their maximum, without taking into account reductions which are likely to occur later. But that is not all. There is another most important consideration: Unesco's itinerant policy - if I may so call it - of leaving its permanent headquarters in Paris to travel about the world, providing an opportunity for these world-wide parliaments of minds to be held in other countries, is extremely useful from the standpoints of information and propaganda. It is particularly valuable in that it familiarizes people with Unesco in a way that even the best organized and most costly propaganda through books or pamphlets could not do.

(50) Again, it is a tremendous help to propaganda in the country where the Conference is held, and not in that country alone but also among its neighbours. This was the case in Montevideo, as the time for Unesco's visit drew near. Despite all our publicity, the hearts of our compatriots had not up to then been stirred in Unesco's cause, but the actual presence of the Organization has produced a veritable wave of interest, and an ardent desire for information. And, in referring to Montevideo, I believe that what I say applies to Latin America as a whole. To Latin America, this visit has been a feast for the mind. Why should Asia be denied the same privilege - distant Asia which Unesco has never visited in its previous journeyings? It has visited the Middle East, at Beirut; another European country, at Florence; northern Latin America, at Mexico City; and the southern part of that cultural region, at Montevideo, omitting from its journeys outside Europe only Asia. This, gentlemen, is Unesco's only opportunity of going outside Europe. Once the headquarters building in Paris is finished, Unesco will probably remain anchored for a long time in Europe. This is Asia's last and only opportunity of being visited by Unesco. For this reason I began by saying that we warmly and enthusiastically supported the proposal. And in this I am in no sense swayed by my personal feelings or tastes. I have acted as a delegate, putting my professional conscience first. For, had I been considering this question as a private person, I would not have had the slightest hesitation. I have

had the good fortune to visit New Delhi, to see for myself its archaeological treasures, the riches of its past, the splendour of its present, and to glimpse the promise of its future.
(51) I still see in my mind's eye the Mogul palaces, those eloquent testimonies to India's rôle in the past as a cradle of culture. And I am still amazed by the stupendous social experiment now being carried out in the sub-continent of India.
(52) For me as a private person, then, this problem raises no doubts. And, though this is not a matter of interest to my fellow delegates, I would say - following the example of the King of France who remarked that Paris was well worth a Mass - that New Delhi is well worth an effort on your part.

(53) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Japan.

(54) Mr. SAWADA (Japan): Mr. President and fellow delegates: On behalf of the Japanese delegation, I have great pleasure in supporting the proposal of India to invite Unesco to hold the next session of the General Conference in New Delhi.
(55) As you all know, eight years have passed since the birth of Unesco and eight General Conferences have been held in succession, but none of them has been held in Asia. Japan, for one, has long been desirous of seeing such a conference held in our part of the world. Naturally we were much pleased when we heard of the intention of India to invite Unesco to hold the next session of the General Conference in its capital. I am inclined to think that this proposal will be unanimously adopted and that, with your approval now and here, the next General Conference will be held in India in two years' time. In that case, I am confident that it will prove to be an event, not only in the development and promotion of Unesco's activities in Asia, but also in the annals of Unesco itself. I may tell you on this occasion that, not long after its establishment about three years ago, our National Commission for Unesco passed a resolution urging our Government to take steps to invite Unesco's General Conference to Tokyo and favourable consideration was given thereto by our Government at that time. Owing, however, to circumstances entirely beyond our control, Japan has not been able to make a definite proposal on this subject to the General Conference. Thus, cherishing that hope as we do, Japan is only too pleased to see the next session of our General Conference held in a friendly country not very far from us. With time-honoured cultures of immense profundity, India, as you know, is also establishing a solid position in the fields of science and education, and her contributions to the cause of Unesco have been very large. In these circumstances, I have every reason to believe that, in the event of a happy decision being taken at this Conference on this matter and of the next session of the General Conference being held in New Delhi, it will certainly be crowned with a signal success for Unesco.
(56) It is also of great significance that the first Unesco General Conference to be held on Asian soil will coincide with the tenth anniversary of Unesco, a very happy coincidence. Let us hope that it will open a new and propitious chapter in the history of Unesco and prove to be an important milestone on the road of progress and development of our Organization. It is in this belief that my delegation reiterates our warm support of the proposal of India to have the next session of our General Conference in the beautiful capital of that country.

(57) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Egypt.

(58) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. My honourable colleagues who have spoken before me have come mostly from the West and the New World or from the Far East. It gives me very great pleasure indeed, and I feel this from the bottom of my heart and speak to you now as a delegate from the ancient East, to give very warm support to the acceptance of this cordial invitation from India.
(59) It has been said that the Conferences of Unesco have been held in different parts of the world, in different continents; I beg to submit that India, in a geographical sense, is not only a country, a Member State, but is a whole continent, a continent by the size of its population, by its diversified culture, by its great history in the past, and, I am sure, by its great history in the future. We all have something in common with India. India is the home of so-called South Asian culture, but that cultural civilization of India has come into touch with the various other cultures of the world. It has been in touch with the Mediterranean since the days of Alexander and his great campaigns. It came again into touch with Western Asia and with the Arab and Islamic world. It came into touch with the Chinese and the Far Eastern world, when the Mogula and their culture penetrated India. Finally, it has come into touch with the West in recent centuries. When we go to India, therefore, we shall find there something which belongs to every one of us.
(60) India has a claim to a Conference, not only in order that the Indian people may see Unesco and the work of this great world organization. India in her turn has a great contribution to make and has an important lesson to teach to all of us citizens of the world. In India we shall not only see the traditional spiritual fruits of Indian culture, but we shall also see a great nation working and applying scientific methods in order to rebuild itself. In India, therefore, there would be a great chance for all of us to see how the East is trying to implement its own peaceful methods of international understanding and co-operation. May I therefore be allowed, in supporting this motion, to couple it with the wish that we adopt it unanimously, with the feeling that we shall all be going to one of the cradles of human culture in the past and to one of the bright spots for human civilization in the future.

(61) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(62) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom): Mr. President and fellow delegates. It is with very great pleasure that I rise, as a delegate of the United Kingdom, to associate myself, on behalf

of my fellow delegates, with this public profession of our deep satisfaction that the next session of the General Conference may be held in India. I am sure we shall all agree that this is in some measure a tribute to the work done amongst us over the last six, seven and more years by the members of the Indian delegation. No country has brought a stronger and more amply equipped delegation to the work of this Conference than India. And it is a measure of the sense of responsibility of a Member State towards this Organization that, in the selection of its delegation, it should choose wisely, amply and well. We know that that has been constantly done by India. There is full evidence of it in the fact that we have always been glad to use their talents in responsible Conference offices. We have been glad to ask their delegates to be, in turn, Chairman of the Executive Board, members of the Executive Board and the President of our General Conference.

(63) May I add that, as soon as it was known that India proposed to invite the next Conference to New Delhi, Her Majesty's Government immediately decided to give that invitation its whole-hearted support. We are members of one family. We are bound by ties which, though lighter than air, are stronger than steel, ties, both of the spirit and of the mind, that should grow stronger and stronger in bringing the Member States together. Finally, may I call your attention to the simple fact that this Organization was born in the heart of the Commonwealth and that, at the end of ten years, it will be holding its General Conference within the territories of another member of the Commonwealth. I can think of no more valuable precedent than that every ten years this Organization should decide to return to the source of its inspiration and there derive strength to go forward in its great work. I am sure that we all look forward with great satisfaction and prospective happiness to the meeting of the General Conference in New Delhi in two years' time.

(64) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Yugoslavia.

(65) Mr. MATIC (Yugoslavia) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, the Yugoslav delegation warmly and whole-heartedly supports the Indian Government's proposal that our next session should be held in New Delhi. I would also like to express our hope that a decision in this sense will be taken unanimously.

(66) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of France.

(67) Mr. LAUGIER (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, fellow delegates, a few days ago, when the Executive Board still consisted of independent members, I strove - and strove strenuously - in my purely personal capacity to get the next session of the Conference held in New Delhi, and I had the good fortune to contribute to the Board's unanimous decision which is now before you.

(68) Today, as my country's delegate and for once entirely in agreement with my Government, I can tell you of France's unreserved wish to see the next session of the Conference held in New Delhi.

(69) We believe that the exchanges of persons advocated in Unesco's programme constitute one of the most important, lively and effective factors in international understanding.

(70) Some years ago, at the United Nations, I strove to get one of the sessions of the General Assembly held in Paris. And I saw outstanding men arriving in Paris - men of exceptional culture, belonging to famous civilizations, who had never before set foot in France, nor even in Europe. It was a revelation to them.

(71) Now, I ask you who are assembled here, how many of you have seen New Delhi? It is very important that leaders in education, science and culture should make contact with India, that great country, with a stupendous past culture and civilization, which, for demographic reasons, and for reasons connected with its geography and its history, is now faced with extraordinary human problems. It is very important that some token should be given of world solidarity, and particularly of solidarity among leaders in education, science and culture, in favour of India. The French Government is therefore prepared to agree unreservedly, whatever the financial implications, to the holding of the next session of the Conference in New Delhi.

(72) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Belgium.

(73) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, fellow delegates, in speaking for my Government I feel sure that I am also expressing the views of many neighbouring and friendly European countries, who will all be as delighted as we are to be able to accept the Indian Government's invitation to meet in New Delhi, two years hence, for the next session of the Conference.

(74) Like the delegate of Uruguay, we also believe in the advantages of Unesco's policy of moving about. Man's nature being what it is, he only likes what he is familiar with. It is surprising to note how much good a man who has travelled has to say about the countries he has visited. For myself, I am convinced that never have the praises of Uruguay been sung throughout the world as they will be after this eighth session of Unesco's Conference, and the same will undoubtedly happen after the ninth session, when we have been to New Delhi. Nor are these journeys fruitless for ourselves. There is a saying that travel broadens the minds of the young. Obviously we are all young or we should not be here, for on youth must fall the task of defending Unesco's ideals.

(75) Not only for ourselves, but for the Organization itself, there is no more effective way of making Unesco's usefulness and its merits understood than by putting it into direct touch with the different peoples of the world. We have sufficient proof of this in the interest aroused among the entire population of Uruguay by Unesco's meeting here. Like me, you have doubtless come across many enthusiasts - from the man at the petrol pump or the hotel keeper to passers-by in the street - who have asked you to let them have our Unesco emblem as a souvenir of this splendid Conference.

(76) I am particularly happy that this invitation should come from a country like India, which has given the world such a great cultural heritage. It is undoubtedly to the interest of all the cultural groups in the world to get to know India better and to make an effort - in the shape of this journey and the few dollars' cost it will involve - to contribute towards the achievement of our common aim, which is to seek for truth and to improve cultural and spiritual standards throughout the world.

(77) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Hungary.

(78) Mrs. JOBORU (Hungary): Mr. President, fellow delegates. Allow me in the name of the Hungarian delegation to echo the thoughts expressed so eloquently by the delegates who have preceded me. The Hungarian delegation also whole-heartedly supports the proposal for the seat of the next Conference. We all know, and we have all seen at this Conference, what an important rôle the Indian people play in human progress and in the fight for peace. We shall be very glad of the opportunity to become personally acquainted with the work and the fight for peace of the people of India.

(79) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Spain.

(80) Mr. RUIZ JIMENEZ (Spain) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, fellow delegates, my Government has pleasure in supporting the proposal that the next session of the General Conference of Unesco should be held in New Delhi, for the same reasons that have been so well stated by other delegations and also because of the spiritual links which for centuries past have bound us to those regions where men of Spanish civilization also went to work for culture. There is a further reason, adventitious perhaps, that it was precisely in seeking a new road, a new road to the region of India, that Spain found the inestimable treasure of these American countries. For all these reasons, we shall vote with satisfaction and pleasure for the next session of the General Conference to be held in New Delhi.

(81) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): As a result of the speeches we have just heard, and in the belief that this is in accordance with the feeling of the Conference, I propose that we vote on this question by acclamation.

(82) The proposal is adopted unanimously.

(83) I call upon the delegate of India.

(84) Dr. MUDALIAR (India): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. It would be ungracious on my part if I were not to crave your indulgence, and that of this Conference, while I express in a few words the thoughts uppermost in my mind and in my heart on this unique occasion. My delegation has listened with the greatest amount of respect, and with an amount of joy that it is not possible for us to express in words, to the various speeches that have been made by distinguished delegates from almost all parts of the globe, and we rejoice indeed that our humble invitation to hold the ninth session of this Conference in New Delhi has been received with approbation by this august assembly. When this proposal was mooted by our National Commission, our Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, immediately gave us his unqualified support and asked us to place the request before this Conference, and I am sure that the result of this afternoon's proceedings will be acclaimed in my country and in the neighbouring countries of Asia with a satisfaction which it is difficult for me to express in words. When the heart is full, words somehow fail, as indeed they must. It has been a unique experience for my delegation to have so much of kindness, so much of consideration and so much of good feeling expressed on the floor from all quarters. We look forward with great rejoicing to the holding of the Unesco Conference in New Delhi, for we are convinced, as original members of this body and as a State which has participated in all these conferences, that, however little India can contribute to the success of this Conference, it will indeed be a great and unique event, not only for our country but for the many countries of the region. It will bring home to our people, to those forward looking millions who cherish the ideals of Unesco in their hearts, how Unesco can hold a Conference and thrill the imagination of the people of that part of the country.

(85) Mr. President, during the last few weeks we have had the unique privilege of holding this Conference in your great city and country and, believe me, we sometimes doubt whether we can ever match the delightful manner in which you have welcomed us in every sphere of activity and whether we shall be in a position correspondingly to fulfil the obligations that are put upon us in inviting you to our country. But I can assure you, Mr. President, the heart will be there and, whatever little defects there may be, we are sure the Conference will realize that India, in extending the invitation, had but one object in view - to spread the message of Unesco in all parts of the world and to make the people of the world more and more interested in the great mission which Unesco has undertaken. It is our heartfelt wish that, when the next conference meets in New Delhi, we shall have progressed much farther in building this, the global organizational State - that we shall have made more and more contacts, that we shall have come to realize that, all said and done, man can be the most immortal of persons in every sphere of mind and body.

(86) They say that gratitude is a lively sense of favours yet to come. I therefore express another hope - that it may be possible for the distinguished members who will assemble in New Delhi, not merely to open the Conference there but also to visit other parts of our country and some of our other Member States. You will realize that it will be a real interest of ours to get these great minds into touch with the people of our country. It is our hope, ladies and gentlemen, that all of you will be in a position to spend a few more days at the conclusion of the session in New Delhi visiting the

many worth-while scenes in that part of the world.

(87) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Director-General.

(88) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President, I think that, if the Secretariat had been allowed to join in the acclamations accompanying the decision to go to New Delhi, you would have heard an even louder noise than you did. I promise the Government of India, on behalf of the Secretariat, that we shall do our zealous best to prepare well the work of the Conference in New Delhi. We shall work closely and continuously with the Indian Government, in order to make it possible for you to hold a very successful Conference there. Having visited India on two occasions, I can assure you that you who go to New Delhi will derive very great personal pleasure from attending the Conference there.

**ELECTION OF 22 MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**
(documents 8C/DIV/145, 8C/DIV/133)

(89) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The two ballot papers are ready for distribution to delegates. We can therefore proceed to the vote on the candidates for the Executive Board.
(90) In accordance with the Conference's decision, delegates may vote either for the list of 22 names proposed by the Nominations Committee, or for the names they choose from the list of thirty presented to the Conference.
(91) I call upon the delegate of Israel.

(92) Mr. KUDOVY (Israel) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we should like to thank the countries which were good enough to vote for the Israeli candidate this morning. In face of the harsh realities of this world - from which Unesco, despite its high ideals, is not exempted - your vote was a great consolation to us. We would, however, ask the Conference to note that Israel has withdrawn its candidature; the name of the Israeli candidate should therefore not appear on the ballot paper containing thirty names.

(93) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the Philippines.

(94) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, fellow delegates, the Philippine delegation wishes to express its warm gratitude to all the delegations which voted for the Philippine candidate. Realizing, however, that the result of the preliminary vote taken this morning expresses the wishes of the heads of delegations here present, and acting as a people that recognizes democratic principles and accepts the opinion of the majority, we withdraw the candidature of our nominee and support the resolution presented by the Chairman of the Nominations Committee, who spoke at the beginning of the afternoon.

(95) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of France.

(96) Mr. CABOUAT (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, before we vote, the French delegation would be glad if the following facts could be confirmed:

(1) That, if neither list has priority over the other, the two ballot papers now in the possession of the different delegations have exactly the same legal value;

(2) That it is understood that, on the ballot papers distributed to delegations this morning, the names of the Israeli and Philippine candidates should be struck out by the delegations wishing to use this ballot paper, and that the fact of striking out these two names does not in itself invalidate the ballot paper.

(97) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I think that the delegate of France is right. The fact of striking out the candidatures of Israel and the Philippines, which have been withdrawn by their own delegates, will not invalidate the ballot papers; it has not been possible to correct these because the withdrawal of the candidatures was too recent. As far as the two ballot papers are concerned, the only difference between them is that one is the list recommended by the Nominations Committee while the other includes the names of all the candidates put forward. If the Conference has no objection, this procedure will be adopted.

(98) It is approved.

(99) I think that the plenary meeting should be suspended for a quarter of an hour, so that the vote can be taken in due order. I also ask for tellers to be appointed to count the votes, and propose for this purpose Mr. Ebbel, the Norwegian delegate, and Mr. Matic, the Yugoslav delegate. If there is no objection, we will proceed accordingly.

(The meeting was adjourned at 5.15 p.m. and resumed at 5.35 p.m.)

(100) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The meeting is resumed.
(101) I should remind delegates that, although two ballot papers have been distributed, only one is to be used for voting. Delegates who vote for the list proposed by the Nominations Committee need not place any mark against the names of candidates; those using the other list should place a mark opposite the names of the 22 candidates for whom they vote. I would remind you that the ballot is secret and that the papers should not be marked in any other way.
(102) The results of the voting are as follows: Number of Member States with the right to vote at this meeting: 72, with 4 absent, 1 abstention and 2 spoilt papers. Number of votes cast: 65. Number of votes constituting the majority required for election: 34.
(103) The following are the names of the candidates elected, with the number of votes secured by each:

Mr. Laugier (France): 65 votes;
Mr. Veronese (Italy): 65 votes;
Mr. Haguiwara (Japan): 64 votes;

Mr. Spilhaus (United States of America): 64 votes,
Mr. Awad (Egypt): 63 votes;
Mr. Ferrara Marino (Cuba): 63 votes;
Mr. Massaquoi (Liberia): 63 votes;
Mr. Raadi (Iran): 63 votes;
Mr. Sharif (Pakistan): 63 votes;
Mr. Bender (Netherlands): 62 votes;
Mr. Berredo Carneiro (Brazil): 62 votes;
Mgr Maroun (Lebanon): 62 votes;
Mr. Mudaliar (India): 62 votes;
Sir Ben Bowen Thomas (United Kingdom): 62 votes;
Mr. Secco Ellauri (Uruguay): 61 votes;
Mr. Martínez Cobo (Ecuador): 60 votes;
Mrs. Schlueter-Hermkes (German Federal Republic): 58 votes;
Mr. Estelrich (Spain): 54 votes;
Mr. Nielsen (Denmark): 51 votes;
Mr. Malakul (Thailand): 50 votes;
Mr. Johannes (Indonesia): 49 votes;
Mr. Solodovnikov (USSR): 48 votes.

(104) In addition, the candidates I am about to mention received the following number of votes:

Princess Souvanna Phouma (Laos): 25 votes;
Mr. Piaget (Switzerland): 24 votes;
Mr. Vo Van Lua (Viet-Nam): 18 votes;
Mr. Wierblowski (Poland): 18 votes;
Mr. Bardales (Honduras): 17 votes;
Mr. Paik (Korea): 15 votes.

(105) In accordance with the transitional provision in the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, we will now draw lots to choose, from among the 22 delegates who have been elected members of the Board, the 11 who will retire two years after taking office.
(106) I ask the Chairman of the Nominations Committee kindly to draw the lots.
(107) As a result of the lots drawn by the Chairman of the Nominations Committee, the following members of the Executive Board will retire in two years' time:

Mr. Bender (Netherlands)
Mr. Massaquoi (Liberia)
Mr. Solodovnikov (USSR)
Mr. Haguiwara (Japan)
Mr. Malakul (Thailand)
Mr. Mudaliar (India)
Mr. Sharif (Pakistan)
Mr. Ferrara Marino (Cuba)
Mr. Spilhaus (United States of America)
Mrs. Schlueter-Hermkes (German Federal Republic)
Mr. Estelrich (Spain).

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

# SIXTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

*8 December 1954 at 3.45 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Committee on Reports of Member States (document 8C/REP/1) . . . . . 195
Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Administrative Commission (documents 8C/ADM/35 and Appendix) . . . . 197

**CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF MEMBER STATES** (document 8C/REP/1)

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We shall consider the report of the Committee on Reports of Member States. I call upon the Rapporteur, Mr. Hazoum.

(2) Mr. HAZOUM (Rapporteur) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, in addressing this Conference for the first time, I wish, first of all, to state my heartfelt conviction that this eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco is a landmark in the annals of the Organization - and, I might add, in the history of mankind - in that it has furthered Unesco's unfailing efforts to increase understanding and hence also friendship amongst men, and to extend that international co-operation which should lead to banishing the spectre of war forever and wiping out other scourges which enfeeble, when they do not actually decimate, the ranks of mankind.

(3) Yes, there is no doubt that this Conference will be a landmark. It is the first Conference at which, in addition to the 70 old Member States, 5 of which belong to the African continent, we have had representatives of two new countries in Equatorial Africa, ranking as Associate Members: Sierra Leone and the Gold Coast.
(4) As an African I cannot but rejoice at this. May the glow which I see today on the horizon of my beloved Africa grow soon into a dazzling light which will disperse the shades of illiteracy, of ignorance, the root, as we well know, of all too many prejudices and evils.
(5) The Head of my delegation has thanked the Uruguayan people for their warm welcome to the delegates of Member States, for the magnificent reception organized in their honour on the day of the opening of this Conference; and, finally, for all the solicitude displayed by the Government of Uruguay in order to make our stay in this city a pleasant one.
(6) Speaking for myself, my heart was won by your schoolchildren, at once the pride and the hope of your country, the young people who sang to us that beautiful Canticle to Hope. My heart was won, too, by your magnificent spirit of universality, which finds expression in deeds as well as in words. You are thus, all unwittingly, setting the world a noble example.
(7) I am aware that a country like yours has always inspired its sons to fine poetry, and that you do not lack talented poets. I am aware also that so sensitive a people must necessarily possess good composers. Your poets and musicians could have produced in honour of this Conference held in your capital words and music equal to the finest produced by the writers and composers of other nations. But you preferred to choose a poem by a French writer - Paul Claudel - and had it set to the music of a German composer - Paul Hindemith. That you elected to do this was proof of your spirit of understanding and of your fervent desire for the international co-operation which will engender an atmosphere of friendship among men and dispel the suspicion that paralyses our spontaneous goodwill, poisons our minds and creates the war psychosis which mankind has for the last few years been struggling in vain to throw off. This fervent desire for international co-operation does you great credit.
(8) I find further proof of your spirit of universality in the warm tribute paid in this city to the memory of Henri Poincaré. That tribute finally confirmed my conviction that, for all your attachment to your own country, you have a very deep interest in mankind in general, in the people of other countries, and that your spirit is universal. You admire the wide learning personified in that great French scholar.
(9) I have seen that you are deeply imbued with the spirit of democracy: that intelligent, tolerant democracy which suffers no sectarianism of any kind, and permits the free expression and clash of opinions. This true democracy, based on justice, has never despised or repressed the humble and the members of minority groups but, on the contrary, has consistently respected them.
(10) I found ample proof of this in your recent parliamentary elections which I have been able to witness in Montevideo. During the electoral campaign, I wandered freely through your capital and through some of your provincial cities, and was thus able to realize the extent of your attachment to the freedom of expression which alone makes Man truly Man. Your elections were marked by extraordinary calm and admirable dignity.
(11) This is surely incontestable proof of your great political maturity. Proof too of a true democracy, which never stoops to acts of violence against those who, in accordance with their rights, hold political opinions contrary to our own.
(12) It is no doubt this democracy, truly understood and conscientiously applied, which is at the root of the serenity of mind which I find so admirable in you, and which explains the domestic peace which other nations must envy you.
(13) But it is time for me to stop, and to come to the subject on which I am here to speak, in my capacity as Rapporteur
(14) The Report of the Committee on Reports of Member States contains four sections: the first section consists of the first seven paragraphs, and deals with the establishment of the Committee on Reports of Member States, set up at the fifth session of the General Conference, by resolution 30.214. it deals also with the purpose of that Committee, which is to examine the reports that Member States are required to submit under Article VIII of the Unesco Constitution. Eleven Member States are represented on this Committee - Austria, Cambodia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Iraq, Luxembourg, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom and United States of America. Two Member States - Luxembourg and Austria - were absent. (Austria was able to send a representative to our first meeting only.)
(15) We also had four States represented by observers - Argentina, German Federal Republic, Haiti and Spain.
(16) At our first meeting, we elected our Officers, consisting of a Chairman, two Vice-Chairmen and a Rapporteur. The post of Chairman fell to Iraq, those of the two Vice-Chairmen to Cambodia and the Dominican Republic, and that of Rapporteur to France.
(17) We held in all eight meetings on 12, 13, 15, 18, 22, 23, 24 and 29 November.
(18) At the last meeting, the Director-General, the Assistant Director-General and the Acting Chief of the Division for Relations with Governments and National Commissions were present.
(19) At the other seven meetings the Chairman was accompanied by the Director of the Havana Regional Office, representing the Director-General. At all meetings we had our Secretary and a representative of the Division for Relations with Governments and National Commissions.
(20) That is a short summary of the first section.
(21) The second contains a general study of the reports submitted for the years 1952-53. The Committee was able to study 58 reports in all. These reports were submitted by the following Member States: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt,

El Salvador, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Korea, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of Burma, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Viet-Nam, Yugoslavia.
(22) I will now read you the rest of the report and the draft resolution that follows it.*

(23) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Discussion of the report presented by the Rapporteur is open. If no delegate wishes to speak, I shall put it to the vote.

(24) The report and the draft resolution were adopted by 45 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

**CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION** (document 8C/ADM/35 and Appendix)

(25) I call upon Mr. Eriksson, the Rapporteur.

(26) Mr. ERIKSSON (Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission): Mr. President, fellow delegates, I shall not be able to make such an eloquent speech in presenting this report as the Rapporteur of the Committee on Reports of Member States. I will, however, mention some of the main points in the Report of the Administrative Commission.
(27) Before doing so, I will draw your attention to a few minor errors:
(28) On page 26, in the middle of the page, resolution No. 31 should read No. 32.
(29) On the last page No. 41, under (b) Part I, Chapter 2, number (v), comes a resolution or recommendation "That the Russian language be a working language of the General Conference". That paragraph should come under Part I, (a), as number (ii).
(30) I am also sorry to say that the names of the Vice-Chairmen from Egypt and Israel have been mis-spelt or wrongly typed, which of course will be corrected. I hope they will excuse those errors.
(31) I will not go into details, as all Member States had delegations on this Commission; I will simply present the report submitted to the General Conference for approval except for certain resolutions which have already been adopted by the General Conference in plenary session. I will mention those exceptions when I come to them.
(32) The Report contains six main Sections from A. to F. On page 2 you will find A. Financial Questions. I draw your attention there to the fact that the accounts and reports on Financial Business were not only accepted by the Commission, but that the Commission also congratulated the Director-General on the excellent state of the finances of the Organization, which congratulations, I feel, were particularly directed to the Comptroller of the Organization, Mr. Harper-Smith.

* The final text of the Report will be found in 8C/Resolutions (Annex 3).

(33) Let us now turn to page 3, which starts the chapter on Member States' Contributions. If you look under Scale of Contributions, you will find on page 5 a footnote saying that this resolution was adopted at the twelfth plenary meeting of the General Conference, so we do not have to take a decision on that part of the report at this meeting. We can pass directly to Currency of Contributions on page 6. You will find under Currency of Contributions that this resolution is similar to that adopted by the seventh session of the General Conference, except that Switzerland is no longer required to pay in Swiss francs, and that provision is made for the acceptance of national currencies for Member States where the Director-General considers that there is a foreseeable need for a substantial amount of that currency. I will not read the resolutions, you will find them under each chapter.
(34) The resolutions on Collection of Contributions are on pages 7 and 8. These have already been adopted by the General Conference at the twelfth plenary meeting. We can therefore turn to Administration of the Working Capital Fund - which covers page 11 and part of page 12. The Commission agreed to the various uses to which the Fund may be put during the years 1955-56 on the same basis as was approved for 1953-54, but with the addition of an item relating to any awards of compensation ordered by the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization. Certain delegates also expressed the hope that the Director General would examine the possibility of amending the Financial Regulations so as to incorporate in them the substance of the resolution proposed thereafter, instead of submitting such a resolution at each session of the General Conference.
(35) Turning to Amendments to the Financial Regulations (pages 12 and 13), the revised text that is proposed provides that cash surpluses shall not be credited to Member States who have not paid in full their contribution for the year to which the surplus relates. We also examined a resolution submitted by the delegate of Spain relating to amendments to and departures from the Financial Regulations, and considered that any departure from the Financial Regulations should be preceded by the preliminary suspension of the provision to which an exception is to be made, that no amendment to the Financial Regulations can be considered by the Conference unless the question has been placed on the agenda of the General Conference in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, and that it would be desirable to insert in the Financial Regulations a provision that the Regulations may not be amended, nor the application of one of the Regulations suspended, except by a decision taken by a two-thirds majority.
(36) On pages 13 and 14 you will find that Iran, Israel and Yugoslavia submitted requests for the writing off of losses incurred by the National Commissions of these States in acting as distributing agencies for Unesco Coupons. The Commission has agreed to these losses being written off.
(37) Methods of Financing the Budget are on pages 14 and 15 and were adopted at the twelfth plenary meeting of the General Conference.

(38) The next main Section is on Social Security Questions. This calls for little comment, but I want to mention especially that the Commission recommended the election of a Permanent Delegate to Unesco of the following Member States as representatives of the General Conference on the Unesco Staff Pensions Committee. They recommended as Members: Australia, France and Italy, and as Alternate Members: Japan, Lebanon and the United States of America.

(39) Staff Questions starts on page 19. I will first take up Personnel Recruitment Standards and Methods (pages 19 to 21). We noted there especially "... that the proposed amendments were aimed at maintaining the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity, affording the maximum security of tenure, and ensuring equitable geographical representation within the Secretariat." We also considered certain measures to enable the Director-General to improve the present situation. If you look at resolution 26.1 (and the same applies later to 29.1), you will find that we have left out the date on which these changes shall take effect. We had to do that as we were not quite sure when this meeting would take place, and it should be the date of this meeting, failing any other decision.

(40) I will then turn to page 21 - Personnel Policy, Obligations and Rights of Staff Members: Proposed Amendments to the Staff Regulations. We examined in detail the Director-General's proposals for amendments to the Staff Regulations, the purpose of which was to define more clearly the obligations and rights of staff members and to bring Unesco's personnel policy into closer conformity with that of the United Nations. In the course of the debate, the attention of the Commission was drawn to Article 13 of the Agreement between the United Nations and Unesco, which Article calls for close co-ordination in matters of personnel policy. Several delegates, while agreeing that close co-ordination was most desirable, maintained that this did not necessarily mean that the Staff Regulations of the two Organizations should be identical. Certain delegates were not sure that some of the changes were opportune and wondered if consideration of them should not be postponed until the ninth session of the General Conference. Some delegates were of the opinion that the existing Staff Regulations were adequate, but that, if the Director-General considered that certain points required clarification, it was the duty of the General Conference to clarify them. While there was some question whether there could be an exhaustive definition of the term integrity, it was pointed out that staff members had to observe certain overall standards of behaviour, and in this respect the particular attention of delegates was called to paragraph 4 of the report of the International Civil Service Advisory Board on Standards of Conduct in the International Civil Service. It was emphasized that staff members had duties and obligations as well as rights and that, although they were not required to give up their convictions, they were obliged at all times to regulate their actions in such a way as to put the interests of the Organization above their own personal interests.

(41) I also wish to mention specially that, in connexion with Regulation 9.1.1, the Director-General stated that he would make a Staff Rule providing for a Special Advisory Board, consisting of a Chairman and of four other members selected by himself in consultation with the Staff Association.

(42) On page 24 you will find that we considered a proposed resolution concerning the Statutes of the Appeals Board and one concerning recognition of the competence of International Administrative Tribunals.

(43) On page 25, we have Staff Regulations and Staff Rules as they appear in document 8C/ADM/27.

(44) The next main Section deals with Official and External Relations (page 26). We noted resolutions and recommendations of the United Nations organs concerning Unesco and discussed at some length the review by the Executive Board of the employment of subventions and also of the Directives concerning Unesco's relations with international non-governmental organizations. While approving the conclusions and recommendations of the Executive Board, the Commission decided to refer (with one exception) the proposed changes to the Directives contained in document 8C/ADM/21 back for further study by the Executive Board, with the request that it submit a report to the ninth session of the General Conference.

(45) On pages 27 and 28 you will find the results of our discussions concerning applications by international non-governmental organizations for admission to consultative arrangements with Unesco. You will find under item 33.1 the list of those which we suggest that the Conference approve, and on page 28 under 33.2, those which we suggest should be reconsidered at the ninth session of the General Conference. In that connexion the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics informed the Commission that it would raise the question of item 33.2 again in plenary session.

(46) We can now turn to Legal Questions (pages 29 to 39). We considered amendments to Article II of the Constitution, relating to the withdrawal of Member States, and approved in principle the right of Member States to withdraw by unilateral action. You will find the draft resolution under 35.1.

(47) Amendments to Article V of the Constitution relating to the composition of the Executive Board (pages 30 and 31) have already been adopted by the General Conference. The amendments to Article V, 9 and VI, 3, of the Constitution, relating to the Director-General's reports on the activities of the Organization, were also considered and you will find the resolution under 35.23.

(48) You may then turn to page 32, where I especially want to mention draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference relating to the election of members of the Executive Board, which were adopted by the General Conference, on 22 November. The Conference adopted amendments to Rule 95, paragraphs 1 and 2, Rule 95A and Rule 98. Under (b) you will find draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference relating to Associate Members. The numerous changes made in the Rules of Procedure will be found on pages 34, 35 et seq.

(49) We also, as you will find on page 33 under (c), considered draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference resulting

from the adoption of Russian as a working language of the General Conference. Under (d) you will find some miscellaneous amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. These latter amendments aim at clarifying certain points of drafting, at bringing certain rules into closer conformity with existing practice or at harmonizing the texts of certain other rules in the three languages.
(50) You may now turn to page 40, where you have General Questions under Section F. We considered and have suggested resolutions concerning the new Headquarters in Paris; but I do not think I have to go further into that.
(51) On page 41, you will find some recommendations which you had submitted to the Programme Commission, but we do not have to discuss that part here, since it will be presented to the plenary conference by the Rapporteur of the Programme Commission. I wish, however, to mention that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' delegation informed the Commission, in this connexion also, that it would take up the question of Russian as a working language of the General Conference and the Executive Board, at a plenary meeting of the General Conference.
(52) That is really all I have to say for the present about this report. I must, however, express the gratitude of all the delegations who participated in the work of the Commission to the Chairman - Dr. Beeby of New Zealand - for his excellent conduct of the Commission's work. We had some really difficult questions to deal with, and without his help we could not have disposed of them as we did.

(53) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I submit for your consideration the report which has been presented to the Conference. In view of its complexity, and the variety of subjects dealt with, I suggest that the Conference should discuss and vote on the resolutions chapter by chapter.
(54) If the Conference has no objection to this procedure, we will adopt this method, discussing each section separately and voting on the resolutions pertaining thereto. We shall therefore omit those sections containing resolutions already adopted by the Conference.
(55) I take it that this suggestion is accepted, and ask you to consider the first section of the report, dealing with Financial Questions, resolutions 15.1, 15.2, 17, 19, 20 and 21.

(56) Resolution 15.1 was adopted by 43 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

(57) Resolution 15.2 was adopted unanimously.

(58) Resolution 17 (17.1 to 17.3.5 inclusive): Currency of Contributions was adopted unanimously.

(59) Resolution 19 (19.1 to 19.5 inclusive): Administration of the Working Capital Fund was adopted by 46 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

(60) Resolution 20 (20.1 to 20.3 inclusive): Amendments to the Financial Regulations was adopted unanimously.

(61) Resolution 21 (21.1 to 21.3.1 inclusive): Losses on Exchange on Unesco Coupons was adopted by 46 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

Section B: Social Security Questions

(62) Resolution 23 (23.1 to 23.3 inclusive): Report by the Director-General on the Medical Benefits Fund was adopted by 47 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

(63) Resolution 24 (24.1 to 24.4 inclusive): Report by the Director-General on the Staff Compensation Plan for service-incurred risks was adopted unanimously.

(64) Resolution 25 (25.1 to 25.3 inclusive): Report by the Director-General on the United Nations Joint Staff Pensions Fund was adopted unanimously.

Section C: Staff Questions

(65) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of France.

(66) Mr. CABOUAT (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, I merely wish to ask that the vote be taken item by item, i.e. that we vote on resolution 26.1, taking 26.11, 26.12, 26.13, 26.14 and so on; and then vote separately on resolution 26.2 and again on resolution 26.3.

(67) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Belgium.

(68) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make a comment about the date suggested by the Rapporteur for the entry into force of the changes in the Staff Regulations which we have to consider. There appear to me to be serious objections to deciding that these changes shall take effect as from today. No private employer can change his staff regulations and make those changes applicable overnight. No civilized State would act in this way, and I scarcely think that an international organization like ours can refuse to allow a certain delay before the proposed amendments enter into effect, especially as these amendments make considerable changes in the Staff Regulations. I therefore suggest that their application be postponed until three months after the staff has been given notice of them by the usual procedure.

(69) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Does anyone wish to speak? We have to consider the motion proposed by the delegate of Belgium and seconded by the delegate of Greece. I call upon the Director-General.

(70) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President, this would, I believe, constitute a clear departure from the practice of the General Conference. In the past you have adopted amendments concerning the Executive Board, you have passed amendments to Financial Regulations, you have changed the Rules of Procedure at this Conference and I believe in every case you made them effective immediately. I think that in the mind of the Administrative

Commission when it put this proposal before you, the only thing that needed to be written in was the date of your adoption of these Regulations, and I should like to recommend most strongly that you make them effective according to the usual practice.

(71) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If no delegate wishes to speak, a vote will first be taken on the item under discussion, namely the proposal of the Belgian delegate.
(72) In the opinion of the Commission, the motion presented by the Commission should first be put to the vote. I call upon the delegate of Belgium.

(73) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, gentlemen, I feel obliged to speak again because I think we are making an error of procedure. My proposal constitutes, I think, an amendment to the proposal of the Rapporteur of this Commission, and should therefore, as I see it, be voted on before we vote on the report before us.

(74) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Very well. A vote will be taken on the amendment submitted by the Belgian delegate. It is understood that approval of this amendment will mean acceptance of a three months' delay.

(75) The amendment submitted by the Belgian delegate is rejected by 24 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.

(76) We shall now take a vote on the proposal submitted by the Rapporteur - item by item - in accordance with the French delegate's request.

(77) Resolution 26.1 - 26.15 was adopted by 44 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

(78) Resolution 26.2 was adopted by 46 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

(79) Resolution 26.3 was adopted by 47 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

(80) Resolution 28: Salary Adjustments for Staff in the Principal Officer and Director, and Professional Categories was adopted unanimously.

Resolution 29 - 29.2: Personnel Policy, Obligations and Rights of Staff Members; Proposed Amendments to the Staff Regulations.

(81) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of France.

(82) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, gentlemen, the French delegation wishes to pay tribute to the important work done by the Administrative Commission, which had a particularly heavy agenda.
(83) Whilst the French delegation agrees with most of the decisions reached by the Commission, it is obliged to express its regret and state certain reservations with regard to one vital question.
(84) The fact is that the suggested changes in the Staff Regulations, affecting the articles dealing with the obligations and rights of staff members, were adopted by the Commission without its being possible to judge what their exact repercussions would be.
(85) The concepts mentioned, in particular that of integrity, should have been defined beforehand, as the Executive Board urged. There was, in our opinion, no question of drawing up a comprehensive and watertight code of the obligations of staff members; but you will agree with us that there was room for a middle course between drawing up an out-and-out catechism and providing no definition at all of an abstract, ambiguous and inevitably controversial concept. There is, perhaps, a tendency to lose sight of one fact - that the resolutions adopted by the Administrative Commission lay down rules of conduct not only for the staff members but for the administration as well. The staff member must know whether any action he is about to perform does or does not constitute a lapse from integrity. Similarly, the administration must know whether or not any action a staff member takes or proposes to take constitutes a lapse from integrity. And this necessitates, if not actually a code, at least a guide. We wished, in the interests not only of staff members but of the reputation of the Organization itself, to determine the general features of the notion of integrity, its meaning and its scope. This was particularly necessary, we thought, because some of the provisions adopted appear to be retroactive. Our hopes and expectations in this matter were disappointed, Mr. President. That is the reason for the reservations which we have expressed and which we now repeat before the General Conference. However, we have reason to hope that our fears will be allayed, principally because the Director-General has already shown that he appreciates our contention by withdrawing some of his original proposals which we opposed in the Administrative Commission and which, of course, we do not intend to raise again at this point; and also because the Director-General has undertaken, to use his own words, to make known for the guidance of the staff the principles and criteria on which his decisions are based, and to submit those principles and criteria for the approval of the Executive Board. We are hopeful, finally, because the appeals system will continue to provide basic guarantees of justice. In this connexion, we are very pleased to see that the Appeals Board now has Statutes which will ensure its stability, the stability of its organization and the impartiality of its rulings.
(86) There is one point, however, Mr. President, which we are in honour bound to mention and on which the General Conference should, we think, state its opinion: this is the amendment to Regulation 1.7 of the Staff Regulations. This Regulation, as adopted by the Administrative Commission, states that: "Staff members may exercise the right to vote but shall not engage in any political activity which is inconsistent with or might reflect upon the independence and impartiality required by their status as international civil servants". Mr. President, we entirely agree. It is one of the prime duties of an international civil servant to take no public part in political controversies and to refrain from giving public support, in word or writing, to any political party, for such action would, as the

International Civil Service Advisory Board has said, detract from the value of his contribution to the work of an international organization. But, while we approve of this principle, we cannot accept a form of words which, even though it may not be the intention of its authors, opens the door to discrimination on the grounds of an attitude of mind. The inclusion of the words "or might reflect upon", by endorsing and legalizing what has been called the notion of potential offence, would leave room for that kind of discrimination which should, in an Organization with ideals as lofty as ours, be entirely ruled out.

(87) The use of this wording, permitting penalization of staff members on the strength of a doubt, engenders - forgive me for saying so - doubts in the public mind about the use which might be made of this weapon, a weapon perhaps as dangerous to the wielder as to the victim. Another clause adopted by the Administrative Commission, Regulation 1.4, states that staff members are not expected to give up their religious or political convictions, or their national sentiments, but that they shall at all times bear in mind the reserve and tact incumbent upon them by reason of their international status. The combination of these provisions and the order in which they appear show them to be sufficient. Sufficient, firstly, to deal with any specific deviations from the political reserve incumbent upon international civil servants; and sufficient also to eliminate the possibility of arbitrary sanctions for potential misconduct.

(88) In any case, Mr. President, we consider that the contentious phrase "or might reflect upon" ("ou qui puisse en faire douter" in the French text) should be deleted from the regulations we are now amending.

(89) For all the above reasons, we request that the French text be altered to read as follows:

"Les fonctionnaires peuvent exercer le droit de vote, mais ils ne peuvent se livrer à aucune activité qui soit incompatible avec, ou porte atteinte à, l'indépendance et l'impartialité qu'exige leur qualité de fonctionnaires internationaux".

(90) In other words, the French delegation submits a formal amendment as follows: (1) in the French text add, after the word "avec" the words "ou porte atteinte à" and (2) delete the words "ou qui puisse en faire douter". This, I am told, would simply necessitate deleting the word might in the English text.

(91) That, Mr. President, is the amendment which my delegation wishes the Conference to adopt, for the honour and reputation of the Organization.

(92) In conclusion, I need hardly add that we request a separate vote on each paragraph introducing changes in the Staff Regulations; in other words, that separate votes be taken on paragraph 29.1, on Regulation 1.4, then on Regulation 1.7, Regulation 9.1, and Regulation 9.1.1; within Regulation 9.1.1, the French delegation also requests that each sub-paragraph be voted on separately.

(93) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We now have to consider the proposed amendment. I call upon the Director-General.

(94) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the statement of the French delegate. I am in agreement with what he has said about Regulation 1.7 contained in this document under 29.12.

(95) I should like to add that we discussed in the Administrative Commission the use of the Report of the International Civil Service Advisory Board as a guide to integrity, impartiality and some of the other terms that should be interpreted and defined. I have accepted that report as the guide which I shall follow in developing more precise statements of criteria for action in connexion with the application of some of these Regulations. The Report of the International Civil Service Advisory Board, which had not been prepared at the time the paper was developed for presentation to the Conference, will be distributed to all members of the staff, and they will be told what I have told you just now about my use of it as a guide. The French delegate wanted a guide, and that is, for the moment, the guide that I shall follow.

(96) This has been the practice of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and I think it is a good practice to follow. In these circumstances, I have no objection to the amendment of this text as suggested by the French delegate.

(97) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The Director-General has expressed his approval of the French amendment. Will any delegate second it?

(98) The French amendment is seconded.

(99) I call upon the delegate of Belgium.

(100) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, gentlemen, Perseverare diabolicum est. Even though I may seem diabolical, I am at least consistent and, just as I suggested a short time ago that the date to be inserted at the beginning of this resolution should not be today's date, so I now propose formally that the date to be added to paragraph 29.1 of the resolution before you be not 8 December 1954, but some later date. Why? The Director-General's explanations, which I did not think it necessary to take up when he first spoke, did not convince me. No doubt, when your Conference decides something, the resolution takes immediate effect, because as a rule your decisions bind only the Organization or the Member States, which are all represented here. But when it is a matter of amending the Staff Regulations, not only the Organization and the Member States are involved; there is the staff as well and, as the staff is a party to the agreement, it is only right that, if the Regulations are amended, the amendments should not take effect until reasonable notice has been given. This notice, which an industrialist gives his workmen or employees, which a State gives its officials, should also be given by an international organization of the standing of Unesco.

(101) For that reason, gentlemen, I must once more urge that the date to be inserted in paragraph 29.1 be later than today (8 December 1954), and be such as to allow sufficient time for the staff to be notified.

(102) Moreover, I note that, when the Director-General informs the staff of amendments to the Regulations, he takes care to leave a certain interval between the date on which the document is drawn up and the date on which it becomes effective. As proof of this, take document 8C/ADM/27, which

we have approved and which you will have to approve again in a few minutes. This document, which was printed and distributed to Member States in October 1954, stipulates: "These rules shall be effective 1 November 1954" (Rule 112.2). On this occasion, the Director-General found it necessary to notify the staff and give them a month's warning.
(103) It is, I think, only right to allow an interval to elapse between the adoption of our resolution and its coming into force.
(104) When a country passes a law, it does not become applicable until it has been published in the Official Gazette and until a certain period has elapsed after the date of that publication. I see no reason why our international organization should depart from a principle of public law which is accepted in all civilized legal systems.

(105) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the United States of America.

(106) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America): Mr. President, I first of all would like to state that my delegation supports the amendment introduced by the distinguished representative of France. The intervention of the honourable representative of Belgium, I regret to say, surprises us a little, for this very meeting only a few minutes ago made it clear that its vote on other Staff Regulations, and I repeat Staff Regulations, should become effective immediately, and we do not see why some of these changes in the Staff Regulations which you have just approved should become operative at once, while others, which we are still considering, should become operative later. It would create a situation which would be, to say the least, confusing. Moreover, it has always been our understanding that the adjustments which are being made to the Regulations now before us do little more than clarify the powers of the Director-General. For these reasons, we strongly support, for the sake of consistency and good administration, the views put forward by our Director-General and we hope that this plenary meeting of the Conference will not accede to the proposal made by the distinguished representative of Belgium.

(107) The PRESIDENT (Translation from Spanish): Has any delegate seconded the motion of the Belgian delegate?
(108) It has been seconded. We shall now take a vote on the amendment proposed by the Belgian delegate.

(109) The amendment is rejected by 25 votes to 15, with 11 abstentions.

(110) Accordingly, the date inserted will be 8 December.

(111) Paragraph 29.11, Regulation 1.4 was voted upon and adopted by 38 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

(112) Paragraph 29.12, Regulation 1.7, with the amendment proposed by the French delegate, supported by the Director-General and by other delegates, was adopted by 41 votes to 0, with 9 abstentions.

(113) Paragraph 29.13, Regulation 9.1, was adopted by 42 votes to 0, with 8 abstentions.

(114) Paragraph 29.14, Regulation 9.1.1, sub-paragraph (a), was adopted by 34 votes to 0, with 14 abstentions.

(115) Paragraph 29.14, sub-paragraph (b), was adopted by 31 votes to 7, with 12 abstentions.

(116) Paragraph 29.14, the last sub-paragraph, reading: "No termination ... shall take effect," etc. was adopted by 48 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

(117) Paragraph 29.15, Regulation 9.3, was adopted by 45 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions.

(118) Resolution 29.2 was adopted by 47 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

(119) Resolution 30: Statutes of the Appeals Board was adopted by 48 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

(120) Resolution 31 - 31.2: Recognition of the Competence of International Administrative Tribunals was adopted by 49 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

Section D: Official and External Relations

(121) Draft resolution 32 (32.1 to 32.5 inclusive) was adopted unanimously.

Recommendations of the Executive Board regarding applications by international non-governmental organizations for admission to consultative arrangements.

(122) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the USSR.

(123) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, gentlemen, as regards draft resolution 33, submitted by the Administrative Commission, the Soviet delegation would like to dwell for a moment on two recommendations of the Commission, in connexion with the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth. These two organizations have applied for consultative arrangements with Unesco. The Administrative Commission, after considering the matter, took what we consider a wrong decision. The decision was to postpone consideration of the applications of these two organizations until the ninth session of the General Conference; I may mention, incidentally, that, during the discussion of this question in the Administrative Commission, those who proposed postponing decision until the ninth session adduced no arguments proving the need for so doing. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, there are no grounds at all for postponement until the next session. It is common knowledge that the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth play an active part in the development of international co-operation in the very fields with

which Unesco also is concerned: the fields of education, science and culture. Accordingly, in view of the widely representative character of both these organizations and the contribution they can make to the achievement of Unesco's aims, the Soviet Union supports the applications of both organizations for consultative arrangements with Unesco.
(124) At the same time, I should like to recall that all those here present are well aware that both the organizations in question have already taken an active part in Unesco's work, and have had consultative arrangements. The Soviet delegation therefore submits for the consideration of the plenary meeting a proposal to the effect that the International Union and the World Federation be accepted for consultative arrangements.

(125) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The delegate of Czechoslovakia seconds the draft amendment submitted by the delegate of the USSR.
(126) If no delegate wishes to speak, a vote will be taken on the proposed amendment.

(127) The amendment is rejected by 35 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

(128) A vote will now be taken on the draft resolution as submitted by the Commission.

(129) Resolution 33 - 33.2 is adopted by 41 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

(130) Resolution 34 - 34.2: Renewal of formal agreements concluded with non-governmental organizations was adopted unanimously.

Section E: Legal Questions

(131) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We now come to resolution 35.1. This is an amendment to Article II, consisting of the addition of a new paragraph 6, and is given on page 30 of the English text. A two-thirds majority is needed for this amendment.

(132) The amendment is adopted by 48 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

(133) We now pass to paragraph 35.23: paragraph 9 of Article V will be replaced by the passage appearing on page 31 of the English text, reading as follows: "The Chairman of the Executive Board shall present, on behalf of the Board, to each ordinary session of the General Conference, with or without comments, the reports on the activities of the Organization which the Director-General is required to prepare in accordance with the provisions of Article VI.3.b.".

(134) This draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

(135) Resolution 35.3: Amendment to Article VI: paragraph 3 of Article VI to be replaced by the text appearing on page 32 of the English version of the document.

(136) The draft resolution was adopted unanimously, as was also resolution 36.

(137) Resolution 37 (37.1 to 37.31 and 37.35 to 37.38) was adopted unanimously.

Section F: General Questions: Reports of the Headquarters Committee on the progress of the project (document 8C/ADM/24)

(138) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of France.

(139) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, it is stated in the report of the Administrative Commission that the Commission took note of the Director-General's report on the Headquarters Agreement between the French Government and the Organization.
(140) Now that the first stone of Unesco's permanent headquarters building is about to be laid in the very heart of Paris, I should like to repeat, on behalf of the French delegation, how proud and happy our country is that the international palace of education, science and culture is being built on her soil.
(141) If the French Government, when signing the Headquarters Agreement, consented to substantial limitations on its national sovereignty, it was because it was fully conscious of the great compliment which 72 States were paying to France. I am able to confirm that the French parliament now has before it the text of the Headquarters Agreement signed on 2 July last by the Director-General and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The French delegation hopes that this agreement will very soon be ratified.

(142) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Director-General.

(143) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President, I should like to thank the French delegate for what he has said and to assure this Conference that the Secretariat's relations with the French Government in this matter are a cause of great satisfaction to me. If you knew the details of our negotiations and the concessions which the French Government has made, you would be happy indeed and would applaud the wonderful spirit of co-operation and of hospitality which has been shown us by the French Government.

(144) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If no delegate wishes to speak, a vote will be taken on draft resolution No. 40 - 40.3.

(145) This resolution is adopted unanimously.

(146) I call upon the delegate of the USSR.

(147) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, at the beginning of our work today on the report of the Administrative Commission, the Soviet delegation, as you remember, stated that it would submit two questions for consideration by the plenary meeting. The first question we have

already discussed; the second concerns the adoption of Russian as a working language of the Executive Board. I should like now to deal with this second question since, I understand, we have come to the end of our consideration of one section, so that I can now take up this matter without interfering with the rest of our work.

(148) The Soviet delegation thinks it very important, from the point of view of the Soviet Union's contribution to the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, that Russian should be, not only a working language of the General Conference, as has already been decided, but also a working language of the Executive Board. In this connexion, it is essential, apart from everything else, to bear practical considerations in mind, since the Executive Board will meet several times a year, i.e. five, or sometimes even six times in the period between the sessions of the General Conference, and discuss a whole series of important practical questions directly bearing on the work of our Organization.

(149) As you know, a representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Solodovnikov, has been elected to membership of the Executive Board, which, I think, in itself gives a practical significance to the problem of making Russian a working language of the Board.

(150) Some people have said that attention must be paid to the financial cost which this step would involve. In my opinion, delegates, account must also be taken of another very important fact - namely that the Russian-speaking delegations (the delegations of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian and the Byelorussian Republics) pay, in accordance with the scale of contributions laid down by the General Conference, the sum of $2,853,000 over the two-year period - a large sum, nearly $3,000,000 in two years. On the other hand, the cost of making Russian a working language of the Executive Board would be only $49,000 - $49,000 over two years. In other words, the cost of making Russian a working language of the Board would represent a mere fraction of the contributions paid by these three delegations. To say nothing of the fact that a number of other delegations, which also pay large contributions to our Organization, are interested in seeing Russian become a working language of the Executive Board, as they stated quite clearly when this question was discussed in the Administrative Commission.

(151) Thus, the financial costs, if it is a matter of that, are, as you see, very small. As regards the general importance of the Russian language and the development of world culture, I do not think I should waste the time of the delegates to this Conference by enlarging on the subject, since every person active in the fields of science, culture, literature and education knows very well, without any discourse from me, the importance of the part which the Russian language has played and is playing in the development of world culture. Moreover, we should take account of the fact that in the United Nations, for instance, Russian ranks as a practical working language along with the other official languages of the Organization. We are asking that the documents of the Executive Board be printed in the Russian language and that, at the meetings of the Board, there be interpretation into Russian and, when our representative speaks, from Russian into the other languages. All this is done in the United Nations, in all seven Committees and in the plenary meetings; it is also done in the United Nations councils, such as the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council, not to speak of the many commissions set up by the General Assembly itself and by the Councils of the United Nations. Thus, though we are told, as we often are, that we follow the example set by the United Nations, we are in fact, in this matter, lagging considerably behind the practices already adopted by the United Nations in regard to the Russian language.

(152) The delegation of the Soviet Union therefore hopes that the following draft resolution will be favourably received and adopted by the General Conference:

The General Conference,

"Decides that the Russian language shall be one of the working languages of the Executive Board."

(153) In this connexion, I do not need to make special mention of the fact that, when the question of making Spanish a working language of the Executive Board was being discussed, the Soviet delegation supported that proposal long before the question came up before the General Conference, i.e. in July of this year after the Soviet Union joined Unesco. Nor do I need to point out that a favourable decision on this question, i.e. on the question of making Russian a working language of the Executive Board, will constitute proof of the fact that the majority of the Member States of Unesco attach real and profound significance to the development of practical co-operation amongst the members of our Organization.

(154) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I was glad to call upon the delegate of the USSR to speak on this question, but the Secretariat informs me that the matter raised by the delegate of the USSR is already being studied by the Programme and Budget Commission, which will submit its report, when ready, to the plenary Conference.

(155) I therefore feel, if the Conference has no objection, that we must postpone discussion of this question until the Programme and Budget Commission submits its report for consideration by the plenary meeting.

(156) I call upon the delegate of Ecuador.

(157) Mr. TERAN ROBALINO (Ecuador) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, with regard to the report which the Conference has been discussing this afternoon, the delegation of Ecuador wishes merely to mention one particularly important point - the resolution whereby Article V of the Unesco Constitution, concerning the composition of the Executive Board, was amended. Since the delegation of Ecuador was not present at the plenary meeting at which those amendments were passed, I would like to take this opportunity of stating the position of my country and my Government on this fundamental issue. The delegation of Ecuador earnestly requests that it be stated in the records of this meeting that Ecuador endorses the stand taken by those delegations which opposed the amendments to Article V of the Constitution.

(158) Ecuador wishes to add its voice to the wise and authoritative protests of those countries which opposed the amendments. The President of Ecuador, Dr. Velazco Ibarra, a statesman and a man of wide culture, interprets the spiritual values and the national genius of his country with real authority and fervent conviction. Ecuador and its Government have therefore, from the very first, held the view that the amendments to Article V might in practice compromise the principles for which this lofty institution of the United Nations was established.
(159) The delegation of Ecuador trusts that Unesco will, nevertheless, always stand fast by the true and genuine virtues of its early days and that, notwithstanding the political interests of the moment, the enduring values of culture, science and education will continue to guide the thought and action of the Organization.

(160) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the USSR.

(161) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, I should like to clear up the position as regards the use of Russian as a working language of the Executive Board. After I had spoken, you stated that this question is to be discussed by the Programme and Budget Commission. The fact is that the question of the use of Russian as a working language of the General Conference was discussed in the Administrative Commission and that, in accordance with the resolution adopted by that Commission, a decision was then taken by the plenary meeting of the General Conference. If the position now is that this question is being discussed or will be discussed, as the Secretariat states, by the Programme and Budget Commission, the Soviet delegation would like to know when that discussion is to take place.

(162) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Sir, according to the Secretariat, the procedure might be to refer the proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(163) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, if I have understood your explanation aright, you are proposing that the plenary Conference should refer this question for consideration by the Programme and Budget Commission. If this is the case, the Soviet delegation has no objection to this question first being considered by the Programme and Budget Commission, but would like to know when this will be done, and whether it can be done tomorrow.

(164) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Very well. I will transmit the request of the delegate of the USSR to the Programme and Budget Commission, which will discuss this question tomorrow, so that it can report immediately to the plenary Conference.
(165) I call upon the delegate of the United States of America.

(166) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America): Mr. President, I am sorry to have to raise a point of order on this matter, but it is one, I hope, that will not delay but may perhaps expedite our business. It seems to my delegation that some error was committed in the presentation of this report. The paragraphs on the last page of the report which deal with Working Languages are paragraphs which were fully discussed in the Administrative Commission, to which these questions had been referred. They were discussed, they were voted on and, as such, they should be presented to the plenary Conference as recommendations of the Administrative Commission and not as something that has to go to yet another committee - the Programme and Budget Commission. It is, in our opinion, obviously out of order and would lead to unending confusion if matters which had already been decided, and clearly decided, in one committee, were to be referred to another of the major committees before they can come to us here. This is the kind of duplication that we think should be avoided and, without taking any position on the substance of the issue, I would think that the distinguished representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be as well satisfied as anybody else if this matter could be settled here and now.

(167) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Administrative Commission.

(168) Mr. BEEBY (Chairman of the Administrative Commission): Mr. President, can I perhaps help to simplify this situation? It so happens that the question of working languages was referred to the Administrative Commission in two separate items of its agenda. If you take item 9.2 of the revised agenda, you find there, Examination of the Report of the Advisory Committee on Parts I, III and IV of the budget, and Report to the Programme Commission. Now, Part III of the budget included the item on working languages, presumably on the cost of those working languages, and since that was its first appearance before our Commission, we discussed it then and reported to the Programme Commission on it. You may remember that, when the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission was presenting his report to the plenary meeting, it was decided that that portion should be postponed. But if you look at item 9.8 of our revised agenda, you will find the whole subject of a heading is Working Languages; thus we had to report directly to this body on working languages. So I think, Mr. President, that you will be quite in order in accepting a debate here, or a recognition here of the principle of working languages, since we had the right and the duty to report to you directly, although we also had to report to the Programme Commission under the other item of our agenda.

(169) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): In accordance with the information we have now been given, I think that, as we are already in possession of reports from the Administrative Commission, we can study and vote on the Soviet delegate's proposal at this meeting, provided that the Conference agrees to this procedure.

(170) I call upon the delegate of Poland.

(171) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) (Translation from the Russian): In view of your decision, I should like, on behalf of the Polish delegation, warmly to support the Soviet delegation's proposal regarding the acceptance of Russian as a working language, not only of the General Conference, but of the Executive Board of Unesco as well. I should like to point out that the language of the great Russian nation is, at the present day, the international language not only of the peoples of the Soviet Union, but also of a large number of other countries; and serves as the vehicle of communication at many conferences for international co-operation and cultural relations. Many of the countries where the knowledge of Russian is widespread are now Members of our Organization. We therefore see no reason for putting Russian on a different footing from the other working languages of Unesco. On these grounds, the Polish delegation supports the Soviet proposal, and will vote for its adoption.

(172) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of China.

(173) Mr. CHEN YUAN (China): Mr. President, fellow delegates, the Chinese delegation was opposed to the adoption of Russian as a working language for the General Conference, and is still more opposed to its adoption for the Executive Board. The arguments advanced for adoption of Russian seem to us unconvincing and unjustified. One is that Russian is a great language. We do not wish to deny that. No one will deny that the language of Tolstoy and Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Tchekhov is a great language. But there are many great languages in the world. There is the language of Dante and Petrarch; there is the language of Goethe, Schiller and Heine, and there is the language of Confucius and Lao-Tsu, of Chuang-Tsu, of Chu-Yuan, of Li Po and Tu Fu. There are many other great languages. If all great languages were to be made into working languages of Unesco or the General Conference, the number would be very large indeed. It would be quite impossible to make the system work.

(174) Another argument is that Unesco should follow the United Nations. But five languages are used in the United Nations and there is no proposal to use all of the five in Unesco.

(175) The only justifiable argument in favour of adopting a language as a working language, is that it meets the convenience of a large number of delegates and delegations. That is why my delegation warmly supported the adoption of Spanish as a working language. It is not because the language of Cervantes and Calderón is a great language. It is not because Spanish is used in the United Nations. It was only for the reason that Spanish is the mother tongue of about 20 Member States of Unesco that we supported the proposal whole-heartedly.

(176) If the convenience of a number of delegations is to be the criterion, we believe that Arabic should take precedence of Russian, as there are, I believe 6 or 7 Member States whose mother tongue is Arabic and only 3 whose mother tongue is Russian.

(177) As for the Executive Board, we cannot see a shadow of a reason for making Russian a working language. It is true that, after the elections of yesterday, there is now a Russian member on the Executive Board, but he is the only member who speaks Russian. I find that at least 16 native languages are spoken by the 22 members of the Executive Board. Any one of the three working languages now adopted is spoken by a large number of members of the Executive Board - more or less perhaps. It is sheer arrogance to demand that one language out of the other thirteen, spoken by only one of the 22 members, should be singled out to be made into an additional working language. Apart from the large expense and the waste of time involved, the proposal cannot be accepted in principle on any grounds. Therefore, my delegation is strongly opposed to the proposal to make Russian a working language of the Executive Board.

(178) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Rapporteur.

(179) Mr. ERIKSSON (Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission): I would like to suggest that the two paragraphs on page 41 concerning the Spanish and Russian languages can stand as they are. The text is as it was contained in the recommendations to the Programme Commission. But we can add to page 40, under the last section there, a new Section III, which would read: "Adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board", and then, as a draft resolution, take the text from page 41 "That henceforth, the Spanish language be one of the working languages of the Executive Board." That should, in that case, be resolution No. 41.

(180) Then we could add another Section IV "Adoption of Russian as a Working Language of Unesco". The resolution would become No. 42 and would read: "That the Russian language be a working language of the General Conference". I think that is the simplest way to settle this question.

(181) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the Legal Adviser.

(182) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, gentlemen, I wish merely to point out that, so far as the use of Russian as a working language of the General Conference is concerned, you have already adopted texts amending the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference to make Russian a working language of the General Conference in the same way as French, English and Spanish. This point is already covered by the vote you have taken.

(183) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Czechoslovakia.

(184) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, the Czechoslovak delegation wishes to support the proposal of the Soviet delegation to the effect that Russian be made a language of the Executive Board. For the peoples of the greater part of Europe, Russian constitutes

the first international language, the first language for international intercourse. For these peoples, therefore, participation in Unesco's work would be immensely facilitated if all the documents of the Organization, including those of the Executive Board, were issued in Russian. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore supports the request that Russian be made a language of the Executive Board.

(185) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The debate continues. I call upon the Director-General.

(186) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President: As you know, this is my first General Conference since becoming Director-General and I have not been able to find in the Constitution and in the Rules and Regulations of the Organization a clear definition of what the duty of the Director-General is in relation to political issues, as well as certain issues of substance which are not political, and many other issues that are before the Executive Board and the General Conference. Hence, if I am out of order in making a suggestion here, I assure you that it is for the purpose of trying to help this Conference make Unesco a unified, a harmonious, Organization; it is for the purpose of promoting coexistence, which all of you have approved as a principle, and it is also for the purpose of helping solve a budget problem. I feel sure that some of you who are thinking about this problem, are wondering what projects the Programme Commission would have to cut out in order to find $49,000. I therefore take the liberty of presenting to you for consideration a compromise text which may possibly facilitate the work of the Conference. It is as follows: "The General Conference authorizes the Director-General, subject to the approval of transfers for this purpose by the Executive Board, to provide the services of interpretation and translation from and into the Russian language, necessary for the effective participation of any member of the Executive Board in the work of the Board". Let me explain that the sum transferred should be less than the $49,000 and all money spent would be subject to the prior approval of the Executive Board. Now the Executive Board, under the Constitution, has the power - subject to the instructions of the General Conference - to make its own Rules of Procedure, so that it would have to do two things: it would have to change its Rules of Procedure and it would have to grant the necessary funds by transfer. This would leave the budget as it comes from the hands of the Programme Commission to you tomorrow, undisturbed. I understand that the Programme Commission has already voted the Appropriation Resolution and it would be difficult to get that matter reopened, but, by the means I have suggested, that would be unnecessary and the Board would be left to judge the matter on its merits before any action were taken.

(187) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of India.

(188) Dr. MUDALIAR (India): At this almost final stage of our Conference, which has ended in every one of its Commissions in a harmonious spirit, the delegation of India is most anxious that nothing shall disturb the tranquillity with which we have so far conducted our proceedings. It is with that conviction, and in the hope that what I have to say may appeal to all of you, that I have requested the President to allow me a few minutes to speak on this question. My task has been considerably lightened by the proposal that the Director-General has been pleased to make - a proposal with which my delegation fully agrees.
(189) If I may be permitted to say so, the position is one of difficulty, not because we do not recognize the importance of the language, not for any of those considerations that have unfortunately crept into this discussion, but because we feel, as the Director-General has already told you, that the Programme and Budget Commission has completed its labours, and that anything done at this late date would unfortunately disturb the programme and budget to a considerable extent.
(190) If you will permit me to use my experience in other international organizations where a somewhat similar situation arose, it has been found possible to satisfy the delegates of the Executive Board in the matter of interpretation by an interpreter sitting beside the person who spoke, and by providing all facilities for the interpretation of certain documents. This is not a final solution, nor do I suggest that the question should not be examined and submitted to the ninth session of the Conference. One thing I suggest is that, having accepted Russian as an official language of the General Conference under Rule 52 - Working Languages, this Conference should place Russian as one of the working languages at the General Conference beside English, French and Spanish. I would appeal to my friends who wish Russian to be introduced as a working language in the Executive Board, that they kindly consider the difficulties of the present situation and accept the proposal of the Director-General as a compromise. This would enable them to see later after the ninth session, whether they can have it as a working language for the Executive Board. In so saying I am trying to avoid a situation which may give rise to a feeling that there has been some lack of appreciation of the position adopted by the Soviet delegation. In that manner I would appeal to them to consider the possibility of accepting the suggestion by the Director-General.

(191) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Uruguay.

(192) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I asked to speak before I knew that the delegate of India was going to make the speech he has just made; for our position resembles his so closely that we are actually working on a proposal similar to that submitted by the Director-General. The position, as we see it, is as follows: it is not a question of comparing Russian with other languages that might be used by Unesco. It is a case of striving for a realistic understanding of the question, in the light of the fact that Russian has been adopted as a fourth working language of the

General Conference. This, sooner or later, must have repercussions in other sectors of the administration of Unesco. It is my belief that, once a language has been accepted as a working language of the General Conference, it must inevitably, in the long run, end by making its way into the work of the Executive Board as well. This is a fact.

(193) And this is precisely what has happened with Spanish. There was a time when Spanish was a working language of the General Conference, but not of the Executive Board. We Spanish-speaking delegates have gradually, thanks to the understanding attitude of our colleagues on the Executive Board, secured full recognition of Spanish as a working language of the Board.

(194) I remember being present at the meeting of the Administrative Commission at which the question of Russian was discussed. It was said at that time that Russian would have to wait, as Spanish had done, to gain acceptance in the Executive Board. I must admit that this argument does not convince me. We who had to pay the price of passing through these slow stages do not wish to force any other working language to go through the same process.

(195) In our view, the fact that a language is used in the General Conference but not yet in the Executive Board in no sense implies any sort of slight on the country concerned. But we do, in this instance, think that the adoption of Russian as a language of the Executive Board should be facilitated.

(196) The Administrative Commission discussed this question at a time when it was still uncertain whether or not the USSR would be represented on the Executive Board; and I have no doubt that this circumstance influenced the views of many delegates. Now, the position has changed: we are faced not with a possibility, but with a fact. But there is a very serious financial objection to this claim for the use of Russian. There can be no question of our sacrificing important sections of our programme in order to find the sum of $50,000 which represents the estimated cost of the adoption of Russian.

(197) I consider, therefore, that the best solution at the moment, the most equitable one, and the one best calculated to avoid all difficulties, is to follow the course indicated in the motion which has just been submitted by the Director-General, and which we endorse.

(198) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Hungary.

(199) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, whilst entirely agreeing with the spirit of the remarks made by the Director-General and the delegate of India, I am deeply convinced that the adoption of Russian as a working language both of the General Conference and of the Executive Board would be most useful and conducive to the growth of co-operation and mutual understanding among the Member States of Unesco.

(200) The delegate of Cuba, amidst warm applause, expressed his pleasure that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with its outstanding literary tradition, is here with us. We must, I think, draw the logical conclusions.

(201) Some delegates, in the Administrative Commission, suggested that the delegation of the USSR should speak in the languages of other Member States. But those delegates were forgetting that Russian is the medium of communication between dozens of nations and that there are among us many delegates who wish to take Russian as their working language.

(202) I myself am Hungarian, and it gives me pleasure to speak in Spanish; but there is no reason to thwart the many other delegates who wish to use Russian.

(203) We delegates to the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco have said much about the universality of Unesco, the strengthening of ties between the peoples, and mutual understanding; in my opinion, the way to promote those ideals in Unesco is to open the doors to all science and culture worthy of the name, so that Unesco becomes a veritable focus for the lofty ideals of mankind. Russian culture, literature and science enshrine some of the greatest treasures of mankind, and I think it is incumbent on Unesco to see that those treasures are used. For all these reasons, I propose that the General Conference adopt Russian as a working language.

(204) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the United States of America.

(205) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America): Mr. President, on this stand fifteen minutes ago, I had the honour to suggest that we ought to tackle this question, which was reintroduced by the distinguished representative of the USSR, this very evening, and I am glad that you permitted the discussion to go on after that intervention.

(206) When I made the suggestion, it was, of course, on the understanding that we would vote on the concise proposal which had been discussed earlier in the Administrative Commission, and which had been reintroduced by the distinguished representative of Soviet Russia. We are now, however, confronted with a new situation. The Director-General has put before this plenary meeting a resolution, and a rather complicated resolution. Frankly, my delegation has not been able to grasp its full import. We do not know whether we are now talking about the Russian language, or whether we are talking about the language of any of the Executive Board who do not speak English, French or Spanish. Under these circumstances, Mr. President, it seems to us, again without taking a position on the Director-General's proposal, that this proposal should be presented to the Conference in writing and that the final vote be postponed until the next plenary meeting. That is the proposal I would like to put forward.

(207) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Since this is a procedural motion, it takes precedence. The motion is that the proposal be circulated in writing, and that the discussion on it be postponed until the next plenary meeting. I call on the delegate of the USSR.

(208) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, I, evidently, am also speaking on a procedural motion; that is why I took the floor. To begin with, I would like to point out that, speaking on a point of order, I have in any case the right to reply before we take a decision on the question raised by the representative of the United States of America; and since I have that right, I shall continue to speak, in this instance, about the substance of the question, and not about the procedure to be adopted at this meeting.

(209) The Soviet delegation does not think it necessary here to dwell on the unworthy manoeuvres countenanced by a person who has no country and who is, naturally, indifferent to the fate of Unesco and to whether or not it is successful in developing and strengthening international co-operation in the realms of education, science and culture. We consider it unworthy to dwell on his speech, even as we consider it unworthy that this gentleman should be present in our Organization.

(210) I come now to the substance of the question. The Soviet delegation is grateful to those delegations which have spoken here in support of the proposal to make Russian a working language of the Executive Board of Unesco. We are grateful also to those delegations which have taken up an understanding attitude towards our proposal. I have in mind, firstly, the Indian and Uruguayan delegations. I would also like to make special mention, in this connexion, of the spirit of co-operation and goodwill displayed by the Director-General of Unesco who, in our view, is doing everything in his power to solve this problem on the basis of the real needs of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization - which he is, of course, better placed to appreciate than are other persons who are not so closely and directly concerned with the practical work of our Organization. The Soviet delegation of course considers that the correct decision would be to accept Russian as a working language of the Executive Board, and no objections can be adduced against this perfectly legitimate arrangement. But at the same time we understand the practical difficulties in the way of an affirmative decision on this issue.

(211) In this connexion, I am empowered by the Soviet delegation to state that, in view of the fact that it is impossible, at the present moment, to take a final decision on the subject of the use of Russian as a working language of the Executive Board, the Soviet delegation is not opposed to the proposal which was submitted by the Director-General of our Organization and which, as we understand the text, refers quite clearly to the Russian language. It runs as follows:

"The General Conference

Authorizes the Director-General, subject to the approval of transfers for this purpose by the Executive Board, to provide the necessary services of interpretation and translation from and into the Russian language, for the effective participation of any member of the Executive Board in the work of the Board".

(212) It is thus absolutely clear, from this proposal, that it is a case of the Russian language: so that the doubts expressed by one of the delegates here are, as you see, completely groundless.

(213) Such are the comments I wished to make on the speeches which dealt with this subject. We consider that, at the present moment, a positive decision on the basis proposed by the Director-General would serve to promote the co-operation about which we have been talking so much at this meeting.

(214) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Australia.

(215) Mr. KELLY (Australia): Mr. President, on behalf of the Australian delegation, I rise to support postponement of the discussion of this question, and I do so for a number of reasons, one of the most important of which is this - that the speaker who immediately preceded me introduced for the first time into this Assembly a note of personal attack which I, for one, deplore. I speak as a citizen of a free country that has welcomed to its shores the free citizens of other lands, no matter what their home language.

(216) Secondly, I support the adjournment of this debate for the reason that my delegation has not had time to see the actual text of the motion initiated by the Director-General. I also support adjournment because I feel that such an alternative proposal might well have been placed at some stage before the Administrative Commission, which spent much time discussing this proposal. A suggestion not put before delegates in writing cannot now receive full consideration, and it is a proposal which requires consideration, not only as a gesture of sympathy towards a great people - and the Russian people are a great people - but chiefly and principally because we are not now discussing the extension of Russian as a medium of culture throughout the world. We are discussing simply the more efficient operation of our Executive Board. And I find that, on that Board, there is only one representative who can claim Russian as his home language. I wonder, speaking of this proposal, whether some other delegate may not propose that Portuguese be also adopted as a working language of the Executive Board, and thus pay homage to two great peoples, the peoples of Portugal and of Brazil. I look at the Executive Board, and I find on it many representatives, Moslem and Christian, of the Arabic-speaking peoples, and I wonder if at this late hour someone else may not propose the adoption of Arabic, partially or wholly, as a working language of the Executive Board.

(217) This is a practical issue which must be studied by delegates in the light of the actual working requirements of the Executive Board. The Director-General's suggestion requires further consideration, and I therefore invite you to support the proposal for the adjournment of this debate.

(218) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We shall now take a vote. Since one representative has spoken in favour, and one against, we shall now, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, take a vote on the motion of

the United States delegate for adjournment of the debate on this question.
(219) For the information of the delegate of the USSR, I would point out that the Rules of Procedure require that motions which have precedence shall be voted on after one representative has spoken in favour, and one against. As this has been done, the President must take a vote on the motion. We shall now vote on the motion of the delegate of the United States of America, that the debate on the Director-General's proposal be adjourned until the plenary meeting tomorrow.
(220) I call upon the delegate of the USSR.

(221) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, I evidently misunderstood the position, since in fact I was speaking not on a point of order, but in reply to the speeches which were made here on the subject of our proposal. Hence no objection was raised by the Soviet delegation to adjourning the debate on this subject.

(222) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We shall now take a vote on the motion for adjournment proposed by the delegate of the United States of America.

(223) The motion for adjournment is adopted by 48 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

(224) A vote will now be taken on the new resolution 41, dealing with adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board.

(225) Resolution 41 is adopted by 48 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.

# SEVENTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

*10 December 1954 at 10.45 a.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Consideration of draft resolution concerning the use of the Russian language at the Executive Board (documents 8C/DR/124 rev. and 126). . . . . 210
Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Administrative Commission (continued) . . . . . 214
Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (documents 8C/PRG/30 and 8C/BUD/6 rev. 2). . . . . 214
Need for making Unesco a global organization (documents 8C/DR/4 and Add., 8C/DR/120 and 8C/DR/128). . . . . 221

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The General Committee announces that the newly elected Executive Board will hold its first meeting and elect its Chairman at 9.30 tomorrow morning, in Room 2.

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE USE OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AT THE EXECUTIVE BOARD (documents 8C/DR/124 rev. and 126)**

(2) I call upon the delegate of India.

(3) Dr. MUDALIAR (India): Mr. President and fellow delegates: the draft resolution that my delegation has the honour to submit for the consideration of this plenary meeting, runs as follows:

"The General Conference authorizes the Director-General, subject to the approval of transfers for this purpose by the Executive Board, to provide the necessary services of interpretation and translation from and into the Russian language to the extent compatible with the efficient operation of the Board for the effective participation of any member of the Executive Board in the work of the Board."

(4) When we adjourned late on Thursday, it was felt that a document should be made available in all

the languages to the delegates concerned so that they might have the opportunity of studying it closely and noting its implications. We had then come to face two questions. The first was: should the Russian language, in some form or other, or interpretation into the Russian language, be made available at meetings of the Executive Board? The second and equally important question was: what would be the international implications if this suggestion were accepted?

(5) My delegation has given considerable thought to both these questions, and we feel that we may submit to you our tentative conclusions on each. With regard to the use of Russian in meetings of the Executive Board, we note that, on the recommendation of the Administrative Commission, the General Conference has already accepted the proposition that Russian should be one of the four languages for the General Conference. This important conclusion has been arrived at and accepted at a plenary meeting.

(6) The next point for your consideration is that, at the time when the Administrative Commission recommended this, and the Plenary Conference accepted the position, it was evident that no such conclusion could apply to meetings of the Executive Board. The elections to the Executive Board had not then taken place, and it would certainly not have been appropriate at that stage, even if it was not premature, to consider any other aspect of the use of the languages of the Executive Board. Since then, the new Executive Board has been constituted, and my delegation knows that there is one representative who speaks only Russian and would therefore not be in a position to understand any of the three languages. From a purely practical point of view, therefore, avoiding all sentiment, my delegation felt that, if the Executive Board were to work smoothly and satisfactorily, and that if every member of the Board was to contribute his best to the conclusions that are to be arrived at, it was necessary, nay, inevitable that some means must be provided to interpret, for the sake of the member concerned, the only language with which he was familiar. At the same time, we were certainly concerned about the implications, in so far as the programme and budget activities are concerned. We also noted that, at conferences where intergovernmental organizations met, the Russian language was used for this purpose in interpretation and translation, and the document that has been circulated to all the members will bear evidence of the fact that it has been so used. Apart from this we came to the conclusion that we should study the financial implications of the use of the Russian language. Here may I say that we appreciated the attitude of the Russian delegate, who accepted our position that it must, for a period of two years, be a limited use of Russian in regard to interpretation and translation from and into that language.

(7) The original estimate of the Secretariat was that this would amount to a sum very near $49,000. I am not in a position to state what the exact figures would be for the two-year period, but I can state with some amount of confidence, having noted the international implications when this procedure was adopted in a sister organization, that it will be considerably less than the figure quoted above. We have now been trying to see how this amount can be satisfactorily provided. On looking at the composition of the Executive Board, we find that, while a sum of $12,000 was provided for and accepted by the plenary meeting, two delegates have now been added to the original figure of twenty. In actual analysis we found that the Executive Board consists of the same number of members from the various regions, except for one region. The number of members from Latin America, from North America, from the Middle East, from South East Asia and from Africa below the Sahara desert, is exactly the same as in the twenty member Executive Board. We therefore assume that the travel cost of these delegates would not be more. We then come to the two additional members and we find that these are from Member States which are as near to Headquarters as is possible, and therefore, from that one point of view, we have deduced, on a rough calculation, that the saving will be something like $7,000, at least.

(8) I wish also to refer to another document submitted for the approval of this plenary meeting; it is 8C/ADM/35 Corr., which says: "That every effort shall be made by the Executive Board, in co-operation with the Director-General, to reduce, as far as possible, the number and length of sessions of the Executive Board". I am speaking as a member of my delegation, and not as a member of the new Executive Board, and it is my delegation's view that, if this resolution is accepted by the Executive Board, as it ought to be, there will be at least a 10% saving on the total amount budgeted for the Executive Board. We feel that it cannot be less, and I am sure that the Executive Board, having listened to the debates on this question in the Administrative Commission, and having seen the nature of the resolutions that have been passed by the plenary conference, will certainly take every step possible. I do not anticipate what the final saving will be, but I think I shall not be guilty of an error in calculation if I say 10%, which comes to about $15,000. On these calculations, therefore, we feel that a sum approximately between $20,000 and $22,000 will be available from the budget provided for the purpose of the functioning of the Executive Board.

(9) The Director-General referred to another point, and that is that he will probably be able, at the conclusion of the year, to transfer certain funds necessary for this purpose. We feel that these funds will be comparatively small in amount for the reasons that we have stated and we are satisfied that, so far as the financial implications of this proposal are concerned, they will in no way interfere with programme and budget activities, nor even with those anticipated savings which are likely to be devoted to other purposes, as suggested in the Programme and Budget Commission. When therefore the Director-General put forward the suggestion, my delegation in a rough and rather rapid mental calculation felt that he was not performing the trick of a magician, nor presenting us with something that was hidden by the Secretariat to be suddenly brought forward as a surprise at this Conference, but that he was dealing with practical suggestions for a very useful measure.

(10) I have dealt with the practical implications of this proposal. There are, however, some intangible but nevertheless highly significant results which cannot be equated in currency values. My delegation has attended every Conference since the inception of Unesco, and it is our firm conviction that at no time has there been in evidence such abundant measure of goodwill and appreciation of diverging points of view. The resolutions we have passed are eloquent testimony to the fact that the spirit and ideals of Unesco have been fully borne in mind, and that here, in your beautiful city of Montevideo, Mr. President, as well as in your State, we have sown seed which in the fullness of time will grow into a big tree, shedding its shelter upon all of us and yielding the luscious fruits of peace, goodwill, concord and harmony to be shared by all the people of the world.
(11) It is in a spirit of humility and hope that I move this resolution for the gracious acceptance of this assembly.

(12) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Korea.

(13) Mr. PAIK (Korea): Mr. President, fellow delegates, many able speakers have already spoken from this rostrum, giving reasons why we cannot and must not add Russian to the working languages of the Executive Board. The Korean delegation wish to make one or two observations on this question. The problem has arisen this year because of the election of a Russian delegate to the Executive Board. The addition of Russian to the working languages of the Board would commit this Conference to the perpetual membership of one of our Russian-speaking people on the Executive Board. The Korean delegation does not believe that we can make such a commitment, for the General Conference may elect any qualified member to the Executive Board from among the representatives of the Member States. Furthermore, when we elect a person who does not or is not willing to use the existing working languages of the Executive Board, the Conference should not provide in each case for the language he wishes to speak; that would create a most undesirable precedent. The Korean delegation therefore opposes the proposal to add Russian to the working languages of the Executive Board of the Organization.

(14) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Chile.

(15) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, although it would have been timely and helpful to comment on the reasons leading to the adoption of English, French and Spanish as working languages, we feel that it would be rather difficult to do so at this moment. Such a study would naturally have helped us in reaching a decision on the request made by the delegates of the USSR and supported by the distinguished delegate of India.
(16) In our opinion, every language can provide a channel to the main stream of culture, and no language has a monopoly of what might be called the vitamin of culture. Nevertheless, certain persons and groups maintain that Latin and Greek, for instance, are essential to any person of culture. Though such assertions may be heard indulgently, there can be no doubt that they are false. This is not the place for an analytical discussion of this contention, which touches on a fundamental problem of the philosophy of culture, but it is worth mentioning that any given people or civilization that has meditated deeply on the eternal problems of man and his position in the universe, has always converted its thinking into the fabric of its own language.
(17) Various arguments have been brought forward in support of the adoption of Russian as a working language; reference has been made to the millions of dollars to be contributed by the peoples speaking that language; it has also been argued that Russian should be adopted for the convenience of Russian-speaking members of the Executive Board, etc. In our opinion, these are not factors to influence our decision. In the first place, there is one important fact to be taken into account: Russian is a working language of this Conference. In the second place, what matters is that the millions of children, young people and adults who speak this Slav language should have the opportunity of learning directly about the ideals of this international Organization. If the proposal in question will ensure that these people become familiar with our ideas and ideals, I feel that we should support the proposal for the good it will do. In the third place, there is, in my opinion, another very strong argument: the acceptance of this proposal would initiate that process of cultural unification in which we are all interested.
(18) I may add that the above could also be achieved through the use of other languages, such as Chinese and Japanese. I need not refer to the budgetary implications of the proposal, as the Indian delegate has already dealt with them in detail. For all these reasons, and many others which might be set forth at this Conference, the Chilean delegation supports the proposal for the adoption of Russian as a working language of the Executive Board.

(19) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the Union of Burma.

(20) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma): Mr. President and fellow delegates, I wish to point out one or two small implications that should be very seriously considered in relation to this draft resolution presented by the delegation of India. We have had a very good session which is coming to an end, and Unesco from the beginning has meant international co-operation. The phrase has issued many times from very many mouths, and fittingly so. Do we mean it? On behalf of the delegation of Burma, I suggest that, if we do not support the draft resolution put forward by the delegate of India, we shall seem to be contradicting our own words. We speak continually of international understanding and mutual goodwill - how can we expect mutual goodwill if we contradict ourselves by ignoring the contribution of one of the most important countries, important because it can bring

so much to the enrichment of our ideas and to the achievement of our aims. Only a few days ago we, fellow delegates - you and I - of our own free will chose the delegate of the USSR to serve on the Executive Board. In other words, we want their contribution to the Executive Board. By contribution I do not mean money - of which however they are the second largest contributors; we do not mean that, we mean the contributions of culture and science. We have proved by our act that we want these contributions and, if we now decide not to have Russian on the Executive Board, we shall again be contradicting ourselves.
(21) As good and reasonable people, our acts and our words should be logical and, from the practical point of view, would it be wise to ignore the contributions to science, culture and education that might be forthcoming from the Soviet member of the Executive Board?
(22) Another consideration, that of finance, will be dealt with, has been very fully dealt with by the mover of the draft resolution, and by the Secretariat. I confine myself to general considerations. We have asked the Soviet Union to serve on the Executive Board and I feel, logically, we want to hear its views and we want to receive its contributions.

(23) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Japan.

(24) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, during the discussions about Spanish in the Administrative Commission, I said that the use of a language was a question of internal convenience to be determined by the provisions of the Executive Board's Rules of Procedure. I was whole-heartedly in favour of the use of Spanish in the Board, but I added that the General Conference should not impose rules on the Board. Although the Board is responsible to the General Conference, I consider that the two bodies should be able to arrange their procedure as they think fit and should avoid unnecessary interference with one another. For that reason, I then proposed that the General Conference should simply make a recommendation to the Executive Board, leaving the latter to decide what languages it should use at its sessions. I should like to say the same with regard to the question now under consideration. I greatly appreciate the way in which the Indian delegate has dealt with the question of languages; since this question is a practical one and the object of the proposal is simply to facilitate the work of members of the Board, I fully agree that, if we are to meet tomorrow with our Russian colleague, we should be able to find a means of making things easier for him; but I feel that the decision should rest with the Executive Board.
(25) If the delegate of India is willing to amend his proposal, therefore, I shall certainly support it; but if he is unwilling to do so, I shall be obliged to abstain from voting.
(26) The amendment I should like to propose is as follows: "The General Conference authorizes the Director-General, should the Executive Board so decide, by making the necessary transfers, to provide ...".

(27) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Since the Indian delegation has not, as I gather, accepted the amendment proposed by the Japanese delegate, the discussion of the Indian delegate's proposal is still open.
(28) If no other delegate wishes to speak, I shall put the proposal to the vote.

(29) The Indian delegate's proposal is adopted by 25 votes in favour, 16 against and 14 abstentions.

(30) I call upon the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(31) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Translation from the Russian): Mr. President, the Soviet delegation voted for the Indian delegation's proposal that interpretation and translation from and into Russian should be provided for in the proceedings of the Executive Board, as it feels that the adoption of this resolution will create the required conditions for the Soviet Union's regular participation in the work of Unesco's Executive Board. The Soviet delegation also wishes to state that, when the draft budget for 1957-58 is being prepared, the Soviet Union will again raise the question of the adoption of Russian as a working language of Unesco's Executive Board and will submit this question to the ninth session of Unesco's General Conference. The Soviet delegation takes this opportunity of thanking the delegations which were sympathetic towards our request and voted for the Indian delegation's proposal.

(32) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of China.

(33) Mr. CHEN YUAN (China): Mr. President, I have asked for the floor in order to enter a protest against the personal attack made upon me by the Soviet delegate at the last meeting, and to claim your protection. As the distinguished delegate of Australia pointed out, such personal attacks have never been known at any previous General Conference of Unesco. I have no intention of retaliating. I even refrained from retaliating when he made a gratuitous attack upon my country. I will only say this, that, although we have at the moment lost a great deal of our territory, thanks to Soviet machinations, our Government still stands firmly on our own soil. Our Government has the fervent support of millions of our nationals overseas, and the silent but no less fervent support of many more millions of our brethren who are writhing in the iron grip of alien rule. Mr. President, it is not we who are without a country, it is those who willingly look up to a foreign power as their father and master, who are really without a country. But the Soviet delegate's attack upon my country is not only an insult to my country and my delegation, which are used to such insults, but is an insult to the General Conference, which, in the face of Soviet opposition, accepted the credentials of my delegation by a large majority. It was a decision of the whole Conference and commands the respect of all delegations. Whatever their political or ideological differences, delegates who are now

members of the same Conference should refrain from recrimination and work, if not in harmony - as desired by some of the delegates and speakers - at least in a spirit of mutual respect. If someone offends against this spirit, he strikes a blow at the fundamentals of any international conference. Should such violent personal attacks be allowed? How can a delegate be protected from such attacks? According to the common parliamentary practice of many nations, when a member of an assembly makes a personal attack upon another member, the member attacked can request the offender to withdraw his words and apologize. I ask him to do so now, or, perhaps, Mr. President, you might consider ordering the offending remarks to be expunged from the records. My delegation is confident that you, in your wisdom, will decide rightly how to protect a delegate from being personally assaulted by another delegate and to prevent any recurrence of such offences.

(34) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): As President, I must consider this regrettable incident closed. I shall endeavour to have the matter amicably settled between the two delegations, but I do not feel that the incident should engage the attention of the Conference any further.

**CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION** (continued)

(35) I call upon the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission.

(36) Mr. ERIKSSON (Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission): Mr. President, fellow delegates, I want to introduce to you the Corrigendum to document 8C/ADM/35. According to it, you should delete Part III of Section F, page 41 in the report I presented to you the other day and take the document you have before you in 8C/ADM/35 Corrigendum, where you have the resolution on the working languages. We have adopted No. 41 concerning the Spanish language and No. 42 will be the resolution we have just adopted concerning the use of Russian.
(37) The last point will be resolution 43, which recommends that every effort shall be made by the Executiv Board, in co-operation with the Director-General, to reduce as far as possible the number and length of sessions of the Executive Board, and to request the Executive Board, in co-operation with the Director-General, to study ways and means of achieving this end and to submit recommendations to the ninth session of the General Conference.

(38) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The discussion is open. If no one wishes to speak, I shall take a vote on items 43, 43.1 and 43.2

(39) They are unanimously approved.

(40) I feel that, by way of conclusion, it would be well to take a general vote on all the items in the Administrative Commission's Report on which we have voted separately.

(41) The items in the Administrative Commission's Report are approved by 51 votes in favour, none against and 1 abstention.

**CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION** (document 8C/PRG/30 and document 8C/BUD/6 rev. 2, Annex I)

(42) I call upon the Rapporteur.

(43) Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur of the Programme and Budget Commission): Mr. President, fellow delegates, the Programme and Budget Commission began its discussions on 17 November and finished yesterday afternoon, after a total of some thirty-three meetings. The substance of our deliberations and of our subsequent recommendations are in document 8C/5 with Corrigenda plus several amendments listed in the Annex to the report now before you. In addition to these amendments there are a few corrigenda which are provided with the same code no. of 8C/PRG/30 Addenda. The background of our report is the history of the past programmes of Unesco. Bearing these past programmes in mind, bearing in mind the need for their improvement and above all the urgent need for bringing to the attention of the peoples of the world the Organization of Unesco and its activities and aims, we turned to a deliberation of our present programme. Further, we had before us a report of the Executive Board known as document 8C/PRG/13, which makes recommendations for the future programme of Unesco under the title Remodelled Programme. The main points of this document, you will recall, are that the Board invites you to give further heed to the needs of Member States, to attempt to adopt in the future, instead of many small projects, a few major ones, and, in order to implement these major products to strike a balance between those general activities that continue from year to year and the special activities through which we hope to meet the needs of Member States.
(44) The framework within which our deliberations were fixed is the budget ceiling. When last our Commission came before you, the General Conference gave us its approval to work within a budget ceiling which roughly gives us for 1955 just under $10,000,000 and for 1956 just over $10,500,000. Having received that permission, the Commission proceeded to examine chapter by chapter the documents in the proposed programme and budget for 1955-56. We first examined, out of chronological order, the chapter on the expanded programme of technical assistance. Thereafter we followed from 1 through 8 the chapters in the grey book. I do not intend here to enter at length into the deliberations of the Commission or into the many amendments, the occasional deletions and rejections it made. I will summarize briefly some of the major modifications in the chapters one by one.
(45) Of the technical assistance programme I will only say that we adopted the resolutions in that document and call the attention of the Director of this programme to several constructive criticisms.

I say this now so that I do not need to repeat that in each chapter many constructive criticisms were made regarding the programme by delegates in the Commission and these are herewith called to the attention of the respective departmental directors. Without further modification, then, of the technical assistance programme, the resolutions which put this into effect were recommended for adoption.

(46) In the chapter on Education one of the most important parts was the new document 8C/DIV/80, containing the recommendations of the Committee of Experts on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation. This was placed in the Education chapter only for convenience; actually it is intended by the Commission that the recommendations contained in it shall have a bearing upon the implementation of projects in each chapter, in other words, the Commission urges the Director-General to make an effort in each part of the programme to carry out ideas of international understanding and co-operation.

(47) Subventions to international organizations in the educational field - and, I may add, in all of the substantive fields recognized in our programmes past, present and future - were enthusiastically supported, and I will anticipate the programme here to say that, in the discussion of the remodelled programme, doubt was expressed by certain delegations regarding the fixing or stabilizing of a level of general activities; it was the sense both of the Advisory Committee and of this Commission that general activities and special activities should at all times be interdependent. With that understanding we can go on to say that the Commission made a serious effort to increase the subvention offered to the group of international non-governmental organizations in each of these chapters, notably ICSU in the Natural Sciences chapter and the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies in the Cultural Activities chapter.

(48) To continue with Education, the programme puts strong emphasis upon fundamental education and primary education. In this respect the Commission approved the regional projects on fundamental education but indicated for the future that Member States should encourage the development of their own national centres. The proposal for an Advisory Committee on School Curriculum was accepted with reservations, with the understanding that further planning will precede the convening of the experts.

(49) Finally, there was an important modification in the aid to Member States, in the form of an increase in the allocation for emergency educational assistance to Palestine refugees, and here again, although the figure was fixed at somewhat less than was requested, it was the sense of the Commission that, should economies be made in the Education chapter, they could be added to the amount supplied to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for this large and important project.

(50) In the Natural Sciences chapter I have already mentioned the Commission's interest in giving aid to ICSU. New elements in the programme are increased attention to arid zone and humid zone research, as well as the programme on oceanography. One of the most hotly debated projects in Natural Sciences was the campaign against cancer. It was accepted, rejected, then accepted again, under the new title Basic Research on Cellular Growths. Finally, a dramatic addition to this programme came with the adoption of a resolution, originally introduced by the delegations of France and Japan, on the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, the programme to be worked out in development with that now being planned by the United Nations. In view of the effort to change the direction of the science co-operation offices, there was some discussion about maintaining the Science Co-operation Office in New Delhi. It was agreed, however, to continue this Office under special circumstances. In the same way, the Office of Science Co-operation in Istanbul was voted to be closed so that the money could be used for other parts of this chapter. However, the Turkish delegate was assured by the Director-General that services to his country would be continued either through the Department of Natural Sciences at headquarters, or through the action of National Commissions, action made possible by a development in our programme which I shall refer to later.

(51) Under Social Sciences the programme was adopted very much as it stands in the book, with the important exception of projects under the heading: Problems of international understanding and tensions. It was felt that this part of the programme was weak, and the entire section was revised as document 8C/PRG/29. In this form it found the approval of the Commission and was adopted. Lastly, an important resolution introduced by the delegation of India, amended, and then jointly presented by Czechoslovakia, the United States of America and other countries on the subject of peaceful co-operation, was adopted unanimously.

(52) Under Cultural Activities I have already referred to the Commission's support of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. One should add to this the interest shown by the Commission in all organizations concerned with creative artists: musicians, writers, playwrights, architects, and their participation in international activities. Two subventions in this field were increased and many delegates expressed their wish to obtain further participation of creative artists in this Organization. An important addition to this part of the programme is the series of international regulations which were adopted by a working party of the Commission and further by the Commission itself. These refer to the Copyright Convention, the Convention for Protection of Cultural Property, the International Competition in Architecture and the desirability of establishing regulations with regard to archaeological investigations. An important new project in Cultural Activities was that of producing reading material for new literates. This project, of course, crosses the departmental line and is of as much interest to experts in education as to specialists in cultural activities. Again, the attention of the departmental director is called to the many constructive suggestions made by delegates on this point.

(53) Another new development is the recommendation to the Director-General that he shall have published a book in commemoration of the centenary of the great Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz.
(54) The Index Translationum, which had been recommended for a reduction in the budget, was reinstated at its 1953-54 level.
(55) A working party of the Commission studied the continuing project for a Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind and the programme as listed in this chapter was adopted.
(56) The Commission took note of a report on Esperanto (document 8C/PRG/3).
(57) Mass Communication. The most important development in this Department came from the Commission's acceptance of the recommendations of the working party, to the effect that the structure of the Department be organized according to its two operative functions. A few changes were made in the Mass Communication projects, as follows: the film budget was somewhat reduced, but money was provided for the addition of two posts in visual aids and for the making of a limited number of films and filmstrips. At the same time, the Commission felt that the Secretariat should not attempt to set up a film laboratory, but rather contract for films.
One of the most important acts of the Commission, and doubtless of this Conference, was the unanimous adoption of a resolution calling for measures to promote the use of means of mass communication to increase mutual confidence and understanding among the peoples of the world. This resolution was drawn up on the basis of proposals submitted by the delegation of the USSR and of amendments suggested by the delegation of the United States of America and other countries. The final draft of the resolution was submitted by twelve countries. In the supporting speeches much emphasis was given to the importance of implementing this resolution through the action of Member States.
(58) In the chapter on General Resolutions, several important decisions were taken which should have a bearing upon the future programme. These are largely contained in the report of our fourth working party, the party on decentralization (8C/PRG/25 (rev.)). Its recommendations in this respect were accepted with an important reservation, namely, that decentralization of the programme shall not mean decentralization of administration. We call to the attention of the Conference, therefore, that the basic principle of universality must not be forgotten in our adoption of this programme of decentralization. Then how are we going to go about decentralization? An important project in the paper is one brought forward by the delegation of India for the establishment of an Office of Co-operation with Unesco in that region. This project was viewed favourably by the Commission.
Secondly, important recommendations were made for developing the activities of National Commissions. This has been, as many of you know, a subject of much interest and of constant reiteration in past programmes. Here in these resolutions important budgetary steps are taken that will make it possible for National Commissions to receive further aid for such purposes as holding regional meetings among themselves, and other purposes.
(59) Another point to be made in decentralization is an important recommendation of this working party adopted by the Commission regarding the seat of future Unesco conferences. As we all know, the ninth session of the General Conference is to go to New Delhi, but this party, especially in view of the decentralization of activities, recommends that, by and large, conferences should be held at the permanent headquarters in Paris.
(60) I mention, in concluding my remarks on these chapters, that, in spite of every effort by the Commission to economize, the final total of expenditure came to perhaps a quarter of a million dollars above the ceiling. The Commission turned over this problem to the Advisory Committee and accepted its recommendations for bringing the programme back into line with the budget ceiling. The only important change was the one already referred to - the reinstatement of the campaign against cancer. This was made possible by economies in another part of the chapter on Natural Sciences.
(61) At our closing meeting yesterday, in fact in two meetings, the Commission deliberated on the recommendations received from the Advisory Committee regarding the remodelling of the future programme of Unesco. You will recall that the Conference in plenary session has already voted on this matter, and the substance of its deliberations were finally brought together in a resolution which bears the number 11.1.
(62) In conclusion, gentlemen, the Commission has certain observations to make to this Conference, observations many of which are well known to you, but which should be repeated here. In the first place, I think it is proper to say to you that this Commission holds very dearly to its prerogatives of deliberating and taking action upon the programme and budget. In doing so, it recognizes the great difficulties imposed upon it by the large number of delegations, each of which has the full right to speak. That number now reaches, in the Commission which has just completed its labours, 68 delegates of our 72 Member States, and we were aided and abetted by numerous observers from the international non-governmental organizations, whose support was considered one of the basic interests and needs of Unesco. But with this huge programme, 280 pages plus numerous addenda, plus the large number of supplementary documents, it was extremely difficult to do what the Commission felt it necessary to do, namely, make a close examination of each project in the programme. It therefore places on record the need, if the programme is to be a good programme, if Unesco indeed is to continue to exist and carry out its aims, for the reform of these procedures.
(63) What does the Commission specifically advocate for the consideration of the General Conference? We ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to consider some way of improving the time-table. I would remind you that it was not until the sixth day of the General Conference that this Commission was able to begin its deliberations. It was not until the twelfth day that we had a figure for the budget ceiling which made it possible to deliberate

with any degree of permanence. Furthermore, we were overwhelmed this year with draft resolutions, exceeding 120 in number. Some of these were of major importance to our programme and, as you have heard in the details of the various chapters, many have been adopted and will have an important effect upon our future programme. Others were of secondary importance, and we recommend to the Member States, to their National Commissions and to the Director-General that means be considered of getting these resolutions in ahead of time, and furthermore that they should be screened so that those which are not really appropriate for adoption or consideration by the Commission, can be handled in some other way. A resolution, even of minute importance, often required for its discussion from half-an-hour to an entire meeting.

(64) I will conclude with this observation. The Commission is deeply concerned with the need to improve the relationship between itself and the other important bodies of this Organization which have been set up to assist it, to advise it, to help in carrying out the programme, and particularly with its relationship to the Advisory Committee. We have no special recommendations to make to you there, other than the general urge that somehow this relationship be improved. I will add that throughout the meetings we found this advice, whether it came from the Advisory Committee, the Executive Board, or other Committees, very helpful, but often, it must be frankly admitted, it meant a duplication of effort, and the time could have been spent very effectively otherwise.

(65) Finally, it is appropriate, ladies and gentlemen, to thank the Executive Board, the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat for the many hours of hard work, sound advice and friendly assistance all have put into the planning of this programme.

(66) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The report we have just heard is now open to discussion. I think that, in order to facilitate the discussion and adoption of the report and its conclusions, we should take the different parts separately. Part I, which is short, can be considered as a whole, and Part II chapter by chapter, as we did when dealing with the Report of the Administrative Commission.

(67) We shall begin, then, by examining the first part of the Report and its resolutions.

Page 1 of the Annex. If no delegate wishes to speak, we will take a vote.

(68) Part I is unanimously adopted.

Part II. Chapter 1: Education

(69) I call upon the delegate of Colombia.

(70) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, the Colombian delegation will approve this chapter, but asks that the following statement be included in the records.

"In approving Unesco's programme and budget for 1955-56 the delegation of Colombia regrets that, so far as the chapter on Education is concerned, it must record certain reservations and objections with regard to the Regional Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro (Mexico). Reliable information in the delegation's possession about the working of this Centre has given cause for serious concern in matters of morality. This is the most important aspect of education and there seem to have been grave shortcomings in this respect.

The Latin American countries, for whose benefit the Patzcuaro Centre was established have always followed the highest moral principles in their education and culture, and it would be quite illogical and extremely regrettable if future teachers, while undergoing specialized technical training, were to be exposed to corrupting moral influences which would have a harmful effect on the children and young people who will later be in their charge.

Colombia, which has given CREFAL generous financial support and has sent a large number of carefully selected students to study at the Centre, in expressing these misgivings at the eighth session of the General Conference, earnestly hopes that the necessary moral reforms will be made to ensure that the Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro, far from constituting a danger and a menace, will henceforth be a sound instrument for the promotion of good citizenship, education and culture among the peoples of Latin America.

The Colombian delegation requests the President to arrange for this statement to be included, in full, in the records of the session."

(71) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): It shall be done.

(72) I call upon the Director-General.

(73) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the delegate of Colombia, and also with the Director of the Patzcuaro Centre. I have also visited Patzcuaro on two occasions, in September of 1953 and October of 1954. I have been unable to find evidence of serious difficulty of the sort he mentioned. I have, however, asked the Director of the Centre to take any possible measure to increase the assurance that things are not as bad as they sometimes have been rumoured to be. I cannot, of course, give full assurance on this matter because the students there are adults, they are not under the kind of discipline that children are under in school and in their homes. Nevertheless, we will do everything we can to prevent occurrences of the kind which have been rumoured to exist and which have given concern to the Colombian delegate.

(74) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Viet-Nam.

(75) Mr. VO VAN LUA (Viet-Nam) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am addressing the meeting today in order to voice the Viet-Namese delegation's objections to the chapter on Education.

(76) We do not disagree with the Secretariat or with the Programme and Budget Commission, but

we feel that something should be added, if only that our attitude, which is common to all members of the great university family, may be noted in the records.

(77) I refer you to resolution 1.212, paragraph 114. This resolution reads as follows:

"The Director-General is authorized to assist Member States and appropriate international organizations to develop and improve school education, while at the same time orienting it towards international understanding and co-operation".

(78) When considering this improvement in national education systems, however, both the Secretariat and the Programme and Budget Commission have confined their attention to fundamental, primary and secondary education, leaving aside the question of higher education. All we can find about this question of university education is a simple reference by the Secretariat in paragraph 125: "the heading school education seems to exclude teaching and research at the university level. In this respect, most professional and educational problems relating to universities are the direct concern of the International Association of Universities, which will receive a subvention".

(79) And when I turn to paragraphs 45-48 relating to the International Association of Universities, to which the General Conference has granted a total subvention of $28,000 for the two years, all I find is:

"The Association established a documentation centre, maintains a permanent information service and publishes a quarterly bulletin and special studies on questions of interest to universities. Unesco is thus enabled to free itself of clearing house work in the field of higher education".

(80) This, then, is all we can hope to receive from the International Association of Universities, in return for $28,000.

(81) Paragraph 125 refers to professional and educational - that is, pedagogical - problems. Unesco is not interested in questions of this kind, particularly professional questions. At the most, pedagogical questions might have some repercussions in the life of the Organization.

(82) Pedagogics is concerned only with the formal side of education, the manner in which a science or subject is taught, but it has nothing to do with the content of the teaching.

(83) But it is a matter of great importance to us, the Member States of Unesco, that attention should be given to the content of teaching, for it is by that means that Unesco can achieve its aim of establishing understanding among the peoples and international concord.

(84) Thus, the question of university education remains unsolved. Only primary, secondary and fundamental education are dealt with by the programme of Unesco.

(85) In now pleading the cause of university education, I have no intention of creating other budgetary difficulties for the Organization, but simply wish to draw attention to the gap which has been left in this chapter on Education.

(86) With regard to university education and students, the delegate of Japan, in the Programme and Budget Commission, put forward a draft resolution on Friends of Unesco Clubs, organized by students. There again, however, Unesco is only on the steps of the faculties and universities. It would do much better to enter boldly by the main door instead of wandering round outside.

(87) I should like Unesco to make a direct approach to students themselves. Belonging as I do to the great university family, I have found that this is the only way to produce international understanding, for students come to play their part in the political life of their countries a few years after completing their studies; they guide public opinion in various capacities - as writers on current affairs, teachers or statesmen. Perhaps I may be allowed a personal reference: at present, three of my former students are Ministers in the Government of Viet-Nam, including the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance. You will thus see how important it is that we should give some thought to the student body if we wish to do anything for the good of Unesco.

(88) As a practical suggestion and to avoid taking up too much of your time, I shall make the following proposal: the International Association of Universities should be made to appreciate the need for it to co-operate with Unesco in order to bring Unesco into the universities, and first of all into the Faculties of Arts, by instituting special degree certificates for studies relating to all the cultures of the world: Hindu, Arab, Chinese, Japanese, Latin American, etc. These diplomas would not be taken into account for the degrees required of secondary teachers (like the French licence d'enseignement), but they would give all students a knowledge of intellectual, cultural and, above all, spiritual developments in the Arab countries, in Japan, in Montevideo, etc. When all students throughout the world have a clear idea of what is going on among their neighbours, they will have more sympathy for the countries on their borders and even for countries which lie some 15,000 miles distant from their own, as Viet-Nam does from Montevideo. The only people we like are those whom we know and understand. And it is this which offers the best hope of establishing lasting peace throughout the world.

(89) But there is no reason to stop at the graduate level; there is also the doctorate. I am not thinking of the higher degrees, like the French doctorat d'état (which is very difficult and not within the powers of all intellects) but of those corresponding to the doctorat d'université. What is there to prevent Unesco from encouraging the preparation of theses on the modern humanities, dealing, for instance, with Mexican-Spanish and Uruguayan-Spanish literature, or Chinese philosophy, Indian philosophy, Japanese literature and philosophy, etc? All these theses would be defended before the faculties and universities of all countries and would constitute veritable monographs, which Unesco would undertake to publish. In that way, we should soon build up a collection of Unesco works which would assist in the development of international understanding or, in other words, in the establishment of international peace.

(90) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Mexico.

(91) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, the Mexican delegation deeply regrets that the Colombian delegation has felt obliged to criticize the Regional Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America, at Patzcuaro.

(92) Furthermore, as I have already said in the Programme and Budget Commission, the Mexican Government wishes to state once more to the Conference that it will always comply strictly with the terms of the contract which it has signed with this Organization, governing the operation of the Centre concerned.

(93) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Lebanon.

(94) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in connexion with resolution 1.222 - page 3 of the Annex concerning Education - I should like to take this opportunity of thanking Unesco, all the Member States and the Secretariat once again for the kindly interest they have always shown in the situation of Palestine refugees. I should like to emphasize that when the resolution, after being examined by the Programme and Budget Commission, was approved, an increase was made in the amount of assistance to refugees. When the Commission was obliged to readjust the budget, it cancelled that increase, but the Director-General promised that if, in the future, he found he could restore it, he would certainly do so. I should have liked this to be mentioned in the report, and I would ask the Conference whether it has any objection to its being noted in the records.

(95) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The proposal is approved and it will be done. If no other delegate wishes to speak, we will take a vote on the Education chapter.

(96) The chapter on Education is unanimously approved.

Chapter 2: Natural Sciences

(97) If no one wishes to speak, we will take a vote.

(98) The chapter on Natural Sciences is unanimously approved.

Chapter 3: Social Sciences

(99) I call upon the Secretary.

(100) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretariat) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in this chapter, I have to ask you to refer to the new resolution 3.53. The text shown under this number, with the reference 8C/DR/8 amended, is not the right one. It is not the wording that was approved. The text approved is contained in document 8C/DR/105 (rev.), which is in fact the amendment to document 8C/DR/8. With the President's permission, I shall reread the text actually approved by the Commission.

"Bearing in mind that discrimination, as enumerated in Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on the basis of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, is one of the greatest dangers to peace and to human dignity; noting that Unesco has already taken some commendable steps in producing excellent publications on the subject of race and race relations; regretting that discrimination in very ugly forms continues to vitiate relations between human beings in certain areas of the world; the General Conference calls upon all Member States and National Commissions for Unesco to eradicate in all possible ways the evil of discrimination and authorizes the Director-General, in carrying out the programme of Unesco, to give special attention to measures designed to eliminate all such discrimination and, more particularly, in 1955 to measures calculated to eradicate race prejudices."

(101) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): We shall continue the discussion, subject to the correction just indicated. If no delegate wishes to speak we will take the vote.

(102) The chapter on Social Sciences is approved.

Chapter 4: Cultural Activities

(103) Approved unanimously.

Chapter 5: Mass Communication

(104) Approved unanimously.

Chapter 6: Exchange of Persons

(105) Approved unanimously.

Chapter 7: General Resolutions

(106) Approved.

Chapter 8: Publications Fund and Seal and Emblem of Unesco

(107) Approved unanimously.

Chapter 9: Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance

(108) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of France.

(109) Mr. LAUGIER (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, fellow delegates, now that you are about to vote on the budget and resolutions relating to technical assistance, the French delegation wishes to make its position perfectly clear: it considers that the programme of assistance provided by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies is the greatest and most generous instance of men's endeavours to help their

fellow men ever known in all the history of the world. We have already said, and say once more, that those in charge of this programme have in their hands the hopes of mankind. France is resolved to bring the support of all its intellectual, technical and material resources to this great project; it is ready to share all the sacrifices which Member States may one day be asked to make in order to add to the means available for promoting this great cause. But, just because it has faith in this work and ardently desires its success, it feels obliged to submit the texts referred to it, and the administrative machinery which will serve or hinder the progress of technical assistance, to a fair but searching criticism. The French delegation does not share the general optimism which burgeons forth so trustingly on every page of the report on technical assistance; it feels that rigorous self-criticism would produce better results than the expressions of mutual admiration so lavishly bestowed upon each other by the various administrative services concerned with the distribution of technical assistance funds and services. It fully appreciates the efforts made and the results achieved, but it does not consider that technical assistance has already brought about any notable improvement in the standard of living of the vast numbers of people who have placed their hopes in it.

(110) Lastly, the French delegation wishes the serious reservations which it is obliged to make with regard to the administrative machinery for the conduct of technical assistance, and which it has already indicated briefly to the Programme and Budget Commission, to appear verbatim in the records of the proceedings, and accordingly has to restate them at this plenary meeting.

(111) The French representative has maintained, without contradiction, that, if the international authorities which have to consider technical assistance projects were counted up, the total number would be at least 24; I shall not give you a list of them, for I should probably leave some out, but, after passing through the various services in Unesco - the Technical Assistance Department and the other programme Departments, the Bureau of Personnel and Management, the Travel Bureau, the Bureau of Programme and Budget, the Office of the Director-General, the Executive Board, the General Conference's Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, the Programme and Budget Commission, and the General Conference itself - after surmounting all these hazards, as I say, the projects, on reaching the United Nations, come before TAB (United Nations Technical Assistance Board with its sub-committees and working parties); they must then be examined by TAC (Technical Assistance Committee of the Economic and Social Council), by the Economic and Social Council itself, then by the various Committees of the General Assembly and, finally, by the General Assembly itself. Nor is that all: successively, concurrently or simultaneously, the ACC (Administrative Committee on Co-ordination) with its preparatory committee and subsidiary bodies must also consider them. At least 24 international bodies are thus concerned with the administration of this programme, and yet we are now told that new committees - committees for the evaluation of the results - are to be set up at the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies.

(112) Will these headquarters committees draw up central reports on the local reports, or will they send out inspectors as missi dominici to collect additional information? Only the future can tell.

(113) Ladies and gentlemen, there is no sense in this. No business undertaking could possibly survive such a proliferation of parallel or superimposed machinery. Unless international co-operation takes a ruthless axe to the strangling tentacles of bureaucracy, unless it can break free, there is a danger that it will one day stand arraigned before the wrath and indignation of the peoples of the world. The task is a great one, and it is urgent; it must be carried out by the champions of concentration, who have made drastic cuts in the programmes but, as far as we know, have refused to do the same in the sacrosanct bureaucracy which threatens to hinder technical assistance from carrying out its mission of humanity. France has done its duty by saying what it thinks of the present situation; it will vote for the budget and resolutions submitted to you, subject to the serious reservations which I have just set forth.

(114) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Brazil.

(115) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, while supporting the documents dealing with technical assistance which are now before us, the Brazilian delegation wishes to record its approval of the comments made by the French representative. We are convinced that we should all gain if the procedure for the provision of technical assistance were simplified. We should gain by ensuring that the Specialized Agencies, and more particularly in our case, Unesco, carry more weight in the Technical Assistance Board and the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations when final decisions are being made on subjects which are of interest to us as an educational, scientific and cultural organization. We need greater latitude in our own special fields, greater flexibility in the machinery and procedure for channelling requests from Member States, and also, in my opinion, closer attention to the special features of each State when their requests are submitted.

(116) We sometimes fear that there is a tendency to make the procedures which lead from a Member State's request to the final grant of technical assistance by TAB too uniform and too rigid.

(117) We would therefore urge the Director-General and the Executive Board to see that the machinery by which the needs of Member States and the resources provided by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies are brought together is made as simple and as flexible as possible.

(118) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If no other delegate wishes to speak, we will take a vote.

(119) The chapter on the Expanded Programme

of Technical Assistance is unanimously approved.

Chapter 10: Miscellaneous Resolutions

(120) Approved by 50 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions.

Chapter 11: Resolution concerning the Future Programme

(121) Approved unanimously.

Appropriation Resolution for 1955 and 1956 (document 8C/BUD/6 (rev. 2), Annex 1)

(122) Approved by 47 votes in favour, none against, and 5 abstentions.

(123) Having approved all the chapters separately, we shall now take a vote on the report as a whole.

(124) The report is unanimously approved.

NEED FOR MAKING UNESCO A GLOBAL ORGANIZATION (documents 8C/DR/4 and Add., 8C/DR/120 and 8C/DR/128)

(125) I call upon the delegate of India.

(126) Mr. WADIA (India): Mr. President and fellow delegates, it is my proud privilege to move the resolution that stands in the name of the Indian delegation, as found in document 8C/DR/4:

"Realizing that Unesco cannot fulfil effectively its great task of establishing the foundations of peace upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind without becoming truly global in its membership, character and scope,

The General Conference

Expresses the wish that all States which have not yet become members of Unesco, will do so as soon as possible, and

Authorizes the Director-General to invite all such States to join the Organization."

(127) My delegation has found it necessary to amend it by adding the words which are found in document 8C/DR/4, Addendum "in consultation with the Economic and Social Council".

(128) If the Indian delegation now sponsors this resolution with pride, it does so not without considerable regret, for the resolution on the face of it should be superfluous; the very essence of Unesco, as clearly enunciated in its preamble, is the recognition of "full and equal opportunites for all in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge". If, in spite of this open and unambiguous declaration, we feel constrained to move a resolution, it is a clear sign that "there is something rotten in the State of Denmark", that Unesco has not risen to a full realization of its responsibilities or of its potentialities.

(129) In the light of our experience of what has happened at this session in Montevideo, it would be worth refreshing our memory of the conditions which brought Unesco into existence. The world was dark with war clouds when the Great Powers conceived the noble idea of the United Nations, and it was welcomed as the last desperate means of saving the world from the ravages of modern warfare. But it was conceived at the political level. Politics has its obvious limitations, it cannot bypass fears and suspicions, the will to power and the wish to get the best of existing conditions. In such a soil, the will to peace cannot effectively flourish. And so on a great day the idea was conceived of bringing into being another organization which could work for peace and towards peace without the limitations of politics. That organization was Unesco. The United Nations was rooted in the present, and was content to solve world problems as and when they arose, in makeshift fashion, in the spirit of compromise, but Unesco aimed at a long-range policy, it wanted to sow the seeds of peace in the minds of men, it wanted to tackle the problems of peace through education, science and culture, it recognized the supreme worth of culture as a broadening concept, it aimed at producing men and women of culture who could understand one another. The mark of a cultured man is always his lack of fanaticism, he emphasizes the will to understand and sympathize, to tolerate, nay, even to appreciate standpoints other than his own, in recognition of the great axiom politics divides - culture unites. It is clear, therefore, that, while Unesco is a child of the United Nations and owes certain loyalties to the fundamental principles of the United Nations, it is nevertheless, an autonomous organization. It was never intended to be a mere carbon copy of the United Nations. Surveying the work of Unesco during the few years of its existence, we all recognize that its foundations were well and truly laid, that it has carried light to the darkest corners of the earth, that it has honestly aimed at raising the level of the underdeveloped countries in their education and culture. The world has awakened to a new sense of human dignity, whether humanity be white or black, yellow or brown; it implies a consciousness that the weakest link in the chain of human relations constitutes the greatest danger to peace, and to eliminate this weakest link requires that all the nations of the world, big and small, all find a home in the warm bosom of Unesco.

(130) Has this hope been fulfilled? The other day, as I was listening to the speech by the honourable delegate of the United States of America, playing the rôle of counsel for the prosecution, whether against China, or Rumania, or Bulgaria, I thought to myself how much better this world would be if countries in Europe and America took to heart the simple but great biblical precept "Judge not that ye be not judged". The ideal of Unesco is so lofty that there is hardly a country in the world today that can say with a clear conscience that there is no skeleton in its cupboard. I feel that the wisdom of Ovid can apply to organizations as well as to individuals: Meliora video, pejora sequor.

(131) The very ideals of Unesco as embodied in its Constitution should make it impossible for any nation willing to accept the ideals of Unesco, to be excluded. The triumphs of Unesco should be judged not by its capacity to convert the converted, but by

its capacity to convert the unconverted. There have been countries that kept aloof from Unesco. Today, for the first time in this very hall, we find the delegates of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of Spain, sitting together, intent, like everyone else, upon solving the problems of humanity through dissemination of education and culture.

(132) To keep out the representatives of 600 million Chinese weakens Unesco, to keep out even for two years small countries like Rumania and Bulgaria, countries pulsating with life and keen to play their part in the cultural renaissance of humanity, is to repudiate our faith in Unesco as the one organization in the world of today which may be trusted to achieve an enduring peace. Beati pacifici - whether they come from the East or the West.

(133) We in Unesco today are faced by a dilemma, and it can be resolved in only one way. If China, Rumania and Bulgaria are as cultured as they claim to be, if the records of their achievements in education and science are as great as they are claimed to be, they should be welcomed to Unesco with open arms, for they, too, have something precious to give to the world. If, on the other hand, they are still so backward as their critics point out, in the elementary principles of justice and international morality, it is all the more the duty of Unesco to admit them as members, for they need help, they need enlightenment. Unesco exists, not so much for the developed as for the under-developed; not so much for the strong as for the weak, for it has taken upon its shoulders the burden of the world as a keeper of its brothers in every corner of the world. Nothing at this session of our Conference has impressed me more than the wonderfully eloquent speeches that came from the lips of the representatives of our new Associate Members, the Gold Coast and Sierra Leone, Malaya and Borneo. They were learned and impassioned, they mark the birth of a new consciousness of freedom and culture in the countries of Africa and Asia that were not so long ago lagging behind in the race of life. Unesco has given them a status which they value and are proud of, that is what Unesco itself can be proud of.

(134) We in India have come most into contact with the West, we are grateful to the British and the Americans for having made us lovers of freedom. We still wish them to be leaders in the world of freedom. If there is anything noble in Unesco, that inherent nobility must infect all its members, whatever political creed they may follow. If they find a country within the Unesco fold not keeping to the mark, they can hope to bring all the pressure that a peaceful, global organization like Unesco can bring to bear on it as a brother member. But if a country is kept out of our great Organization, we have no hold on it, we cannot argue with it, we cannot hope to improve it.

(135) Mr. President and fellow delegates, I hope I have even partially succeeded in making clear the imperative needs to have Unesco function as a truly global organization. If it is not global, it is false to itself; it can fulfil its mission as a great organization for peace only if it admits all to its ranks; every country that seeks admission to Unesco does so with open eyes and a clear knowledge that Unesco is for peace and for all. If there are countries in the world that still shun our fellowship, and unfortunately there are some, we should try to get them in, and that is why our resolution calls upon the Director-General to invite all such nations to join Unesco.

(136) Fellow delegates, we commend this resolution for your acceptance. If I am not out of order, I should like to refer in brief to the amendments of which notice has been given. We have considered these amendments. We regret that we do not find it possible to accept the amendment proposed by the delegation of China, for it differs essentially and in spirit from our resolution, but, in the amended resolution as put forth by the Advisory Committee, we find that the central principle of our resolution is accepted, and to that extent the Indian delegation is prepared to accept that amendment.

(137) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Denmark.

(138) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark): Mr. President, if I have asked for the floor it is not because, as the honourable delegate of India said: "There is something rotten in the State of Denmark". There is not a single word in what the honourable delegate of India has just said to which I would not subscribe, except his last words - that we should adopt the resolution. I will tell you why.

(139) No delegation in this hall would be more in favour of the aim of this resolution than the Danish delegation. We are as prone as anybody to urge the universality of Unesco, and we hope that every nation of the world will join us. I trust that it is evident from our attitude at this General Conference that we mean what I have just said. Nevertheless, I have some doubt about the wisdom of adopting the Indian resolution as it stands, for one single reason. The Indian resolution, in its last words, "authorizes the Director-General to invite all such States (as have not yet joined) to join the Organization". Since this resolution was circulated early in October, the Indian delegation, in the light of deliberations in the Executive Board, has added "in consultation with the Economic and Social Council" on the grounds, of course, that the Economic and Social Council has to give its opinion on new applications. But, my fellow delegates, it is not only the Economic and Social Council which has to give its opinion on a new application, it is the General Conference of Unesco in the end. We have seen at this very Conference that an application was made, and was supported by the Economic and Social Council, and by the Executive Board of Unesco and was rejected at this General Conference. I suggest for your consideration that we do not place the Director-General and our Organization in the position of inviting States to join us at the risk that they may be rejected by a vote of the General Conference. We cannot do that and for this reason I cannot accept the Indian resolution as it stands. I know that two further amendments have been submitted - DR/120 and DR/128. Let me deal with the latter. It is, of course, more acceptable because it does not invite the Director-General to

take the initiative. It welcomes the admission of all States not yet members of Unesco which have demonstrated that they are willing and able to abide by the obligations of the Unesco Constitution. While I feel that I cannot vote against that resolution, I have some doubt in my mind regarding this restriction and how it would be interpreted, but I would rather abstain from voting on it. As far as the Indian resolution is concerned, I do not think that we can put this responsibility on our Director-General.

(140) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of China.

(141) Mr. CHEN YUAN (China): Mr. President, fellow delegates, my delegation is wholly in favour of universality. Indeed, universality has always been a dominant creed in our philosophy. More than 2,500 years ago our great sage Confucius preached the commonwealth of mankind, and a common saying of our people is: "All men are brothers within the four seas"; four seas, meaning the world. Therefore, any call for universality has an appeal to our very nature, to our instincts. But however much we welcome universality, we must not lose sight of the fact that Unesco is not a garden party, Unesco is an organization for common action, an action with a definite purpose. The purpose of Unesco is laid down in our Constitution, it is for furthering universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the people of the world. We have regretfully to admit that not all people in the world have shown their willingness to serve. Indeed the actions of some States are not only at flagrant variance with these purposes, but their actions are a complete negation of our purpose. Much was said in a previous debate in this Conference against the admission of certain States and many facts were given. We do not intend to repeat them, to enlarge upon them here. Suffice it to say that, while all delegations are in favour of universality, the Conference, with the exception of small minorities, is against the admission of States which are to all intents and purposes in conflict with our aims. For that reason we propose an amendment to the Indian resolution. We propose merely to add a single phrase, that is: "... which have demonstrated their willingness to fulfil the purposes of the Organization..." in the second and third lines of the second paragraph. But we are also in favour of the draft of the Advisory Committee on the Programme and Budget, which we think has the same object in view. We do not wish to complicate matters or to bring in too many amendments and, if this General Conference wishes to accept that amendment, my delegation is perfectly willing to withdraw our own.

(142) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the United States of America.

(143) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America): Mr. President, my delegation accepts, with previous speakers, the principle of universality of membership of an organization such as Unesco. We are, at the same time, very happy to note that the delegation of India, which has initiated this hopeful resolution, has agreed to accept the amendment which was worked out after considerable discussion by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. We are glad also to note that the Chinese amendment has been withdrawn so that we have only got one resolution before us at present. We believe the amendment is hopeful; it is hopeful for two reasons. First of all it makes clear what I believe all of us can agree to, that membership of Unesco requires the fulfilment of certain conditions. It is quite clear that States can be admitted, can co-operate usefully in our Organization, can help us constructively, only if they are willing and able to abide by the obligations of the Unesco Constitution. That is in keeping with the amendment which has been accepted, and makes it easier for many of us to support this resolution. Obviously the question of which countries ought to be admitted under this resolution is not before us at this present time. That is a matter for the Conference, and the Conference, in its wisdom and on the basis of its interpretation of its own Constitution, will, I hope, take the right decision when an application comes to this Organization.

(144) The second point is that, under the amendment, the difficulties so clearly pointed out by the distinguished representative of Denmark have disappeared. Under this draft amendment, the Director-General will never find himself in the awkward position of possibly inviting a State to become a member, only to be told later by the Conference that it is not willing to accept such member. For these reasons, we feel that the resolution as now amended offers a very happy solution, and I would like to add on behalf of my delegation that we very much hope that, in the spirit which has prevailed in this Conference up to the last day, we shall be able to vote for this important resolution unanimously.

(145) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Since no one else wishes to speak, I put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document 8C/DR/128: Need for making Unesco a global Organization, presented by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(146) The draft resolution was approved by 38 votes in favour, none against, and 7 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

# EIGHTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

*10 December 1954 at 4.45 p.m.*

*President:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

CONTENTS

Organization of work of the Ninth Session of the General Conference (documents 8C/DR/118, 119 and 129). . . . . 224
Tribute to Juana de Ibarbourou . . . . . 226
International petition in favour of Esperanto (document 8C/DR/116). . . . . 228
Commemoration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights . . . . . 228
Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Nominations Committee (document 8C/NOM/41). . . . . 229
Vote of thanks by the General Conference to the Uruguayan Government (document 8C/DR/125). . . . . 230
Closing speeches . . . . . 233

**ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE NINTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE** (documents 8C/DR/118, 119 and 129)

(1) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Denmark.

(2) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark): Mr. President, it is the impression of a good many delegations that the working methods of our General Conference have not proved altogether satisfactory. I may remind you that the Rapporteur of the Programme and Budget Commission underlined the fact in his speech this very morning. It is not my intention to suggest that we should at this present Conference debate or go into the details of all these difficulties. Let me only point out one single fact: if we try to calculate the net amount, and I underline, the net amount of time which the Programme Commission has been able to devote to the discussions of the particular items of the programme, we arrive at something less than one week in a four-weeks' Conference. Many delegations feel that we might have gone into more detail if we had had the time to do so, instead of being under the pressure of having to reach the deadline by means of fatiguing night meetings.
(3) This is no reproach to our able Chairman of the Programme Commission, to whose patience we have all paid tribute. Nor do we propose that we should, at this session start discussing how the situation might be improved, although some means might very well be suggested. This because - and it is a point I want to stress - we see a danger of the General Conference being thwarted at the last moment by innumerable draft resolutions to which it cannot devote the necessary study. That might bring with it haphazard decisions which may, in some cases, well bind the hands of the Director-General and the Executive Board in a manner not always to be foreseen, and which might well make their work more difficult in the coming two-year period. It is quite natural that some such revision of working methods should become necessary at a time when the number of Member States is about double the number in Unesco's first years, always assuming that we do not want to extend the length of sessions. That is why a group of Scandinavian delegations, on the one hand, and that of the United Kingdom, on the other, put forward resolutions earlier in the Conference, proposing that the Executive Board, together with the Director-General, be invited to go into these matters and to make them an object of their study in the coming two-year period.
(4) As you know, these different draft resolutions have now been combined in one: DR/129, which replaces those numbered 118 and 119.
(5) I take great pleasure in moving the adoption of DR/129.

(6) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of France.

(7) Mr. LAUGIER (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, fellow delegates: France whole-heartedly supports the draft resolution now before you. The French delegation hopes that the revision carried out by the Executive Board will be as thorough, far-reaching and

unhampered as could possibly be imagined.
(8) Revision of the working methods of the General Conference: what exactly does that mean? It does not mean deciding whether speeches shall be limited to two or three minutes in committees, commissions or plenary meetings, or whether the President should have beside him a red light, a green light or a bell to warn speakers. I have seen the Executive Board, which has already gone thoroughly into these matters, decide whether or not a blackboard showing the times of meetings should be placed at the entrance to the Conference building, or whether it was enough for the times to be announced in the Journal. That is not what revision of working methods means. It really means reconsidering the whole question of how far the Conference should check the work done by the Secretariat in preparing and implementing the programme and budget. There must be no more of those debates - depressing, to say the least - in which 72 governments, after the matter has already been discussed by the Commission of the Executive Board, by the Executive Board itself and by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, decide whether, in order to carry out a project, a mission of experts should be sent on one short journey, two medium-length journeys or one long journey. All that, I repeat, should be reconsidered with the following idea in mind: the executive powers of the Secretariat should be extended. Few delegates, I believe, have criticized the Secretariat more violently than I, but I know its work, often unnoticed, its good faith and its devotion to Unesco's aims. We should therefore trust the Secretariat; Unesco will not function efficiently unless we allow the Secretariat greater freedom, both in preparing and executing the programme.
(9) How can this be done? The Conference should first discuss the Organization's policy at a high level; it should then divide up the money available into large sections or chapters and, within those limits, during the two-year period, the Secretariat, supervised by an Executive Board henceforth closely controlled by the governments represented at the General Conference, would be free to steer the Unesco ship along a broad river like the Rio de la Plata, and not along a small stream, hemmed in by the banks of detailed budgetary decisions taken by the General Conference.
(10) Moreover, we have examples before us. Some of the big Specialized Agencies vote their budgets in large sections in less than a week, thus demonstrating their confidence in their secretariats. It is in this spirit that the French delegation will vote for the resolution now before you.

(11) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of the German Federal Republic.

(12) Mr. BERGSTRAESSER (German Federal Republic): Mr. President, fellow delegates, I am asked to support, in the name of the German delegation, the proposal contained in DR/129. I think that this proposal, supported by the delegates of Denmark and France, carries even more weight than other suggestions and criticisms which have been made in private and in public during this Conference, for it is a constructive suggestion. We admire the spirit of collaboration which has governed the deliberations of this Conference. We consider that this shared experience in designing and deciding upon practical undertakings in the realm of education, science and culture constitutes a step in its own right towards international understanding and co-operation. However, we feel that the General Conference, the Executive Board and the Secretariat might contemplate for the future, and in particular for the next General Conference, additional means by which this world organization could exercise its influence, its counsel and its authority. We believe that the peoples themselves look at Unesco as at a unique world forum. It is here that world problems may come up for international debate, problems of intellectual and spiritual significance on the cultural plane, problems the discussion of which will mean much even in the preparation of common action in the future, and it is in this sense that we believe in a free discussion of the philosophic bases of Unesco's undertakings. We may also add to what has been said by the delegates of France and Denmark some suggestions both to the Secretariat and to the Executive Board. We hope that these agencies will consider ways in which, at the ninth session of the General Conference, discussions can be arranged on questions relevant to the thinking of all of us and fundamental to the practical work of Unesco; and on questions which, because they are of universal character, are not likely to be debated in any other organization with an equally stimulating effect, or with the same impact on thought all the world over.
(13) I will refrain from making any more detailed suggestions. We shall hope to submit proposals in collaboration with any National Commission which wants to share in this thinking, to the Executive Board and to the Secretariat, but we think that panel discussions, a discussion, for instance, of the main points of similarity and difference between Indian and Occidental thought, might be a theme appropriate for the Conference to be held in New Delhi. Unesco, through all its departments and work projects, devotes itself to furthering practically our mutual knowledge of each other's cultures, and to promoting international understanding on the cultural plane. A thorough discussion here during the General Conference of the philosophic bases and methods of this understanding should produce substantial results. It will give all delegates added insight into the work done or to be done by Unesco in the coming years, and into the work to be done by those whom Unesco at this General Conference has supported by its decisions. Such a discussion may constitute of itself a promising step, preliminary to practical action, and thereby help keep alive the hopes of the peoples of the world in Unesco. The people believe that Unesco is supposed to be the pioneer of community thinking, and they expect from this forum here intellectual and spiritual leadership. We are happy to support the resolution, because it testifies to the fact that very many among us see in it a unique chance for Unesco to do this pioneer work of stimulating mutual respect, and of thinking ahead in terms of the cultural concerns of mankind.

(14) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If no delegate wishes to speak, a vote will be taken.

(15) The draft resolution was approved unanimously.

TRIBUTE TO JUANA DE IBARBOUROU

(At this point Señora Juana de Ibarbourou entered the hall.)

(16) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Mr. Jaramillo Arango, the delegate of Colombia.

(17) Mr. JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, Señora Juana de Ibarbourou, ladies and gentlemen: this eighth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has appropriately decided to pause in its arduous labour in order to pay a well-deserved tribute to the distinguished Uruguayan poetess Juana de Ibarbourou.
(18) Poetry is in general one of the loftiest pursuits of the human mind, requiring the exercise of the most varied talents. To perceive and capture the emotions of nature, the feelings of love, the ecstasy of the mystic, the fire of passion, the harmony of music, the cadence, the significance and colour of words, is among the most astonishing of human achievements. Verse is thus meet to express thought with singular clarity and to preserve and give lasting life to the production of genius.
(19) The works of Juana de Ibarbourou or Juana of America, as she is fittingly called, occupy an outstanding place in the literature of the Spanish language. Her poems have awakened a wide response among the American peoples and are recited in other continents and other languages, for there is something vital in their true poetry that transcends the limits of form and fills the spirit, irrespective of time or latitude.
(20) When, therefore, Unesco met in this city of Montevideo, in this country of Uruguay where culture flourishes, where the intellect finds a congenial atmosphere and the air of freedom breathes, this nation-wide Conference - perhaps the largest at which sovereign States have been represented - marked the presence here of our illustrious poetess and desired to pay her homage. Honouring the most eminent of its children also means honouring the land that gave them birth, for it has been recognized since Greek and Roman times that poets largely personify the finest qualities of their native land. Therefore, Señora, this well-deserved tribute and welcome, though it may add nothing to your fame, nevertheless gives the delegates who approved it the satisfaction of expressing their gratitude in a fitting manner. May I also, although this may seem superfluous, reiterate in the name of the Colombian delegation here present, our great admiration for your work.

(21) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Mr. Barrenechea Pino, the delegate of Chile.

(22) Mr. BARRENECHEA PINO (Chile) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, fellow delegates, Señora: the finest sentiments so far expressed at this great Conference were voiced by the distinguished Colombian delegation when they suggested paying this tribute to Juana de Ibarbourou, that precious Uruguayan diamond in the crown of Spanish America.
(23) In this same place, at another memorable moment in her life, her praises were sung by a Mexican, Alfonso Reyes, when he proclaimed her Juana de América. Today it is an assembly of the intellect, a refined élite of the world, that makes Juana de América a part of our universal inheritance, confirming her renown and bestowing on her gifted poetry a laurel of pure gold.
(24) We know well that fame does not spoil her, that her triumphs are to her as the triumphs of a stranger and that only in creative work does she find the reason for her existence and the possibility of happiness. That was how her great poetic output was achieved, from the Barca de Caronte to Serenidad, without any seeking after fame, for she knew, as all rare souls know, that fame is autonomous and chooses its elect only from those who are worthy.
(25) But today's glory is shared by all Latin America, for this universal recognition of her worth as an artist and a woman, illumines this whole part of the earth's face and thereby Juana de Ibarbourou is made one again with the original fount of her poetry and gives back with interest to her American land the glory it had thought to grant to her. Through the transparent genius of this woman can be seen the new America, ever present in her poetry, with its verdant strength, its golden health and shimmering youth.
(26) In this America of hers, Juana de Ibarbourou has felt at one with the earth itself and has even seen the flowering of her hands. Here in her own country her poetry, in emulation of Uruguay itself, grew up simple and natural as the winds that blow across the pampas towards the wide and ever clear horizons of freedom. Here in this country she watered the hands she now raises aloft, seeking the secret root of light. Aware of the transitoriness of life, she accepts the sorrows that come like great gusts of wind from the irrecoverable past. But Juana de Ibarbourou did not waste her youth, she eternalized it in her verse: youth become poetry is the burden of her song; her art is a fountain of Castalia and this is the source of its magic and its true wonder.
(27) But today, the great poetess becomes as it were a symbol, for by this mark of respect the cultural world exalts in her person the value of the intellect, and in the anxious hours of this world of fear we, in the land of Rodó, can think more optimistically about the triumph of Ariel.
(28) Juana de Ibarbourou: we who know you intimately, have heard that you, like Darío, loved your hands and were glad that the artist found them dovelike.
(29) That makes you, today, even more of a symbol, because the cultural world that is paying you tribute has met here, in this concourse of races and nations, to seek for human understanding and peace.

(30) In your fine city, along the beaches of the Rio de la Plata, I see your hands lifted up like doves, as if in prayer that the political world may hear the voice for peace of the cultural world which honours you today.

(31) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Mr. Hope, delegate of the United States of America.

(32) Mr. HOPE (United States of America): Mr. President, fellow delegates and the distinguished poet in our presence. It is in every sense appropriate that in the name of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization we should offer tribute to Juana de Ibarbourou. We who are of the Western Hemisphere could not think of leaving the home of Juana de América without showing her once more, although she knows it well, that she lives in the thoughts and hearts of our nation as a bright and gracious presence, her work as an indispensable element in the living literature of our international community. In my country her poems are being more and more widely published and appreciated. They are increasingly known to the children of the United States of America, through their school books, and to our intellectuals and the general public through anthologies and in the great periodicals that circulate so widely among us. When in 1953 the Union of American Women proclaimed her Woman of the Americas, we responded to their inspiration with special pleasure, because it seemed to us that the work of Juana de Ibarbourou in its radiance, hopefulness and youthful zest gives authentic expression to something that is in the very nature of the new world. But she belongs to all peoples everywhere who value the life of the spirit, and it is with that consciousness that we join in Unesco's Act of Homage. Here indeed, is ground for mutual understanding. Here, as with one voice we praise and thank a great poet, we are reminded again of the meaning and value of our harmonious collaboration and find fresh confidence in our mission.

(33) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon Señora Juana de Ibarbourou.

(34) Mrs. DE IBARBOUROU (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, delegates, Dr. Jaramillo Arango, the Colombian Minister, Dr. Julio Barrenechea, Mr. Henry Hope, Colombians, ladies and gentlemen. For the second time in my life I come to the Legislative Palace of my country, to receive an undeserved honour which transports me with emotion, gratitude and wonder. For the second time I tread this solemn and memorable Salon de los Pasos Perdidos as if hypnotized and walking in a dream. I am encompassed by the world. A humble woman who writes poems is today the centre of a throng of men and women magnificently representative of universal culture. And for no other reason than that I write poems. This is the revenge of the rose over the golden menhir. The august shade of Plato, though perchance irascible and doubting, may come to our aid today. But that cannot disturb my dream, nor today's happiness. I receive this honour more for my country than for myself, for it is certain I was chosen that my country might be honoured through one of the Uruguayan women whose dreams and longings are most strongly fixed on the brotherhood of all the nations of the world. I receive it also in the name of my literary colleagues, the writers who make up our largest guild, the AUDE, and among whom are many far more deserving than I to receive this signal mark of honour.

(35) Born as an agency of the United Nations, the powerful Organization of Unesco has accomplished the splendid task of extending culture and peace without regard to frontiers. May it please God to defend and preserve it for ever.

(36) From Spain that gave birth to Unamuno and which has sent us a valuable group of young thinkers, from the England of Bernard Shaw, and the France of Jean Cocteau and Paul Valéry, from the Sweden of Pär Lagerkist, the Russia of Pushkin, the Germany of Hermann Hesse and the Belgium of the immortal Maurice Maeterlinck, with the Portugal of Antelo de Quental and Eca de Queiros, and ever living Italy in her second Renaissance, stamped with the illustrious name of Giuseppe Ungaretti, to the young countries of the American continent: the United States of America, among whose heroes, liberators and builders there stands out clearly the massive figure of a poet, Walt Whitman; the Mexico of Amado Nervo and Alfonso Reyes, and my Cuba protected by the stainless spirit of Martí, the apostle of liberty; and the beautiful countries of Central America and the Antilles lighted by the starry brilliance of Darío; and Panama with the Isthmus for its backbone, and Colombia the home of Nieto Caballero, of great men, great artists and great patriots; and the "sweet, wide and well-loved Venezuela" of the Liberator, always in my heart; the sturdy Ecuador of Montalvo, with the Peru of Don Ricardo Palma, our continental forefather; the Bolivia of Alcides Arguedas and José Galver, eminent men from the Andes; the luxuriant and dramatic Chile of Gabriela Mistral; the bewitching, dazzling Brazil of Euclydes da Cunha and Olavo Bilac; the mighty Argentina of Sarmiento, saint and roaring lion of San Juan; Sweet Paraguay our foster brother and all the other nations of Europe, Asia, Africa and the Pacific, which I cannot enumerate here because of the only tyrant we endure in this land of true freedom, democracy and poetry - time ... All these countries are present today in this brilliant gathering of their men of creative intellect and executive capacity. They have come to our Republic to unite the powerful forces of science, education and art on behalf of mankind and for the honour of humanity.

(37) In the company of such men, I am filled with simple pride and unlooked for happiness.

(38) I thank you all, especially Dr. Jaramillo Arango, Dr. Julio Barrenechea, the international spokesman of poetry victorious, Mr. Henry Hope who let me feel the heart-beat of his great country, and Dr. Bernal Jimenez, a poet over and above his weighty treatises on law, who, with his brilliant companions, by a generous and unanimous motion, approached my semi-darkness to lift it towards the light.

INTERNATIONAL PETITION IN FAVOUR OF ESPERANTO
(document: 8C/DR/116)

(39) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Mexican delegate.

(40) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, my delegation presented to the Programme and Budget Commission a few days ago a draft resolution which appears in document 8C/DR/116, regarding a petition in favour of Esperanto. The discussions in that Commission were concluded in full accordance with the provisions of the Regulations. However the voting then took place in a rather unfavourable atmosphere. Without giving his judgment on the fundamentals of this question, the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission has asked me to submit this draft resolution again at this plenary meeting. I therefore take this opportunity of doing so. Unless the President requests otherwise, I do not think it necessary to read through the draft resolution again. In presenting it, I should like to state that this time it is put forward with paragraph 4 deleted.

(41) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The draft resolution is now open to discussion. I call upon the delegate of Switzerland.

(42) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) (Translation from the French): Ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking to you now, not as Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission, but as delegate of Switzerland. In that capacity, I wish to second the Mexican proposal and I would ask you merely to vote on it, without discussion. It is a question of repairing, as it were, a blunder which has clouded the atmosphere, and I believe that, if we pass this resolution, it will clarify the situation a great deal and will attract support which we were in danger of losing. I therefore recommend that the resolution, with the deletion of paragraph 4, be adopted without further discussion.

(43) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Notwithstanding the request of the delegate of Switzerland I have to call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(44) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom): Mr. President and fellow delegates, the United Kingdom delegation is moved to comment upon this draft resolution, for several reasons, first of all, in the light of the statement made by the delegate of Denmark, when he introduced the general resolution about the organization of our work at this Conference and at previous conferences. You will remember that he questioned the wisdom of bringing in general resolutions at a late stage, when due examination and consideration of them is not possible. I submit that this is the case here. More than that, in this case you have a draft resolution that was considered very carefully, and was obviously, from what the delegates of Mexico and Switzerland have said, the subject of considerable feeling. And, after a full discussion, and after a good deal of feeling, it was not accepted by the Commission. Now it is presented to us in this form for our acceptance, under conditions that make due consideration impossible. I would like my fellow delegates to know that the United Kingdom is not unsympathetic, but it is concerned about the propriety of this, and it is also anxious not to commit the Organization, without due thought, to steps that it would find very difficult to justify. For that reason I would like to move the omission, in addition to paragraph 4, as has already been suggested by the delegate from Mexico, of all the words following field in the fourth line from the end. I think, if it were possible for us to take the resolution in that form, the Conference would find itself uncommitted and, consequently, the matter could be examined afresh if presented to a future conference.

(45) I gather from the expression of my friend and colleague, the delegate of Mexico, that he agrees with my suggestion. I take it for granted that that would also be true of the delegate of Switzerland. If that is so, I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution, on the assumption that it ends at the word field. The new paragraph 5 would then read "Takes note that several Member States have announced their readiness to introduce or expand the teaching of Esperanto in their schools and higher educational establishments, and requests those Member States to keep the Director-General informed of the results attained in that field".

(46) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I shall now submit the resolution to the vote, with the deletion proposed by the delegate of the United Kingdom and accepted by the delegates of Mexico and Switzerland.

(47) The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 30 votes to 5, with 17 abstentions.

COMMEMORATION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(48) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on Mr. Laugier, the delegate of France, who will speak to you on behalf of the Executive Board.

(49) Mr. LAUGIER (France) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, fellow delegates: as I take my place on this rostrum to speak to you, on behalf of the Executive Board, in celebration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, I am not very sure what my credentials are. I do not know if I represent the old Executive Board - now dead and buried yesterday - or the new Executive Board which is to come into being tomorrow. I owe this honour in the first place, I believe, to a friendly gesture of Sir Ronald Adam, but I am sure that, in associating the old Board and the new with this event, I am speaking for them both.

(50) Gentlemen, if the principles proclaimed in the Paris Declaration were universally observed, the world would be enjoying an era of justice and peace based on respect for the dignity of man; with the

world in its present uneasy state, however, the Universal Declaration is not a declaration of peace, but a call to arms, a universal declaration of war on all injustice, inequality, ignorance, tyranny and despicable racial discrimination. As such, it is a powerful spur to the nations in their pursuit of justice. May the governments which signed this declaration of principles bind themselves as soon as possible by powerful and far-reaching agreements guaranteeing universal respect for those principles.
(51) Moreover, whether you will or no, whether you rejoice in it or deplore it, the fact is that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has created throughout the world a profound conviction that there must be a way of setting up some machinery of appeal to the highest international courts against all local or national violations of Human Rights. Such procedure for petitions, however difficult to devise, must be established if the peoples of the world are not to lose hope and confidence in international co-operation.
(52) In tackling this immense problem affecting the whole of mankind, Unesco is shouldering an unusual responsibility, placed upon it by its Constitution and by specific resolutions of the United Nations in which its duties are defined. You may rest assured that the future Executive Board, like its predecessor, will do its utmost to help Unesco to accomplish this task worthily.
(53) Having had the great honour and responsibility of directing, from beginning to end, the vast amount of preparatory work done by the United Nations Secretariat before the final texts were adopted, I can assure you that this is one of the achievements of the United Nations most deserving of respect.
(54) Success has been achieved, thanks not to a small group of men, but to the work of thousands and thousands of people in non-governmental organizations, government administrations, the Secretariat and legal circles. They worked to achieve a declaration which would not be regional in scope, but truly universal, defining the rights which are man's from birth, simply because he is a man, whatever his country or colour, or the beliefs and philosophies of his social background.
(55) To ensure the inclusion of the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights in statute law and common law is a major project - it is one of the first tasks of education, science and culture throughout the world.
(56) Let us reflect upon the hope placed in us by suffering multitudes who are still victims of all the forces of oppression that weigh upon mankind.

(57) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of India.

(58) Dr. MUDALIAR (India): Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen. Today commemorates an epoch making event: the Declaration of Human Rights was signed on this day and has been ratified by practically all the members of the family of the United Nations. It is for us of Unesco peculiarly appropriate that we are in session on such a day, so that we can recapitulate with pleasure and profit the ideals that were the mainspring of those who, after long discussion, drew up this Declaration of Human Rights. I am sure there is no one in this assembly who does not believe in the dignity of man, in the nobility of the human race and in the purposefulness of human life. To all those who attach great value to the eternal verities of humanity, this day marks a turning point, and it is well for us to recapitulate that, on this day, we have more or less dedicated ourselves to follow the great truth, the messages that have been given by the great Messiahs of our religions, and that humanity at last - whatever may be the differences in race, in colour, in nationality, even in religion - are united with one voice to maintain human rights in all parts of the world; with that faith, therefore, we whole-heartedly dedicate ourselves once more on this day to that famous Declaration of Human Rights.

**CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE** (document 8C/NOM/41)

(59) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the Chairman of the Nominations Committee to present his report.

(60) Dr. MUDALIAR (Acting Chairman of the Nominations Committee): Mr. President, the Nominations Committee met this afternoon for the last time at 3.30 p.m. and, in the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Kabir, who had regretfully to leave earlier for India, the General Committee asked me to preside.
(61) The Nominations Committee met and discussed the composition of the three Commitees: the Legal Committee, the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget and the Committee on Reports of Member States. The Nominations Committee recommends for your favourable consideration the following names for each of these Committees.
(62) The Legal Committee will consist of fifteen members and the States to be represented are: Argentina, Czechoslovakia, Colombia, France, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
(63) The Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, according to a resolution accepted by the Plenary Conference this morning, on the recommendation of the Programme and Budget Commission, consists of seventeen members, the majority of whom should be non-members of the newly elected Executive Board. The Member States represented on this Committee are: Australia, Burma, Chile, Egypt, France, Guatemala, India, Israel, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia. I may say that, of these seventeen names, six are represented on the new Executive Board.
(64) The Committee on Reports of Member States is to consist of fifteen members, and the panel drawn up for your consideration by the Nominations Committee includes the following names: Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Honduras, Hungary, Iran, Jordan, Korea, Spain,

United Kingdom, United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Nominations Committee recommends these names for your favourable consideration.

(65) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The report is submitted to the Conference for consideration. I call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(66) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom): Mr. President and fellow delegates, we of the United Kingdom have listened to the Report of the Chairman of the Nominations Committee with very great interest, and I am sure that we appreciate the work that he and his Committee did and we listened with great interest to the names that he read out. But I wish to be allowed to ask that one name be withdrawn from the Committee on Reports of Member States and that another be substituted for it. I have every confidence in asking you to withdraw the one name and that is the name of the United Kingdom, and I hope you will allow me to suggest that, instead of the United Kingdom, we invite Turkey to take our place. I look at these lists that we have before us of Member States who have previously served on this Committee and I notice that Turkey has been a faithful member. I also remember that on one occasion, when I had the pleasure of serving on this Committee, the delegate of Turkey was a most efficient and devoted Chairman of that Committee. I understand further that Turkey would be very glad to serve, so with your permission, Mr. President, I should like to withdraw the name of the United Kingdom and to substitute the name of Turkey.

(67) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): The list presented by the Chairman of the Nominations Committee will then be examined, with the alteration proposed by the delegate of the United Kingdom, to the effect that Turkey should take the place of the United Kingdom.
(68) A vote will now be taken.

(69) The report is approved by 53 votes in favour with none against and one abstention.

VOTE OF THANKS BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE TO THE URUGUAYAN GOVERNMENT (document 8C/DR/125)

(70) I call upon the delegate of Italy.

(71) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the fact that the Head of the Italian delegation has, to his regret and mine, been obliged to return to Italy, confers upon me the pleasant duty and honour of presenting the resolution of thanks to the country which has given us hospitality. I am all the more pleased to do this, because I have been entrusted with the task both by the delegations which signed the resolution and by others who wished to be associated with it, particularly the delegation of Spain.
(72) The time has come to reflect for a moment, to take stock of the work achieved and then express our common feeling of satisfaction and gratitude, and in so doing manifest the deep sincerity and conviction behind this expression of our thanks and pay tribute to the people of Uruguay and their leaders.
(73) We can be all the more pleased with the moral balance sheet of this General Conference in that we have seen the reasons for fear (which we all shared at the outset) diminishing from day to day and the reasons for hope increasing in like measure.
(74) Despite difficulties, not yet finally solved, relating to the structure and organs of the Conference, it is comforting to observe that a great deal of practical work has been done by the Conference, its Commissions, Committees and working parties, and in a very favourable atmosphere.
(75) We are leaving Montevideo with an appreciably higher budget, but also with increased work for the Executive Board and the Secretariat; and this has been achieved with a minimum of sacrifice on the part of Member States, thanks to wider co-operation and the entry of new Member States.
(76) Montevideo also marks an important step forward in Unesco's life, the opening of a new chapter. The reform of the programme is today far more than a hope, and the appeal sent out to the National Commissions, now more numerous and better established, ensures the Organization of the effective co-operation of the free forces of education, science and culture.
(77) In expressing our thanks to our Uruguayan friends, we do not overlook the great efforts made in the preparation, conduct and success of this General Conference by the Chairman of the Executive Board, Sir Ronald Adam, from whom we part with great regret and profound gratitude, by the Director-General and the entire Secretariat, both permanent and temporary auxiliary staff, who have had the responsibility for carrying out tasks ranging from the most brilliant to the most humble, but all working for the achievement of a lofty aim. Nor must I forget the interpreters who devotedly and successfully enable us to understand one another.
(78) But, as we all well know, none of this would have been possible without the cordial welcome and generous hospitality of the people and the Government of Uruguay. Addressing myself especially to you, Mr. President, and to our friends of the Uruguayan delegation, and speaking more directly to the vote of thanks proposed in the name of Italy and of the other delegations, I take the liberty, which I intend as a tribute, to speak a language to which I am unaccustomed, and whose beauty I hope I shall not obscure.

(Translation from the Spanish)

(79) Mr. President, I am expressing sincere emotion and not simply performing a conventional but necessary act of courtesy when I say in Spanish, a language brother to my own and born of the same mother tongue, how deeply grateful we all feel towards this happy Republic and towards yourself, Mr. Zavala Muniz, for having so decisively contributed to the success of this eighth session of the General Conference.

(80) There can be no doubt that the atmosphere in which our work has been carried on - an atmosphere of calm and cordial collaboration in which the host country has shown a zeal constantly allied to great delicacy, confirming once more, in the sphere of international solidarity, the value of such a sound and eloquent democratic tradition in the national sphere - there can be no doubt, I say, that this atmosphere has been a decisive factor in enabling our Conference to get through its work smoothly and punctually.

(81) But this quiet and hospitable atmosphere, created by a people at once friendly and active, could not in itself have produced the right conditions for a highly complicated international meeting, if the collective expression of interest in and respect for culture had not been supplemented by the individual efforts of a man versed in cultural values and respectful of the liberty of others, such as you, Mr. President, have shown yourself to be so often during this Conference, with a selflessness equalled only by the worth of the cause we all have at heart.

(82) Nor can I refrain from mentioning the lively and human personality of our friend and distinguished member of the Executive Board, Mr. Secco Ellauri. To his tireless and fraternal care for all of us, we are largely indebted for our pleasant sojourn in Uruguay.

(83) Moreover, Mr. President, the democratic atmosphere that reigns in the Republic of Uruguay is something much more - as we have all realized during our stay - than the formal values of parliamentary practice and technique: it is a stable element in the minds of all the inhabitants of this beautiful country, and even in the minds of those apparently least concerned with the complicated machine of public life.

(84) Democracy is a living and spontaneous force, capable for that very reason of being injected promptly and with sincerity into the spiritual energies of civilization, not only when it takes the form of a tradition linked to particular interests and factors of a political nature, but also when it is in complete and free accordance with the dictates and guidance of its own reasoning and of its own moral conscience.

(85) It is therefore significant that these same qualities of swift and intuitive understanding of events, realism and faith in the future, which are typical of this hospitable country, should have been reflected in the proceedings of this eighth session of the Unesco General Conference, which will stand as an example from three very characteristic points of view: the fast rate of work, the sound practical attitude towards the subjects discussed and the resolutions adopted, and the diverse and generous prospects and hopes held out on the road to New Delhi and the future. And, Mr. President, it is excellent, just and salutary for mankind as a whole and for each one of us considered separately in his unmistakable and invincible dignity as an individual, as a free and conscious being, that once again, culture - the highest expression of human dignity - should have given the representatives of the whole civilized world an incomparable opportunity to demonstrate their solidarity and progress, linked with the names of Montevideo and Uruguay.

(86) The field in which so many unforeseen and ever more abundant harvests have ripened could not be more fertile than the soil itself of your country. On behalf of every one of us I offer our best wishes and undying gratitude to this small, bright country of the Americas.

(Translation from the French)

(87) I now have the honour to read the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Bolivia, Brazil, Egypt, France, India, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America:

"At the conclusion of its eighth session, held in Montevideo from 12 November to 11 December 1954, the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, deeply moved by the warm welcome accorded to it and by the incomparable hospitality extended by the Legislative Authority in allowing the meetings of the Conference to be held in the Parliament building, symbol of the liberties of the Uruguayan people, conscious of the unanimous interest taken by public opinion in the work which Unesco is doing on behalf of international understanding, and of the ungrudging help afforded by the cultural and educational institutions of the Republic towards ensuring the complete success of the Conference, expresses its profound gratitude to H.E. Mr. Andres Martinez Trueba, the President, and the other members of the National Council of Administration, to H.E. Mr. Alfeo Brum, Speaker of the General Assembly, and to Mr. Armando Malet, the Municipal Intendant of Montevideo, who honoured the opening meeting of the General Conference with their presence and who have given so many proofs of their thoughtful interest, and

Expresses its warmest thanks to the Uruguayan Government, and in particular to H.E. Mr. Justino Zavala Muniz, Minister of Education, for the invaluable assistance and unstinted support given to the work of the Conference."

(88) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Pakistan.

(89) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan): Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen; I consider it a great privilege to have this opportunity to pay my homage to you, Sir, as President of this Conference, and to your country, the Government and people of Uruguay. This Conference could not have met under better auspices than that of the Government of Uruguay, and in the city of Montevideo. Mr. President, the Republic of Uruguay has already established a fine tradition of enlightened democracy, of tolerance and of social justice, qualities which appeal particularly to Unesco. This beautiful city of Montevideo shows evidence all round of an enlightened culture. The large number of spacious parks, the youth centres, the universities, and museums, the art galleries are the measure of the interest of your people and of your Government in the sphere of education and culture.

(90) Mr. President, at the last session of the Conference in Paris I was one of those who strongly advocated acceptance of the gracious invitation from the Government of Uruguay, an invitation presented most persuasively by my distinguished colleague, Professor Secco Ellauri, and ably supported by almost all the Latin American countries. I did this in the hope that this Conference would bring people from distant lands into close contact with the people of Latin America. My hope, Mr. President, has been fully justified. We, from the distant lands of the East, came here with a message of greeting, of goodwill, and we have been received here with warmth and affection, with kindness and grace. I have no doubt that this Conference will cement these bonds, comparatively new bonds, into firm friendships. Mr. President, I feel very happy that this Conference has given us an opportunity to visit some of the other Latin American countries. We have come in contact with a large number of Latin Americans at this Conference. It has given us an opportunity to understand the problems of this continent, to appreciate your hopes and aspirations. If you will permit me to say so, your continent is a continent of great promise. It has abundant natural resources, it has a people who are determined to develop those resources, and, with their strong attachment to moral values, I have no doubt that this continent will play a great historical rôle in the future of the world. I hope and pray that this rôle will be for the benefit of mankind, for peace, goodwill and harmony in the world.

(91) Mr. President, may I offer you my warmest felicitations on the sagacity, prudence and cheerfulness with which you have steered this Conference to a successful conclusion. May I also offer the thanks of all of us to your Government and to your people for the generous hospitality and the warmth of their affection.

(92) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of the Philippines.

(93) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be very brief, because all that I could say in support of this resolution before us today, would be of little value.

(94) Although I come from a country that is small and poor, our voice necessarily carries equal weight with those of the most honourable delegations from rich and powerful nations; but what we lack in might and eloquence, we can redeem by the warmth and sincerity of our gratitude for the kindness and extreme friendliness of Uruguay and the Uruguayans.

(95) In Uruguay we have felt completely at home, as if we were in our own country. The sun, the sea, the breezes, the authorities and the population in general have all made us forget we are in a different, faraway land. Here we have not suffered from the deep nostalgia which our national poet, on a visit to Europe, expressed in the following lines:

"Dulces son las horas en la propia patria,
donde es amigo cuanto alumbra el sol,
vida es la brisa que en sus campos vuela,
grata la muerte, más tierno el amor".

("How sweet the hours our mother country yields,
Where all are friends who walk beneath the sun,
Where living breezes blow across the fields,
Where death is sweet and love does softer come").

(96) Here we have found all that our poet missed when he was away from his own country. But apart from the sentimental aspect, there is also a very good and practical reason why the choice of Uruguay for this eighth session of the Unesco General Conference has been fortunate and most successful. At the present time humanity as a whole is passing through a very serious crisis; we are faced with a problem of such enormous importance that upon its solution will depend the fate of generations to come. Unesco is one of the organizations making determined efforts to find the right solution to this problem which affects us all directly: I mean, the problem of our own survival in an atmosphere of freedom compatible with human dignity.

(97) Uruguay is a country - and there are not many like it - which, in a certain way and within its geographical limits, has managed to channel its social, political and economic life towards the solution of the universal problem which is of such great concern to us all. Uruguay has taken a considerable lead in solving problems arising from a false concept of racial differences; it has solved the problem of general, free education from the primary school to the university; it has given no less attention to the spiritual aspect of education, recognizing that the best system of government is that which renders unto God the things that are God's, and unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. Thus it has taken pains to ensure that every man, by the sweat of his brow and his love of work, can secure economic independence, and over and above all these considerations the deep attachment of Uruguay to democratic institutions is an example which all Member States of Unesco should emulate and, if possible, surpass.

(98) The delegation of the Philippines is not only honoured but happy to have had this most welcome opportunity of taking part in the eighth session of the General Conference in this fine and beautiful city, and would like once more to express most heartfelt thanks for the courtesy and kindness we have received from the people and authorities of Uruguay.

(99) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Libya.

(100) Mr. FATHY KEKHIA (Libya) (Translation from the French): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this is the second time a delegate of Libya has spoken at Unesco. The first time was in 1952, when we thanked you for the honour you did us by admitting us as a Member State.

(101) As the only delegate of Libya at this eighth session of the General Conference, I did not think fit to speak during the discussion of the Director-General's report, for one simple reason: having no faith in Unesco assistance to small and poor countries, I had nothing to say and nothing to ask. I was convinced that this assistance was never adequate to

meet the economic and social needs of these countries.
(102) But after attending the various Commissions for four weeks, more as an observer than an active member, I must admit that if we have not obtained what we want, it is often partly our own fault. I have noticed that very frequently requests put forward by the representatives of small countries were listened to sympathetically and were given consideration. I hope that in the future my country will take a more active part in the General Conference.
(103) I have come to this rostrum today because I have a pleasant duty to perform. I wish to speak in the name of my country to this young land of Uruguay which has been such a cordial and generous host to us all, and to tell them how we admire and thank them.
(104) This vote of thanks also has a very special meaning for us. Uruguay is a young country which Libya would be proud to take as an example because, despite its difficult beginnings, it has had faith in its star; it has had confidence in itself and in the great possibilities open to its people. Despite its youth Uruguay has always been in the van; it was a quarter of a century ahead of the great countries of Europe and of the world in the field of important social reforms designed to ensure the welfare of the people, thus setting an example.
(105) It would be hard, therefore, to find better words in which to pay tribute to this young and great people than to say with Corneille: "Aux âmes bien nées, la valeur n'attend pas le nombre des années". (For the noble soul, virtue is not reckoned by the sum of years.)

(106) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call upon the delegate of Ecuador.

(107) Mr. ZEVALLOS (Ecuador) (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. President, fellow delegates, it is a source of real pride to the countries of Spanish descent, that this great little Republic of Uruguay, an authentic mirror of Latin America should have been a meeting ground for men of all races and languages to work for the fellowship of man along the paths of culture.
(108) And there is no country more free and democratic than Uruguay. It is a country from which all mystic of hatred and all doctrines of force have been banished; it is a free republic which throughout its history has shown that it is possible in this world of dust and sorrow in which we dwell for men to live together as brothers. No country could be better suited for an assembly of thinking people than this land of intellectuals which had the good fortune to give birth to a real genius: José Enrique Rodó, the writer who expressed better than anyone else the anguish of being intelligent: real reformers like José Batlle y Ordoñez; women who sing of life, like Juana de Ibarbourou; powerful thinkers and orators like Zavala Muniz or Secco Ellauri.
(109) The delegation of Ecuador ventures to ask the plenary meeting to accept an addendum to the proposal put forward by the Head of the delegation of Italy, to the effect that our sentiments may be permanently recorded by affixing at a convenient place in this Palacio Legislativo, a bronze tablet bearing the following inscription: "The eighth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Unesco, in token of gratitude to Uruguay for its generous hospitality."

(110) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): I call on the delegate of China.

(111) Mr. LI YU-YING (China) (Translation from the French): Ladies and gentlemen, I come here to express our thanks to Uruguay and Montevideo, to the people and the Government. I already spoke on this subject at the opening meeting of the Conference and I quoted facts. I do not wish to repeat what has already been said; we shall never forget what this country has done for us.
(112) I therefore thank and compliment Uruguay, not only as other speakers have done, but in a quite special way. I congratulate our Conference on the work it has done. I cannot say that the Conference has been absolutely perfect. Nothing is perfect in this world. I am an optimist and I do not like to criticize. However, I must admit that on certain points the Chinese delegation has been rather disappointed. There is no need for me to repeat this: it is not the moment. Let us end our work happily and congratulate ourselves on what we have done.
(113) Meanwhile, Uruguay and Montevideo, where we are setting up permanent institutions, bring us compensation; if we have lost on certain points we have gained still more on others. We thank Uruguay and Montevideo not only for their hospitality, but also for their freedom and their sense of justice. I can only repeat those words to thank Uruguay, like all the delegates who have worked for the true cause of Unesco.

(114) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): If no delegate wishes to speak, voting will now take place on the resolution which has been read out, together with the addition proposed by the delegate of Ecuador.

(115) The resolution is carried unanimously.

(116) I call upon the Director-General.

(117) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr. President, I know you would not want the session to end without a few words from me.
(118) I wish to associate the Secretariat with the thanks that have been given to Uruguay and to Montevideo. I wish to thank also the Uruguayan employees who have worked so well for us for such long hours and in such a friendly spirit. I wish to thank the press and the other media of communication which have made it possible for us to communicate the work of the Conference to the outside world.
(119) Of course we all thank our President, and I think I know more than most of you what a great rôle he has played, for I have had to work very closely with him

in the management of the work of the Conference.
(120) Let me end by thanking you, the delegates, for the way in which you have made the work of the Secretariat much simpler than it has been in the past. You have responded to my very great satisfaction to a number of the proposals that we placed before you. I wish that our proposals, indeed, had been as good as the decisions which you, the delegates to this Conference, have taken. You have given us clearer guidance for the next two years than the Secretariat has ever before had from the General Conference. For that we are deeply thankful. You have put heavy responsibilities upon us for the next two years, but, I assure you, even at the weary end of a long Conference, we are full of enthusiasm and zeal for the work ahead. We shall tackle it with energy, enthusiasm and hope.
(121) I should also like to say that we welcome your insistence that, in so many of the jobs which we shall be doing in the coming two years, we work in the closest collaboration with the Executive Board. I think we have demonstrated in the past two years that we can work in the closest kind of collaboration with the Executive Board.
(122) You have put a responsible task upon us, I think greater than in the past, in connexion with the execution of the programme resolutions. You have given us wide latitude in the implementation of many of its items. We shall try to carry out your wishes in the execution of these resolutions and in doing so we shall have to rely a great deal on the guidance of the Executive Board.
(123) You have placed upon us many heavy responsibilities in preparing for the ninth session of the General Conference. You have asked us to make many studies of very great importance; you have, in a very friendly spirit, given us additional money only for some of those tasks, but we are glad to assure you that, without commensurate additional resources we shall make these tasks high priority assignments.
(124) I wish to thank all of the delegates here for the fine spirit of collaboration they have shown. We shall try, in carrying out your wishes, to respond in the same spirit.

(125) The PRESIDENT (Translation from the Spanish): Mr. Chairman of the Executive Board, Mr. Director-General, delegates: I am indeed moved to be present, in the name of my people, my country and my Government and in my private capacity, at this final meeting of the General Conference. I am happy to think that when I proposed, in the name of Uruguay, to the Conference held in Paris in 1951, that it should meet in Montevideo, although I knew that you would discover nothing particularly striking in our country, I was nevertheless sure that the Unesco Conference would find there a suitable atmosphere for its deliberations and the utmost friendliness on the part of our people.
(126) I feel happy and proud, and shall be proud all my life, to have presided over this assembly, whose results will be so fruitful in the world of the intellect: I am glad that this illustrious assembly of the world's thought should have met in this Parliament building, where, in freedom, we seek to achieve justice, to show men the paths of peace, brotherhood and liberty.
(127) I am happy to think that, even when we were intimately stirred by our electoral struggles, our people always contrived to follow attentively the deliberations of this Conference, and that was why, one night, men and women from every corner of the countryside came to the city of Montevideo, which was offering the homage of its friendship; and these men and women came to sing because we are a people who believe in peace, in progress and in the brotherhood of men.
(128) I thank you most profoundly for having conferred upon me the honour of presiding over your deliberations. I thank the Director-General and all the members of his Secretariat for having enabled me, with my lack of experience, to direct the work of this Conference. I thank you for all you have said about my country; I thank you for your generosity and, at the hour of parting, I should like to tell you, and I am sure I speak in the name of the Republic as a whole, that it is with a feeling of happy nostalgia we see you go, nostalgia at your departure, and joy at having won your friendship. At this hour of leave taking, thanks and heartfelt wishes for your personal good fortune and for the welfare of your countries.
(129) I now declare the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

# SUMMARY RECORDS

# CHAPTER III

# GENERAL COMMITTEE

## FIRST MEETING

*13 November 1954 at 9 a. m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

(1) The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting and read the list of members of the General Committee, which consisted of the Vice-Presidents elected by the General Conference and the Chairmen of commissions and committees, with the exception of the Headquarters Committee, which was not represented. He requested the Chairmen of those commissions or committees to arrange to be represented by the Vice-Chairman or, in his absence, by the Rapporteur, if for any reason they could not attend a meeting. He referred to Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference concerning the functions of the General Committee and proposed the approval of the programme as set forth in document 8C/BUR/AG/1. In conclusion, he announced that the Committee was to hear the report of the Chairman of the Executive Board.

**PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE EIGHTH SESSION (Document 8C/BUR/1) TIMES OF MEETINGS**

(2) Introducing document 8C/BUR/1, Sir Ronald ADAM recalled that the Board had been instructed by the General Conference at its seventh session to review the Conference's working methods and suggest improvements. He requested the General Committee to consider the Board's suggestions, point by point.

(3) The first suggestion was that the General Conference be requested to reverse its decision to suspend the application of Rules 58, paragraphs 1 and 59, paragraph 1 of its Rules of Procedure for the eighth session of the General Conference. The approval of the Board's suggestion would mean that verbatim records of plenary meetings of the Conference would be drawn up and circulated to delegations for correction as soon as possible.

(4) Approved.

(5) Sir Ronald Adam then requested the Committee to consider points (a), (b) and (c) at the bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2 of document 8C/BUR/1.

Sub-paragraph (a)

(6) Approved.

Sub-paragraph (b)

(7) Mr. BEEBY, as Chairman of the Administrative Commission, requested the right to hold the first four of the working party meetings. He intended to ask the Commission to set up a working party that afternoon, and it could meet at once.

(8) Agreed.

(9) As Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, Mr. GARDNER DAVIES announced that the Committee intended to propose the establishment of two working parties, one on decentralization and the other on the reorganization of the Department of Mass Communication.

(10) Sub-paragraph (b) was approved.

Sub-paragraph (c)

(11) Approved.

(12) Sir Ronald ADAM requested the Committee to consider the Board's next suggestion, which was that the Board's report on the remodelling of the programme be examined by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, after the latter had completed its examination of the draft programme and budget for 1955-56.

(13) Approved.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

(14) The next point concerned the organization of the general discussion on the Report of the Director-General. The Board's suggestion was that speakers should be requested to focus their remarks on the salient features of the Report, and that the whole

discussion should be speeded up. To give effect to the suggestion, it was proposed that the discussion be limited to six plenary meetings, each lasting a maximum of three hours, and that each speaker be limited to a quarter of an hour.

(15) It seemed to Mr. KABIR that delegations would concentrate on the points in the Director-General's Report which they themselves considered to be the most important. He did not see how the Executive Board or the General Committee could define the "salient features" or how the President could oblige speakers to focus their remarks on them. As for the length of speeches, it had been suggested that there be six plenary meetings of three hours each, making a total of eighteen hours. As fewer than thirty-six speakers had so far been inscribed, it might be possible to allow them a longer time each, for example, twenty-five minutes.

(16) Sir Ronald ADAM reminded the delegate of India that the list of speakers was not yet closed, as some heads of delegations, the Head of the United Kingdom delegation, for example, had not yet arrived.

(17) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ considered the proposal of the Chairman of the Executive Board the sounder. He had thought of proposing a shorter time-limit for speakers, twelve minutes, for instance, but, considering that fifteen minutes was the customary time-limit and a judicial one, he accepted the proposal of the Chairman of the Board. That limit should be strictly adhered to, as many other speakers were sure to ask to have their names put down.

(18) Mr. AWAD and Mr. SAWADA seconded Mr. Jimenez' remarks.

(19) The Executive Board's suggestion was approved.

(20) Sir Ronald ADAM drew the Committee's attention to the Board's next suggestion, set forth in paragraph 1.1, sub-paragraph (b), pages 2-3 of document 8C/BUR/1. He pointed out that it was a difficult question, as most delegations wished to speak on the last two days of the session and often, on the second day of the session, there were not enough speakers on the list.

(21) The Board's suggestion was approved.

(22) Sir Ronald ADAM observed that the rest of the document was submitted mainly for information. He would, however, draw attention to the last paragraph of 5.2. The Board suggested that commissions and committees should not wait until their Chairmen arrived from the General Committee, but should proceed to business at the appointed time under the presidency of their Vice-Chairmen.

(23) The suggestion was approved.

(24) The whole of document 8C/BUR/1 was approved.

(25) The CHAIRMAN stated that the whole of the document submitted by the Executive Board had been approved. He asked for the list of speakers inscribed to be read out.

(26) With regard to the list of speakers, Mr. MONTAGNIER requested members of the Committee to refer to document 8C/DIV/73 and to add the delegation of Iran to those already listed in the document as due to speak on Saturday morning, 13 November.

(27) Mr. COWELL stated that, as the Chairman of the Executive Board had already mentioned, the Head of the United Kingdom delegation had been delayed at sea. His name was therefore not yet on the list of speakers. His delegation wished to apply for inscription on the list and would consult Mr. Montagnier regarding the most appropriate time.

(28) The list of speakers was approved.

**USE OF RUSSIAN DURING THE EIGHTH SESSION** (document 39 EX/DIV/2)

(29) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that he had received an informal request from the Soviet Embassy in Paris that the Secretariat estimate the cost of the various services required for the use of Russian during the General Conference. On the basis of that request, the Executive Board had adopted a resolution in private meeting on 20 July 1954, authorizing him to make the necessary preparations up to a maximum of $50,000. In anticipation of a favourable decision of the General Conference, he had accordingly arranged for a minimum number of services, which had so far resulted in commitments which would cost approximately $25,000.

(30) Sir Ronald ADAM stated that the Board assumed full responsibility for what it had done. Its decision had been taken in private, because the Board had been anxious not to raise too many false hopes.

(31) Mr. STOLETOV announced that his country had every intention of participating actively in Unesco's constructive work, but felt that it would be unable to do so unless Russian were accepted as an official working language at Unesco's conferences and meetings. He drew attention to the fact that Russian was one of the official working languages of the United Nations; it seemed to him inconceivable for an organization like Unesco, devoted to education, science and culture, to take a decision other than that which had been adopted by the United Nations.

(32) As for the financial aspect of the question, he assured the Committee that the Soviet Union wished to do everything possible to minimize expenditure. His delegation considered the following to be the minimum services required: (1) interpretation into and from Russian at plenary meetings of the General Conference and at meetings of its commissions and committees; (2) interpretation into and from Russian at meetings of the Executive Board; (3) translation into Russian of the main official documents and publications.

(33) In conclusion, Mr. Stoletov requested the General Committee to support his delegation's request at the plenary meeting of the General Conference.

(34) Mr. NUFER regretted that his delegation could not approve the decision taken by the Executive Board in private meeting. His delegation felt that it had been

presented with a "fait accompli". He proposed that the whole question be thoroughly examined by the Administrative Commission and that the Secretariat be asked to submit detailed estimates of the cost of the various services that would be required.

(35) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO pointed out that for many years past Unesco had been hoping that the USSR would take part in its work and that the Organization's ideas had not hitherto been as widely disseminated as it would have wished among the Soviet people. In his opinion, therefore, everything possible should be done to bring within that people's reach not only the documents produced by the current Conference, but also all documents dealing with projects or achievements that Unesco considered of special importance for the development of education, science and culture. He therefore urged the General Conference to give sympathetic and very thorough consideration to the question of adopting Russian as a working language.

(36) The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that the Executive Board's proposal under discussion referred exclusively to the partial use of Russian at the present session of the General Conference.

(37) At the request of Mr. BEEBY, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL gave details of the services for which he had made preparations: (1) interpretation into and from Russian at all meetings during the Conference at which there was simultaneous interpretation; (2) translation of the main documents of the session and of draft resolutions from and into Russian; (3) translation of speeches made in Russian in the records of plenary meetings; (4) translation into Russian of reports of commissions and committees; (5) translation into Russian of the final text of the resolutions and decisions of the General Conference after the close of the eighth session. The total cost would be approximately $50,000, of which $25,000 had already been expended or committed to some extent; that was to say, Russian interpreters and translators had been asked not to take on any other work which would prevent their coming to Montevideo until the Conference's decision was known. If the Conference's decision were favourable, those people would be sent for; if not, they would have to be paid an indemnity.

(38) Mr. COWELL stated that, in the opinion of his delegation, the Executive Board had acted wisely in anticipating its responsibilities. Moreover, under the Constitution, the Board was empowered to act for the General Conference between sessions. The United Kingdom delegation fully expected that the General Conference would grant the Soviet request. He therefore moved that the General Committee adopt the proposal concerning the partial use of Russian during the eighth session and that it approve the action taken by the Executive Board. The question of the future use of Russian in Unesco would be considered by various organs of the General Conference.

(39) The motion was seconded by Mr. KABIR, who welcomed the presence of the Soviet delegation and noted with pleasure that it was their wish to keep expenditure as low as possible.

(40) The motion was adopted, with 2 abstentions.

(41) Referring to a remark made by the delegate of the United Kingdom, Mr. GARDNER DAVIES said that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had given preliminary consideration to the proposal of the Soviet delegation regarding the use of Russian in future. The Committee had decided to ask the Soviet delegation for further information, and the Secretariat for budgetary estimates. Until it received that information, the Committee did not feel able to discuss the matter further.

(42) In reply to a question from Mr. STOLETOV, the CHAIRMAN said that the question of the use of Russian during the eighth session would come before the plenary meeting of the Conference that same day.

**VOTING RIGHTS OF COUNTRIES IN ARREARS IN THE PAYMENT OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS**

(43) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ stated that the report of the Credentials Committee, which had been approved the previous day, included a list of the States which were in the position referred to and to which Rule 70 of the Rules of Procedure applied. The problem should be considered with reference to paragraphs (2) and (3) of the said Rule.
(44) He asked the Secretariat for more detailed information on that question and would like to know the opinion of the Legal Adviser.

(45) Mr. BEEBY suggested that the matter might be referred to the Committee on Contributions, which the Administrative Commission would be setting up that day. That Committee could report back on Monday or Tuesday.

(46) The motion was seconded by Mr. NUFER and adopted.

**DRAFT RESOLUTIONS HAVING BUDGETARY REPERCUSSIONS SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARIAT AFTER THE DEADLINE LAID DOWN IN RULE 78, PARAGRAPH 2 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE**

(47) Mr. MONTAGNIER said that two draft resolutions which might have budgetary repercussions had been received after the deadline (documents 8C/DR/63 and 64). They had been submitted by Poland and France respectively. If the Rules of Procedure were strictly applied, those two proposals would not be eligible for consideration. At the seventh session of the General Conference, held in Paris, the General Committee had been consulted on whether draft resolutions received after expiry of the time-limit could be considered.

(48) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO pointed out that the draft resolutions in question did not affect the budget to a very great extent. Since the Conference was meeting that year in a country rather far away from Europe, he hoped that they should not take too strict an attitude towards the proposals in question.

(49) Mr. COWELL seconded the motion, but with some reluctance, as he was a member of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, which had to examine all the draft resolutions. The French and Polish proposals brought their number up to 64. He hoped that, in future, delegations would not submit draft resolutions after the deadline.

(50) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ supported Mr. Berredo Carneiro's proposal and agreed with the interpretation given by the United Kingdom representative. He thought that the question should be treated as an exceptional case for the reasons given by Mr. Carneiro.

(51) Mr. BOURGEOIS agreed with the United Kingdom delegate. He would like to see special stress laid on the exceptional character of the treatment it was proposed to give to the draft resolutions in question.

(52) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES announced that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget would include in its report a recommendation that, in future years, Member States should be asked to submit new draft resolutions at a time when the Director-General could take them into consideration in preparing the draft programme and budget for the next two years.

(53) The motion proposed by Mr. Berredo Carneiro was adopted.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.

# SECOND MEETING

*15 November a. 9 a. m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

(1) The CHAIRMAN informed the General Committee that the Republic of Cuba had paid a sufficient proportion of its arrears to enable it to take part with full voting rights in the General Conference. The delegation of Venezuela, on the other hand, would not be attending the eighth session of the General Conference.

(2) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to the fact that Venezuela's failure to send a delegation to the eighth session of the General Conference meant that the Headquarters Committee was without a Chairman. He suggested that the General Committee might wish to appoint as Chairman Mr. Berredo Carneiro (Brazil), who had served on the Headquarters Committee for a long time. In order not to lose a Latin American seat on the General Committee, he suggested that a delegate of a Latin American country be appointed Vice-Chairman.

(3) Mr. RUIZ-GIMENEZ concurred in the Director-General's proposal.

(4) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ also agreed with the proposal that Mr. Berredo Carneiro, delegate of Brazil, be appointed Chairman of the Headquarters Committee and that the vacancy created by that appointment among the ten Vice-Presidents of the General Conference be filled by a representative of Latin America.

(5) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO accepted that proposal.

(6) The agenda having been completed, the CHAIRMAN called upon the Chairmen of commissions and committees to report on the progress of work in their respective bodies.

(7) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES announced that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had completed its detailed examination of the Director-General's draft programme and budget for 1955-56. Further, it had completed, with two exceptions, its examination of draft resolutions submitted by delegations to the eighth session of the General Conference. The Committee would be considering its report that evening, and it should be ready for distribution sometime the following day. In accordance with its terms of reference, the Committee's report was to go to the Programme and Budget Commission and to the Administrative Commission. The Advisory Committee hoped that the Administrative Commission would examine the two following points as soon as possible: (1) the scale of contributions for 1955-56; (2) the method of financing the budget for 1955-56. Until the Administrative Commission had taken a decision on the first point, the General Conference could not consider the question of the total budget figure for 1955-56. With regard to the second point, by special decision of the General Conference, the budget surplus of previous years had been used in 1953-54 to finance the current budget.

(8) Mr. BEEBY stated that the Administrative Commission had held its first meeting on Saturday afternoon, when it had elected its officers and set up a Committee on Contributions. The Committee was to meet in the afternoon and the whole of the next day

(Tuesday, 16 November) to discuss means of financing the budget, and it was hoped that it would be able to report back to the Commission on that subject by Wednesday morning at the latest. With regard to the Commission's own agenda, it would first examine the Auditor's Report and would then go on (on Tuesday morning, 16 November) to consider the important question of the structure of the Executive Board.
(9) Mr. Beeby asked the Chairman if the question of China's contribution was to be referred to the Administrative Commission.

(10) The CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative.

(11) In reply to a question from Mr. KABIR, Mr. BEEBY said that the Secretariat had already drawn up a tentative scale of contributions for 1955-56.

(12) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES asked if the Administrative Commission could consider the means of financing the budget and the question of budgetary surpluses within 48 hours.

(13) Mr. BEEBY replied that, in his opinion, it would be better for the Commission to consider that question on the basis of the report of the Advisory Committee. He therefore suggested that the item be taken by the Commission on Wednesday afternoon.

(14) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES agreed.

(15) Mr. VERONESE reminded the meeting that 3 December was the date scheduled for the election of the Executive Board. The procedure for that election would depend on whether the General Conference accepted the proposed amendment to Article V of the Constitution. Mr. Veronese would therefore be glad to know whether the Administrative Commission would soon be able to submit a preliminary report on the problems raised by that draft amendment (item 9.3.1 of agenda of the Conference).

(16) Mr. BEEBY replied that he expected the Commission to be able to make an interim report including that item. He did not share the fears of certain delegates, who believed that the debate on the structure of the Executive Board would last three or four days; he very much hoped that it would be possible to conclude it on Tuesday afternoon. The question would then have to be referred to the Legal Committee. It was important to report on the matter to the Conference in plenary meeting as soon as possible, as the Secretariat had informed him that there would be a fortnight's work to be done between the Conference's decision and the election of members of the Executive Board.

The meeting rose at 9.35 a.m.

# THIRD MEETING

*17 November 1954 at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

(1) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL announced that the Secretariat had some suggestions to make regarding the sequence of work of the General Conference. He requested the Assistant Director-General to explain what the Secretariat proposed.

(2) Mr. MAHEU pointed out that the time-table of work depended mainly on when the Programme and Budget Commission fixed the provisional budget total. It could do so only after it received the Report of the Administrative Commission on:(1) the scale of contributions, and (2) the financing of the projects included in the programme.
(3) Mr. Maheu thought that the Administrative Commission would be able to submit its report on Monday, 22 November, so that on Tuesday morning, 23 November, the Programme and Budget Commission could consider the problem of fixing the provisional budget total.

(4) Mr. BEEBY replied that he thought it a fair estimate. The Administrative Commission would start on financial questions that afternoon and he was sure that it would be in a position to report on Monday morning at the latest.

(5) Mr. MAHEU submitted the Secretariat's proposals concerning the sequence of work of the Programme and Budget Commission. The Commission would not start discussing its agenda proper until the morning of 18 November, but might be holding its first meeting in the afternoon of 17 November to appoint its officers and consider some organizational questions. By Monday, 22 November, the Commission would have to consider three major questions and Mr. Maheu indicated the order proposed by the Secretariat for those discussions:
(6) (1) General discussion of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56. The draft programme would be presented by the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General on 18 November at the morning meeting. At the same meeting the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget would submit his report.
(7) (2) General consideration of the document prepared by the Executive Board on the Remodelling of

the Future Programme. It seemed logical to link those two items, even though they were the subject of separate reports by the Advisory Committee. Following that preliminary discussion, the item might be sent back to the Advisory Committee for further study; the Programme Commission would then take its final decision after that first consultation.
(8) (3) Technical Assistance. The Commission would complete its discussion of that item, whereas it would undertake only a general discussion of points (1) and (2), leaving detailed discussion of the draft programme and budget until the budget ceiling had been fixed and a general attitude determined towards (2).
(9) That work would occupy the period from Wednesday 17 to Tuesday 23 November, as a plenary meeting was to be held in the meantime to consider the Administrative Commission's proposals on the amendments to the Constitution; that meeting could be held between the consideration of points (2) and (3) indicated above.

(10) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES formally moved adoption of the Secretariat's proposals.

(11) Mr. KABIR asked whether it would be possible, in order to save time, for the Programme and Budget Commission to combine the first two items, namely, the discussion of the draft programme and budget for 1955-56 and the discussion of the Executive Board's Report on the Remodelling of Unesco's Future Programme.

(12) Mr. MAHEU thought that it might be wiser to leave it to the Commission itself to decide that point.

(13) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES observed that the Advisory Committee would be submitting a separate report on each of those items.

(14) Mr. BOURGEOIS endorsed the Secretariat's proposals, which for the time being were the most satisfactory, since the discussions would be based on two separate reports. He thought that the report of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would clarify the line to be followed in those discussions.

(15) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES explained that the report of the Advisory Committee on its examination of the draft programme and budget had already been printed, but the Committee had not yet approved the final draft of its Report on the Remodelling of the Future Programme. Therefore, if the Programme and Budget Commission met the following day (18 November), it would be able to examine the first report only.

(16) In reply to Mr. HAGUIWARA, Mr. MAHEU explained that the decision concerning the budget total was taken at a plenary meeting on the recommendation of the Programme and Budget Commission.

(17) Mr. HAGUIWARA enquired whether a plenary meeting would be held immediately after the Programme Commission had decided the budget total in order to approve that total. He gathered from the Secretariat's affirmative reply that the plenary meeting could be held on Tuesday 23 or Wednesday 24 November.

(18) The General Committee approved the Secretariat's proposals concerning the organization of work.

(19) Mr. MAHEU pointed out that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would present that Committee's report to the Administrative Commission that very afternoon and to the Programme Commission the following morning and would draw the attention of each Commission to the subjects within their respective competence.

(20) Mr. BEEBY stated that the Commission had three urgent matters to settle: (1) the method of financing the budget (on which it would report by Monday, 22 November); (2) the structure of the Executive Board; and (3) arrears of contributions of Member States. The Commission had held a whole day's discussion on the constitution of the Executive Board, but had decided not to vote on it until Thursday afternoon (18 November). With regard to arrears of contributions, the Committee on Contributions was almost ready to report back to the Commission, but Mr. Beeby did not know exactly when the latter would be able to present its own report on that subject.

(21) Sir Ronald ADAM asked if it would be possible for the Executive Board to meet the following morning (18 November) at 9 a.m., instead of the General Committee, to discuss applications of international non-governmental organizations for admittance to consultative arrangements with Unesco.

(22) It was agreed that the Board should meet at that time.

(23) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES asked the Chairman of the Headquarters Committee when he was expecting the Committee to meet.

(24) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO said that no decision had yet been taken as to when his Committee would meet. The date would depend on consultations which were proceeding with the Secretariat.

(25) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that there was no great urgency. Mr. Callison of the Headquarters Office was arriving in Montevideo the following week, and the Committee might decide to meet then.

(26) In reply to a question from Mr. MAHEU, Mr. BEEBY said that the Commission intended to discuss the directives concerning subventions to international non-governmental organizations immediately after it had settled the three urgent matters he had already mentioned. It would then discuss staff questions later in the following week.

(27) Mr. MAHEU explained that it would facilitate the work of the Programme and Budget Commission if, before discussing subventions, it could have

the report of the Administrative Commission on that subject.

(28) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ announced that he was going to raise a different subject from those under discussion. Uruguay was a country that had always been in the van of Latin American civilization owing to the wealth and vigour of its national culture. In earlier days Uruguayan culture had been represented by such famous writers and poets as José Enrique Rodó, Herrera y Reissig and Zorrilla de San Martín. Today, that culture was personified by the poetess Juana de Ibarbourou, who was famed all over the continent.
(29) He thought that Unesco should pay homage to the Uruguayan poetess by inviting her to a plenary meeting at which one of the delegates would pay a tribute to her intellectual eminence. The ceremony would not last more than five minutes and would be held at the time considered most convenient.

(30) The CHAIRMAN said he had been deeply moved by the words of the representative of Colombia. The proposal filled him with pride and joy, especially as Juana de Ibarbourou, besides being his compatriot, came from his own part of the country and was a personal friend. He accepted the tribute as an honour paid to Uruguay.

(31) Mr. RUIZ-GIMENEZ supported Mr. Bernal Jimenez' proposal and expressed his gratification at the tribute to be paid to "Juana de America" at a session of a Unesco General Conference held in America.

(32) The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, the General Committee would take the proposal into consideration and would consult with the Director-General on the arrangements to be made.

(33) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI supported Mr. Bernal Jimenez' proposal and referred to the precedent of the Florence Conference. There a similar tribute was paid to Madame Montessori, who had been invited to speak at a meeting of the Programme Commission.

(34) The CHAIRMAN announced that the General Committee would make arrangements for the tribute to be paid to Juana de Ibarbourou and thanked members on behalf of Uruguay for having approved the proposal.

(35) Mr. BEEBY requested the advice of the General Committee on whether or not to include two new items on the agenda. He recalled that the Commission had already adopted a resolution recommending the granting of a request from the Government of Iran for the writing off of the sum of $4,915.15, being a loss incurred by the Iranian National Commission acting as a distributing agency for Unesco coupons. Just before the Conference, a similar request had been received from the Government of Yugoslavia and, since the Conference had started, another from the Government of Israel. If so desired, those two items could be added to the agenda.

(36) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the Secretariat could see no objection to the inclusion of the two items.

(37) Mr. MONTAGNIER pointed out that the inclusion of additional items on the agenda of the Conference had to be approved by a two-thirds majority of the Conference, on the recommendation of the General Committee.

(38) In reply to a question from Mr. GARDNER DAVIES, Mr. BEEBY said that the Administrative Commission had not voted on the principle involved, but only on the specific case of Iran. However, the Commission had been informed by the Secretariat that, as other arrangements had since been made, it was practically impossible for the situation to recur.

The meeting rose at 9.50 a.m.

# FOURTH MEETING

*19 November 1954 at 9 a. m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI (Italy)

**PROGRESS REPORTS BY THE CHAIRMEN OF COMMISSIONS**

(1) Mr. BEEBY said that the Administrative Commission hoped that day to finish its preliminary consideration of amendments to Article V of the Constitution (composition of the Executive Board). The matter would then be referred to the Legal Committee, and he hoped that the Administrative Commission would be able to reach a decision and to submit a resolution by the evening of the 20th.
(2) He hoped that his Commission would be able to present a report on the scale of contributions and methods of financing the budget by the evening of the 20th, provided there was a meeting in the afternoon.

(3) Mr. BOURGEOIS said that the Programme and Budget Commission had embarked the previous day on the general discussion of the programme, which would probably still take up part of the morning. As it was impossible to discuss the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 in detail with no indication given of the provisional budget ceiling, the Commission would proceed to consider the report of the Executive Board on the future programme of the Organization (document 8C/PRG/13). It would still have time enough on Monday, 22 November, to deal with technical assistance and to settle general questions before embarking on the substance of the programme, which the Commission was intending to discuss on the basis of the proposals submitted by the United States delegation.

**SUGGESTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE PROCEDURE FOR STUDYING THE PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56** (document 8C/BUR/2)

(4) Mr. Bourgeois proposed the following procedure, suggested by conversations he had held with various delegates after the Commission's meeting. On the first proposal - to the effect that delegations should notify the Secretariat by Monday morning of the items in the programme which they wanted discussed - he suggested accepting that time-limit for Chapters 1, 2 and 3, and accepting proposals concerning Chapters 4 and 5 up to the evening of Thursday, 25 November. He thought all delegations would agree to that proposal. It had further been agreed to drop the proposal for the establishment of working group of specialists. Mr. Bourgeois added that it would be a good thing if delegations arranged for their specialists to get into touch, between meetings, with the directors of Unesco's various departments, who would certainly be very glad to see them.

(5) Mr. KOTSCHNIG said that his delegation would not insist on its second proposal and could agree to the plan proposed by the previous speaker.

(6) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured the Committee that the Secretariat would be very ready to co-operate with the experts mentioned and to work out a schedule of meetings to fit in with the programme of the Conference.

(7) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS feared that by the time the heads of delegations had informed the Secretariat of the matters on which they wished to speak, every item in the existing programme would have been called in question, and the proposal would merely put delegations to a lot of unnecessary work.
(8) Experience of previous Conferences had shown how exceedingly difficult it was to work to a schedule. Sometimes discussion of an apparently contentious notion petered out with but a single speaker; at others there were floods of eloquence. The only way effectively to shorten discussion was to limit the time allowed to speakers - a solution which was unlikely to be acceptable. There was one practical recommendation that might be made, namely, that delegations absent themselves from the Palacio Legislativo as little as possible and that they regularly ask the Secretariat whether matters of interest to them are likely to be raised at any particular meeting.
(9) It was significant that the proposal under discussion came from what was numerically the largest delegation at the Conference, and that it was largely supported by the smaller delegations, which, while deeply conscious of their rights, found it difficult to meet their responsibilities. A workable procedure had already been evolved and he was in favour of maintaining it.

(10) Mr. VERONESE, after paying tribute to the intentions underlying the United States proposal, made a general statement. The procedure so far adopted was based on experience; it had evolved gradually and been accepted in plenary session and he would be reluctant to change it at that stage. He then went on to comment on the first part of the proposal before the Committee, the second having already been withdrawn. He asked the United States delegate whether the fact of certain delegations having submitted as many as 70 new proposals did not already provide the kind of information he wanted. Together they constituted a list of problems which delegations wished to have discussed over and above the proposed programme. He was somewhat alarmed also by the third paragraph of the proposal, to the effect that only those projects should be

discussed which, in the opinion of any Member State, needed to be substantially modified. That idea would exclude the minor adjustments that might be made to projects by the Secretariat, in consultation with specialists from delegations. That brought them to the second part of the proposal, which had just been withdrawn. If one tried to give a definition of "substantial modification", the Commission would be liable to be drawn into fresh discussions on the actual evaluation of projects. Mr. Veronese recommended that the General Committee adopt the United States proposal interpreted as meaning a consultation, but without deciding in advance what would emerge from the consultation.

(11) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO said that, although the delegation of Brazil had, in the meeting, supported the proposal put forward by the United States delegate, that did not mean it was deaf to the arguments of other delegates.
(12) He thought some kind of compromise could be reached to the effect that any proposal to amend a project, either in substance or in form, should be submitted by delegations in writing to the officers of the Programme Commission. Those proposals would be fully discussed by the Commission, whereas programme projects for which no proposal for amendment had been received, could be considered as approved, and the Commission could go through them quickly so as to give more time to points which needed detailed discussion. That procedure would have the merit of meeting both the United Kingdom delegate's request for free discussion and the United States delegate's desire to avoid bouts of eloquence on proposals which were accepted by Member States. Mr. Carneiro had not attended the previous day's discussions, but he gathered from what he had been told that they had not made any specific, practical contribution to the improvement of the programme. On the other hand, he would like to see the Commission or the working parties dwell on points for which substantial amendments had been proposed. He asked the United States delegate to refrain from making a formal proposal and to leave it to the Chairman and other officers of the Commission to bear the underlying intention in mind.

(13) Mr. HAGUIWARA said that the aim of the Programme and Budget Commission's discussions was to produce a better and more concentrated programme. That aim could be achieved only by abolishing certain appropriations and increasing others. A procedure had been worked out for the consideration of draft resolutions with budgetary implications; 70 or so draft resolutions had been considered by the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee. It was the abolition of appropriations which caused the greatest difficulties. He wondered whether a delegation could propose abolishing certain appropriations without knowing the total figure of savings to be made. Mr. Haguiwara thought it difficult to reach a firm conclusion at a meeting of the General Committee, without even knowing the provisional budget ceiling. He thought that it lay with the Commissions, with full knowledge of the facts, to form their own conclusions.

(14) Mr. BOURGEOIS said that there was no question of drawing up hard-and-fast rules for the discussions. The main idea of the United States proposal was to see that the Programme Commission did not cover the same ground as the Advisory Committee and to make use of the latter's report. What was wanted was not draft amendments to the proposed programme but an indication of the points on which delegations wished to speak, on the understanding that they agreed with the Director-General's other proposals and the Advisory Committee's findings. In any case, the Commission had to submit to the Conference a draft programme on which a formal vote would be taken.

(15) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES paid tribute to the intentions behind the United States proposal. It had indeed been the hope of the Advisory Committee that the Programme and Budget Commission would not have to cover the same ground.
(16) At the same time he was inclined to agree with the delegates of the United Kingdom and Italy in doubting the practical value of the proposal. Perhaps the suggestion by the delegate of Brazil, being more flexible, had more to commend it. Delegations might be asked to submit to the General Committee, in writing, any amendments they might wish to propose to the programme and budget documents and to the recommendations of the Administrative Commission. In that way there would be a clear indication of the points likely to be taken up and the work of the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission would be facilitated.

(17) Mr. KOTSCHNIG felt that agreement was very close. He agreed with the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission that it would be most useful to know beforehand what points were likely to lead to discussion. Delegations might simply be asked to let the Secretariat know what were the points on which they had definite ideas, so that the Secretariat might then be able to issue a general document listing those points.

(18) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) said that the delegate of Japan had raised an important point. If the Programme and Budget Commission could start work as soon as ever a decision had been taken on the budget ceiling, there would be some point in delegations listing the questions they were anxious to raise.

(19) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO thought it possible to work out a system which would enable the Chairman to tell his Commission how it could best avoid proposals that would distract attention.

(20) Mr. VERONESE thought that to judge by the vote taken in the Commission the day before it had been left to the General Committee to draw up a work plan. He also thought that agreement was practically reached on the procedure of consultation advocated by the United States delegate and the submission of findings to the officers of the Programme Commission, who would base their final proposals for the conduct of work on those findings.

(21) The delegate of Spain supported that proposal.

(22) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS was ready to support the suggestions made by the delegate of Italy, provided the General Committee approached the problem in a flexible manner.

(23) Mr. STOLETOV said that, as he understood it, two points had been made clear about the procedure for discussion of the report by the Administrative Commission. Firstly, if any delegation wanted a draft proposal submitted, it could raise the matter in the Commission without prior notification. Secondly, any delegation should be free to explain, without prior notification, the reasons for its vote on any draft resolution submitted. He was, in fact, in favour of keeping the normal procedure for discussion of the Commission's report.

(24) Mr. KOTSCHNIG said that the delegate of Italy had spoken of consultation of delegations. If that meant that delegations would be asked to inform the Secretariat of any points of especial interest to them, in order that the Secretariat might prepare a general paper on the question, he could agree.

(25) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS considered that delegations should merely be asked to indicate what points were of particular interest to them, and that they should not be required to outline their exact position on those points.

(26) Mr. KABIR was now less sure of the advantages of the United States proposal. At the same time, if the Committee adopted the United Kingdom suggestion that delegations should merely be invited to indicate points of interest to them, things would be left much as they were. The Commission was losing a good deal of time and the sooner it passed to a discussion of the programme, the better.

(27) Mr. BEEBY said that a similar discussion had taken place at the Mexico City Conference, and the only conclusion reached had been that the Chairman of the Commission had to be trusted to direct the debates as he thought fit. He would suggest that, in the Commission, delegations be informed that they could expedite matters by indicating points of interest to them, perhaps with a statement of their position. Then the Commission would have to trust the Chairman.

(28) Mr. KOTSCHNIG could agree with that suggestion, provided it were made clear to delegations that they should, rather than could, expedite matters by so doing.

(29) Mr. BEEBY agreed.

(30) Mr. BOURGEOIS explained that in his view that procedure should serve for the Commission's guidance but should not be restrictive. Each delegation should still be entitled to speak on any item in the programme. The idea of the procedure proposed was solely to avoid repetition and duplication of the Advisory Committee's work.

(31) The CHAIRMAN asked if members agreed to delegations being asked to notify the Chairman of the Programme Commission, by a date to be indicated by the latter, on what points they wished to speak. The request would be made merely in order to obtain information.

(32) Agreed.

(33) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS said his agreement was subject to the schedule indicated by the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission being observed.

(34) Mr. STOLETOV asked whether the two assumptions he had made in his earlier statement were correct.

(35) The CHAIRMAN confirmed that they were.

**RESOLUTION ON THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL FUND (document 8C/DR/69)**

(36) It was agreed that this matter should be the first item for discussion at the meeting to be held on Monday, 22 November.

**OTHER BUSINESS – PROBLEM IN CONNEXION WITH THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(37) Mr. BEEBY said that the Advisory Committee had referred the problem of reducing the amount of work to be done by the Executive Board and the length of its sessions, to the Administrative Commission. Could the Administrative Commission refer that problem to the Executive Board through the General Committee?

(38) Sir Ronald ADAM thought it would be better to wait until the new Board had been elected.

(39) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the question had been considered in the Secretariat. No such reform was possible without amendments to the Constitution and the Regulations. All that could be done now was that the Conference might call on the Director-General and the Board to study the matter with a view to submitting proposals at the next session of the Conference.

(40) Mr. BEEBY said he would report back to his Commission to that effect.

(41) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES said that that would meet the wishes of the Advisory Committee.

(42) Mr. HAGUIWARA suggested that the General Committee place on its agenda for the meeting on 22 or 23 November the question of budget levels, which was to be discussed by the Administrative Commission and on which it would be most valuable to have a preliminary discussion in a small committee.

(43) The CHAIRMAN explained that there could only be an informal discussion, on matters of procedure and not of substance. With that reservation, he was prepared to place the item on the agenda of the General Committee's next meeting, which was to be held at 9 a.m. on Monday, 22 November 1954.

The meeting rose at 10.30 a.m.

# FIFTH MEETING

*22 November 1954 at 9 a. m.*

*Chairmen:* Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan)

*later:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

(1) Opening the meeting, Mr. HAGUIWARA announced the death, at Punta del Este, on 20 November 1954, of Mr. de Thibault, Governor-General of the Belgian Congo; the announcement so made would be repeated in all Commissions and in plenary meeting in the course of the afternoon.

**PROGRESS OF THE WORK OF THE SESSION: REPORTS BY THE CHAIRMEN OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES**

(2) Mr. MONTAGNIER said that, after hearing the progress reports of chairmen of commissions and committees, he would be able to indicate the work arrangements for two or three days ahead.

(3) Mr. BEEBY announced that the Administrative Commission had practically completed its work on amendments to Article V of the Constitution and would be ready to report thereon to the plenary meeting in the afternoon. That morning, the Commission would be taking financial questions, but could not expect to finish them. He hoped it would be possible for the Administrative Commission to meet in the afternoon after the plenary meeting.
(4) On Saturday, twenty-three Member States had unfortunately been absent from the meeting of the Administrative Commission, so that many of its decisions, carried by a narrow margin, might well be reversed in the plenary meeting.
(5) In conclusion, Mr. Beeby hoped that it would be possible for the Administrative Commission to meet the following morning.

(6) Mr. BOURGEOIS reported that the Programme and Budget Commission concluded its general discussion of the programme for 1955-56 by Friday evening, 19 November 1954. At its meeting on Saturday morning, the Commission decided not to discuss the proposals regarding the division of resources between permanent and special activities until it had gone through the proposed programme and budget in detail and received the Advisory Committee's report on the point. That day the Committee proposed to take the technical assistance questions and the following day, when the report of the Administrative Commission would be before them, the question of the provisional budget ceiling for 1955-56.

(7) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES recalled that most of the questions relating to the Executive Board's report on the remodelling of Unesco's future programme had been referred to the Advisory Committee. The Committee intended to study those questions at four meetings starting on Wednesday afternoon, but he feared that its work would be greatly retarded by the fact that simultaneous interpretation would not be available. In view of the heavy tasks devolving upon the Committee, he asked the General Committee if one of the three following solutions could be envisaged: (1) the Advisory Committee might hold more than four meetings; (2) it might be possible to have simultaneous interpretation after all; (3) if only consecutive interpretation were available, it might be possible to use only English and French as working languages. If none of those solutions were possible, he feared that the Committee would have to hold night meetings, which it was naturally reluctant to do.

(8) Mr. MONTAGNIER pointed out that in the plan for the organization of its proceedings approved by the Conference it was stipulated that only two meetings with simultaneous interpretation and two with consecutive interpretation could be held at one and the same time; thence the Advisory Committee could be provided with simultaneous interpretation only when there were no meetings of the Administrative Commission. He emphasized the great practical difficulty of providing simultaneous interpretation at three meetings staged concurrently.

(9) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES reminded the Committee that he had not received an answer to his question concerning the possibility of restricting the working languages in the Advisory Committee to English and French.

(10) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ thought that interpretation into Spanish should not be dispensed with in the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. The use of Spanish caused very little loss of time and facilitated the work of Spanish-speaking delegates.
(11) Speaking as Chairman of the Credentials Committee, he had to report to the General Committee of the Conference that a number of States had now lodged their respective representatives' credentials in due form and a further report would be prepared for the afternoon's plenary meeting. Under the powers delegated by the Committee to its Chairman, he himself would be able to draft the report in question in the course of the forenoon without having to call the Credentials Committee together.

(12) Speaking for one of the smaller delegations, Mr. SHARIF expressed regret that meetings of the Plenary Conference, the Programme and Budget Commission and the Working Party on Decentralization should all be scheduled for that afternoon. He had understood it to be a rule that, when the Plenary Conference was

meeting, no other organ of the Conference should meet to discuss questions of importance. As the Executive Board was preparing a paper on decentralization, he suggested that the meeting of the working party might be postponed until that paper was ready.

(13) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, although the Plenary Conference and the Programme and Budget Commission were to meet simultaneously, the latter would be holding a general discussion only on technical assistance. As for the Working Party on Decentralization, he would ask the Chairman of the Board to reply to that question.

(14) Sir Ronald ADAM explained that the Board's paper was on the National Commission aspect of decentralization. Although it would not be ready until that evening at the earliest, the working party could, nevertheless, meet to discuss other aspects of the problem.

(15) Mr. SHARIF observed that the National Commission aspect was inseparably connected with other aspects. He did not, however, wish to make a formal proposal and, if the majority of the General Committee thought that the working party should meet that afternoon, he would accept their opinion.

(16) Mr. BOURGEOIS supported Mr. Sharif's suggestion. The Working Party on Decentralization could be suspended for the duration of the plenary meeting to meet the difficulties of the smaller delegations without that entailing the sacrifice of one of the meetings planned for the working party, which had only a very limited time for its work.

(17) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES again asked for the Committee's advice on the subject of working languages and interpretation at the forthcoming meetings of the Advisory Committee.

(18) Mr. MONTAGNIER reminded the Committee that the Rules of Procedure were very definite: Spanish was a working language of the General Conference on the same footing as English or French and interpretation into Spanish could only be dispensed with if all the Spanish-speaking members of the committee concerned agreed.

(19) Mr. HAGUIWARA confirmed that interpretation and pointed out that in a small committee the Chairman could often get members to agree to dispensing with interpretation into one or even two of the working languages for that meeting only. However, before taking any decision he thought they should hear what the Secretariat suggested about the programme of work for the next two or three days.

(20) Mr. MONTAGNIER said that the Programme Commission would be meeting daily up to Wednesday, 24 November. That day (22 November) a meeting of the Administrative Commission could be fitted in during the afternoon by cancelling the meeting of the Committee on Reports of Member States. For Tuesday morning, 23 November, meetings of the Administrative and Programme Commissions and of two of the Programme Commission's working parties were planned. As it was necessary to make the best possible use of the means and time available, it was desirable for four of the subsidiary bodies of the Conference to meet simultaneously. For the afternoon of the 23rd, meetings of the Programme Commission, of the Committee on Reports of Member States, of the Working Party and possibly of the Advisory Committee, were proposed. On Wednesday, 24 November, there was to be a plenary meeting in the morning to take item 14 of the agenda (examination of the report of the Programme and Budget Commission and provisional decision on the maximum assessment level and on the total budget figure for 1955-56), plus meetings of the Programme Commission's two working parties and of the Committee on Reports of Member States. Should a decision on item 14 be reached at the morning's plenary meeting, the Programme Commission could begin the detailed study of Part II of the proposed programme and budget in the afternoon and three other subsidiary bodies of the Conference could also meet; those might be the Administrative Commission, the Advisory Committee and one of the Programme Commission's working parties. On Thursday, 25 November, it was proposed to hold a meeting of the Advisory Committee in the morning and of the Headquarters Committee in the afternoon.

(21) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) asked whether the meetings of the Programme and Administrative Commission on the 25th, would last the whole day.

(22) Mr. MONTAGNIER said that he did not know yet what the Administrative Commission would want to do that day. Generally speaking, though, the Commission could hold daily meetings except when the Legal Committee was sitting. If the latter Committee did not meet on the 25th, the Programme and Administrative Commissions could hold two meetings each that day in addition to the proposed meetings of the Advisory and Headquarters Committees and, possibly, two working parties.

(23) The time-table submitted by the Secretariat was approved.

International Cultural Fund (draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Brazil) (document 8C/DR/69)

(24) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO, introducing the resolution, recalled that the Brazilian delegation in its comments on the Director-General's Report had suggested the establishment of an International Cultural Fund. At the moment the Conference was not being asked to approve the actual establishment of the Fund, but simply to authorize the Director-General to have the proposal studied in consultation with the Executive Board and Member States; very careful preliminary study was essential and there had also to be contacts and consultations, not to mention the essential concurrence of the few States favoured by fortune and of the numerous States for which the provision of substantial help under Unesco's programme was becoming increasingly necessary if their aspirations and needs were to be met and the provisions of the Constitution complied with.

(25) In view of the recent changes adopted regarding the membership of the Executive Board, the speaker suggested amending the draft resolution submitted by amplifying the opening sentence to read "Authorizes the Director-General to arrange for a study, in consultation with the Executive Board and Member States ...." and striking out the second sentence, which had become pointless.

(26) In Mr. Carneiro's view it would be difficult to refuse to commend this text to the Conference; after all, Unesco was meeting in a region of underdeveloped countries to which it had not given much help and had just decided to hold its next session in another underdeveloped region. He felt it was most important not to leave Latin America without giving it grounds for hoping that Unesco was exercised about its problems and was trying to solve them nor to arrive in India without having given that preliminary indication of interest. He hoped that the project would secure the unanimous approval both of the wealthy countries and of the very numerous countries which were less favoured. Finally, could he be told to what commission the project should be submitted?

(27) Mr. KABIR, while entirely in sympathy with the proposal of the delegate of Brazil, thought it more appropriate for it to be discussed in the Programme and Budget Commission than in the General Committee, which was concerned with procedural matters only.

(28) Although Mr. COWELL was sure that no one would contest the fact that the Brazilian proposal was entirely in line with Unesco's aims, he felt that some order of priority should be established for all the appeals for funds being made to governments. His own Government, for example, was already contributing to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Colombo Plan; then there was at present before the United Nations a proposal for the establishment of a Fund for Economic Development; there was also the question of the Educational Development Fund. He therefore suggested that a resolution in broader terms than that of the Brazilian delegation was required; it might, for example, read: "The General Conference authorizes the Director-General to arrange for a study of the utility and practicability of including among the resolutions of the General Conference appeals for extra-budgetary funds for the execution of Unesco's objectives".

(29) In reply to a remark by the DIRECTOR-GENERAL, Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO said that the referral of his proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission would be satisfactory to his delegation.

(30) Mr. KOTSCHNIG would agree to that solution on the understanding that members of the Programme and Budget Commission would be able to suggest amendments to the Brazilian delegation's resolutions such as that proposed by the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(31) Mr. LEROY agreed with the measures adopted but said that a point of procedure arose. In its comments on Part II, Chapter 1, Education, paragraph 143 (8C/BUD/1, p. 5) the Advisory Committee had made a recommendation that, if the work plans submitted by the Director-General for the establishment of an International Fund needed to be expanded, the General Conference should give him any instructions it considered necessary to enable him to undertake activities in connexion with the matter in the light of the decisions taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The question arose whether that recommendation did not clash with the proposal of the Brazilian delegation.

(32) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI thought that the General Committee should simply refer the draft resolution to the Programme Commission, which could study it in detail.

(33) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO suggested that, to meet the point raised by the delegate of France, the amendment of the first phrase might be further amplified as follows: "Authorizes the Director-General to arrange for a study, in consultation with the Executive Board, Member States and the United Nations.....".

(34) Mr. BOURGEOIS pointed out that the proposal of the delegation of Brazil was connected with another proposal by the same delegation to instruct the Director-General to consider what major projects Unesco could undertake under future programmes. As the latter proposal had been referred to the Advisory Committee, it would probably be a good idea to send the Committee Mr. Berredo Carneiro's latest proposal as well.

(35) Mr. KOTSCHNIG moved that the Brazilian proposal be referred to the Programme and Budget Commission and not to the Advisory Committee, which had already been obliged to refer the question of the Educational Development Fund to that Commission.

(36) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES strongly supported this motion.

Legal guarantees to be provided nationally for the staff of the Secretariat (draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Italy) (document 8C/DR/74)

(37) Mr. MONTAGNIER explained that the resolution was being put before the General Committee because it was not expressly included in the agenda, unless it could be read into item 9.5.1 of the revised agenda (Personnel Recruitment Standards and Methods), which would be dealt with in the Administrative Commission.

(38) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI explained that the purpose of the draft resolution was to make it easier to secure outstanding and highly qualified persons for certain important posts in the Secretariat by removing any fears they might have as to the security of their careers in their own countries.

(39) The referral of the draft resolution to the General Conference was approved.

**PROCEDURE TO BE ADOPTED FOR THE DISCUSSION OF ITEMS 8.3 AND 14 OF THE REVISED AGENDA**

(40) Mr. MONTAGNIER pointed out that that matter had just been settled by the Committee's approval of the proposed work plan for the next three days submitted by the Secretariat. The Administrative Commission would have to report on the financing of the budget and the scale of contributions and its report would be forwarded to the Programme Commission; the Conference could decide about item 14 in plenary meeting on the morning of the 24th.

(41) This procedure was approved.

**AMENDMENT TO THE WORDING OF ITEM 15 OF THE REVISED AGENDA, AND PROCEDURE TO BE ADOPTED FOR THE ELECTION OF TWENTY-TWO MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(42) Mr. MONTAGNIER said that, when the agenda was drawn up, it provided for the election of 10 members only. Arising out of the proposal adopted by the Administrative Commission, the number of members now to be elected to the Board was 22. The Chairman was going to make a statement on the procedure for those elections, and the dates had still to be fixed.

(43) The CHAIRMAN read the draft of a statement which would be made in plenary meeting after the amendments to Article V of the Constitution had been approved. The text of the statement would appear in the verbatim record of the eleventh plenary meeting (8C/VR/11).

(44) Mr. KABIR remarked that the meeting of the Nominations Committee had originally been scheduled for 3 December. It was now proposed to hold it on 7 December, and he asked if it would be possible to advance it one day, so that it would meet on 6 December.

(45) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO pointed out that the Member States who had nominated candidates before the Administrative Commission had decided to change the membership of the Executive Board, would have to confirm or amend their nominations in the light of those changes; on the other hand, the States which had proposed the changes would presumably not have to supply such confirmation.

(46) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL informed the Committee that a number of governments, anticipating the possible adoption of the proposed amendment to Article V of the Constitution, had already nominated candidates before the opening of the eighth session. It would therefore be unnecessary to call upon them again for nominations.

(47) Mr. RUIZ-GIMENEZ asked whether, in view of the new method of election, the list of nominations should show the names of the candidates or the names of the countries which they would represent. He felt that the Committee would have to draw up lists giving the names of countries, not of individuals.

(48) The CHAIRMAN thought it was a reasonable question to ask. In his view, as the principle governing representation on the Board had been changed, countries - not individuals - should be nominated for election.

(49) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ said that the system of representation had been changed but certain criteria in the Constitution still remained, more particularly, those relating to the personal qualities of prospective Board members. Article V, paragraph 2, of the Constitution still held good and required that candidates, although they had now become the representatives of their governments, should possess certain specific qualifications in the arts, letters, the humanities, the sciences and education. For an adequate response to the Spanish delegate's point, the two types of criterion had to be combined.

(50) Mr. RUIZ-GIMENEZ indicated his agreement with Mr. Bernal Jimenez's statement.

(51) Mr. KOTSCHNIG, replying as first sponsor of the motion to amend Article V of the Constitution, explained that the election was to be an election of individual persons nominated by their governments and responsible to the latter. Although it was possible under the Rules for a government to nominate a candidate who was not one of its own nationals, he did not believe that the case was likely to arise.

(52) Mr. SHARIF pointed out that the usual procedure was for the elections to be completed in one day, the Nominations Committee meeting in the morning and the Plenary Conference in the afternoon. He considered it better to follow that practice, and proposed that the Nominations Committee meet on 7 December in the morning and the Plenary Conference in the afternoon.

(53) Mr. KABIR seconded the remarks of the delegate of Pakistan on the point of procedure, but proposed that the meetings be held on 6 December and that Saturday, 4 December, be fixed as the last day for the submission of nominations.

(54) Mr. MONTAGNIER pointed out that that proposal did not quite square with the Rules of Procedure, under which nominations could be submitted up to the opening of the plenary meeting at which elections would be held unless the Rules of Procedure were amended by the Conference. Delegations could, however, be asked to do their best to lodge their nominations before the end of the day of 4 December.

(55) Mr. HAGUIWARA thought that the delegate of Pakistan was right in urging that the interval between the meeting of the Nominations Committee and of the plenary meeting of the Conference should be as short as possible. He suggested that the Nominations Committee sit in the afternoon of 6 December and the morning of 7 December, with the plenary meeting in the afternoon of 7 December.

(56) Mr. MONTAGNIER thought that the proposal was perfectly practicable but emphasized the need

for an interval of two or three hours at least between the meetings of the Nominations Committee and the plenary meeting, as the material for the latter would have to be got ready.

(57) This proposal was approved.

(58) The CHAIRMAN, summing up the proposals made by members of the Committee, said that the proposal was to have a first meeting of the Nominations Committee during the afternoon of 6 December, a second meeting of the Committee in the morning of 7 December and the plenary meeting to deal with the question in the afternoon of the same day. Did the General Committee approve that arrangement?

(59) Mr. SHARIF agreed on the understanding that the Nominations Committee would make its nominations on the same day as the election.

(60) The CHAIRMAN announced that the General Committee would meet again on Wednesday, 24 November, at 9 a.m.

The meeting rose at 10.25 a.m.

# SIXTH MEETING

*24 November 1954 at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan)

**PROGRESS OF WORK**

(1) Mr. MAHEU reminded the meeting of the procedure decided upon. The Programme and Budget Commission was to discuss that morning the provisional assessment level for 1955 and 1956 and to draw up recommendations in the light of those submitted by the Administrative Commission. Those two series of recommendations were to have been presented to the plenary Conference for final decision on the morning of 25 November, but certain delegations had spoken to the Secretariat of their misgivings: they feared that members of the Programme and Budget Commission, not knowing what had been recommended by the Administrative Commission, would start discussing matters on which they were not qualified to speak. For those reasons, the Secretariat proposed the following changes in procedure.

(2) That morning a short plenary meeting would be held to take a final decision on the recommendations of the Administrative Commission concerning: (1) arrears of contributions and voting powers of the countries concerned; (2) scale of contributions; (3) financing of the budget.

(3) Those decisions would then be communicated to the Programme and Budget Commission that afternoon; the Commission would be free to make any recommendations it wished on the provisional budget total, and they would be submitted to the plenary meeting for approval on the morning of 25 November.

(4) While agreeing with the recommendations of the Secretariat, Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS proposed that, if possible, there should be a meeting of the plenary Conference that evening at 6 p.m. to fix the provisional budget total, on the recommendation of the Programme and Budget Commission. If that could be done, the Programme and Budget Commission would be able to continue its work without interruption the following morning.

(5) Mr. MAHEU saw no objection to the proposal, provided that the Programme and Budget Commission were able to complete its discussion by 6 p.m.

(6) The procedure proposed by the Secretariat, as amended by the delegate of the United Kingdom, was approved.

(7) The CHAIRMAN called upon the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission to report on the Commission's work.

(8) Mr. BOURGEOIS said that on the previous evening the Programme and Budget Commission had completed its discussion of the chapter on technical assistance and had unanimously adopted the resolutions contained in document 8C/5, Annex VIII, with a few amendments of form rather than substance.

(9) Mr. BEEBY reported that the Administrative Commission had dealt with the question of the voting rights of certain countries and would be ready to report thereon to the plenary meeting that morning. Further, its recommendations on the scale of contributions and methods of financing the budget were to be found in a document before the Committee.

(10) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES announced that the Advisory Committee's consideration of the Final Report of the Committee of Experts on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation was well advanced, and that it was hoped to complete that item during the morning.

(11) Mr. MAHEU indicated the relative urgency of the working parties' business:

(1) Working Party on Decentralization;

(2) Working Party on International Regulations;

(3) Working Party on the Structure of the Department of Mass Communication.

(12) Mr. BOURGEOIS reminded the meeting that it had been decided, on the proposal of the United States delegate, to ask delegations to state in writing the points on which they wished to speak. As proposals had been received on practically all points in the first three chapters of the proposed programme, Mr. Bourgeois wondered whether it was any use adhering to that system and suggested dropping it for the following programme chapters, as it involved extra work for the Secretariat.

(13) The CHAIRMAN remarked that, if the General Committee agreed, the Programme and Budget Commission would have to be asked to reverse its procedure.

(14) Mr. KOTSCHNIG asked how many comments there were and whether it would be possible for the Secretariat to produce a consolidated document.

(15) Mr. CHEVALIER said that the system did not entail a great deal of work for the Secretariat; it meant preparing a document of some 10 pages, in which the replies of 22 delegations would be set out in the order of the chapters of the proposed programme. It was therefore not an impossible task.

(16) Mr. MAHEU explained that the document would be only a synopsis and would not include the actual text of the proposals.

(17) Mr. CHEVALIER added that hardly any of the proposals submitted were accompanied by a statement of reasons and in only very few cases had any priority rating been requested.

(18) Mr. MAHEU inferred that the document would really amount to a list of the delegations which had submitted proposals, set out under each item in the programme.

(19) Mr. KABIR was against altering the procedure adopted and especially against setting a time-limit for the submission of such comments, as he feared that that would encourage delegations which might not otherwise have done so to submit further comments.

(20) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS seconded the delegate of India, but hoped that, in communicating the material to the Programme and Budget Commission, it would be made clear that the procedure was not considered useful; in that manner, the Commission might be persuaded to discontinue it.

(21) Mr. BEEBY was against the continuation of the system.

(22) Mr. BOURGEOIS did not himself expect there would be any fewer speakers for the last chapters of the programme, but he was in favour of abiding by that procedure. It might induce delegates to think over what they would say at the meeting.

(23) Seconding the delegates of India and the United Kingdom, Mr. KOTSCHNIG expressed the opinion that the comments nevertheless had a certain value, as they enabled delegations to know what other delegations thought about various points, and the necessity for five-minute breaks for consultation during meetings might thus be avoided. He therefore seconded the proposal to continue the system.

(24) It was agreed not to alter the procedure.

(25) Referring to the calendar of work, Mr. GARDNER DAVIES requested that the Advisory Committee and the Headquarters Committee should not meet simultaneously on Thursday afternoon (25 November), since it would make his own position very difficult as Chairman of the Advisory Committee and Rapporteur of the Headquarters Committee.

(26) It was agreed that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget should not meet at that time, but that instead there should be a meeting of the Working Party on Mass Communication.

MISCELLANEOUS DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (8C/DR/74 to 83)

(27) Mr. MAHEU said that a number of draft resolutions had been submitted by the Italian delegation. Preliminary perusal by the Secretariat showed that some of them had budgetary implications and could not therefore be considered under Rule 78 of the Rules of Procedure. However, if the Italian delegation agreed, those proposals could be considered as the Italian delegation's indication of the items in the programme on which it wished to speak.

(28) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI accepted that interpretation. Those proposals were merely intended to draw attention to the points which the Italian delegation wanted discussed. It would, if need be, withdraw any proposals with budgetary implications.

(29) Mr. KOTSCHNIG asked for an explanation of the procedure to be followed in discussing the provisional budget total. He assumed that the discussion would start with a presentation by the Director-General or the Chairman of the Executive Board of the higher budget level proposals.

(30) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that the procedure suggested would be satisfactory. The Chairman of the Executive Board might speak first, followed by himself; thereafter, the consideration of motions from delegations would be in order. Motions farthest from the original proposal by the Chairman of the Board and the Director-General would, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, have to be put to the vote first.

(31) The above procedure was approved.

(32) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ wished to know whether the decision about the budget total was to be taken

before or after the discussion of all the chapters of the programme. He wanted that point cleared up.

(33) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, in accordance with the agenda of the General Conference, the decision on the assessment level and the provisional budget total had to be taken before the Programme and Budget Commission discussed the various chapters of the budget. The order of business would thus be as follows: (1) the General Conference in plenary session would meet that morning to consider the report of the Administrative Commission on arrears of contributions and voting rights of certain countries, the scale of contributions and methods of financing the budget; (2) on the basis of the plenary Conference's discussions, the Programme and Budget Commission would meet as soon as possible to discuss the provisional budget total; that meeting would start with the presentation by the Chairman of the Board and the Director-General of the higher budget proposals; the Commission would then report back to the plenary Conference, if possible by 6 p.m., so that the latter could fix the provisional budget total. The next morning, the Programme and Budget Commission would be able to start considering Part II of the budget. It would still be free to propose a change in the budget total at a later stage, if it so desired.

The meeting rose at 9.55 a.m.

# SEVENTH MEETING

*26 November 1954 at 9.15 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

**PROGRESS OF WORK OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE**

(1) The CHAIRMAN asked members of the General Committee if they had any reports to submit. He called upon the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission.

(2) Mr. BOURGEOIS said that the Programme and Budget Commission had begun its consideration of the chapter on Education and had reached paragraph 159 under the heading of Education and Child Development. It would continue its discussion and would complete the Education chapter, either at the end of the afternoon meeting or more probably at the following morning's meeting.
(3) Few alterations had been made in the points already discussed. The main change was the cancellation of the appropriations provided under paragraph 146 for the International Educational Development Fund.

(4) The CHAIRMAN submitted the report of the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission for discussion. As there were no comments, he declared it approved.

(5) Mr. COWELL pointed out that, as a consequence of the decision taken on the budget ceiling, there would have to be slight adjustments to the budget and asked what procedure was envisaged for the discussions on the budget in the Programme Commission.

(6) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he had discussed the matter with the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission and a procedure had been agreed which seemed to deal with the matter in a fair and orderly way. The Chairman of the Programme Commission would inform the Commission from time to time of the position with regard to budget cuts. At the end of each chapter, the situation concerning cuts and increases would be summarized and the Director-General be asked if he had any proposals to make before the chapter was finally approved Each chapter would be subject to reconsideration before final approval was given to the Programme and Budget as a whole.

(7) Mr. BOURGEOIS agreed to the remarks made by the Director-General.

(8) The CHAIRMAN asked the delegate of the United Kingdom if he wished to recommend the adoption of the procedure outlined by the Director-General. The delegate of the United Kingdom agreed with that procedure. The Chairman then called on the Chairman of the Administrative Commission.

(9) Mr. BEEBY said that the Administrative Commission was well advanced. Its work on Official and External Relations had been completed, the work on legal questions had been completed and the Commission was waiting for the draft amendments to be forwarded to it by the Legal Committee. All questions of finance had been settled except the currency of contributions, which question was being discussed by the Contributions Committee. With regard to headquarters matters, the Commission would have to await the recommendation of the Headquarters

Committee on the supplementary report of the Director-General. The questions concerning working languages had been settled. The only work which remained outstanding was that on staff questions, which would be dealt with by the Administrative Commission during the following week. The Commission had been able to allocate the remaining meetings of the current week to the work of the Legal Committee.

(10) As there were no comments, the CHAIRMAN declared the report of the Chairman of the Administrative Commission approved. He then called on the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget

(11) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES said that the Committee had completed its examination of the report of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation, modifying specific points. The Committee's report was ready and he hoped to present it to the Programme Commission at the beginning of its morning meeting.

(12) The Advisory Committee had still to consider various points on the remodelled programme and would require, for that purpose, three or four meetings in the following week.

(13) In the absence of the Chairman of the Headquarters Committee, Mr. Gardner Davies reported that that Committee had discussed the main item on its agenda at its last meeting, namely, the supplementary report on the installation of an office of the International Civil Aviation Organization at the permanent headquarters of Unesco. One point had emerged clearly from the discussion, which was that the new headquarters building must remain wholly a Unesco building. The Committee had, however, agreed in principle to recommend that the Director-General should negotiate a contract with the International Civil Aviation Organization for the building of a block for its use and had agreed that the Headquarters Committee should discuss plans for such a building.

(14) Mr. HAGUIWARA wished to know whether the Headquarters Committee had fixed a date for the completion of the new headquarters building. That date was bound to influence the decision concerning the meeting place of the next General Conference. However, he gathered that the Administrative Commission had already taken a decision on that last point.

(15) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES replied that the Headquarters Committee expected the building to be completed by December 1956 or January 1957.

(16) The CHAIRMAN called for comments. As there were none, he declared the report of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget approved. He then called on the Secretary to outline the programme of work for 27 and 29 November.

(17) Mr. MONTAGNIER, after listing the meetings of 27-29 November, added that the Headquarters Committee would need to hold another meeting to consider the report it would be submitting to the Administrative Commission; that meeting would probably be scheduled for the afternoon of Wednesday, 1 December.

The meeting rose at 9.35 a.m.

# EIGHTH MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

(1) Opening the meeting, the CHAIRMAN called upon the Chairman of the Administrative Commission to make a progress report.

(2) Mr. BEEBY announced that, as the Commission had not met since the General Committee's last meeting, the position was still as he had stated it on Friday morning (26 November). In the course of the day (Monday, 29 November), the Commission would first consider reports from the Legal Committee and would then go on to staff questions, which would probably require four meetings.

(3) The above verbal report was approved.

(4) Mr. BOURGEOIS reported that the Programme and Budget Commission had concluded its scrutiny of the Education chapter. He would not at the moment describe in detail the changes made but they were substantial, more particularly in the item on Palestine refugees, for whom a considerably higher appropriation was being recommended. In all, the Commission had approved additional appropriations of $97,000 in chapter 1 as a whole. Could the Director-General say whether that figure could be offset within the chapter pending the general redistribution between all parts of the programme which would follow on completion of the examination of the remaining chapters? In conclusion he had to report that a large majority of the Commission had not seen its way to accept the proposal for an International School. At its meeting that morning the Commission

would be beginning its scrutiny of chapter 2, Natural Sciences.

(5) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to a difficult question of procedure in the Programme and Budget Commission. He recalled his earlier suggestion that, when the Commission had concluded its examination of the chapter on Education, he should propose all the cuts which he was willing to foresee at that time, reserving additional cuts to be made when all the programme chapters had been considered. The Commission would then adopt, reject or change the cuts he had proposed, with the aim of getting back to the budget level in document 8C/5. Even if all programme chapters were reduced to the 8C/5 budget level, there would still be an excess of $200,000 over the approved provisional budget figure. If that sum were distributed over all the programme chapters in accordance with the percentages allocated to them, a cut of some $60,000 would have to be made in the Education chapter. As a result of the work of the Programme and Budget Commission, however, the Education chapter was already $97,000 in excess of the 8C/5 budget level, so that, if the percentage for each chapter were strictly followed, a total cut of some $150,000 would have to be made in the chapter on Education. The Programme and Budget Commission might wish to redistribute the percentages, but, if the Education chapter were allowed to exceed the 8C/5 budget level by $150,000, other programme chapters might be penalized.
(6) Two alternative procedures were therefore possible: (1) the Director-General could refrain from proposing any cuts in the Education chapter until all chapters of the programme had been considered; or (2) as already suggested, he could propose cuts forthwith, with the intention of reducing the Education chapter to the 8C/5 budget level before the other programme chapters were examined. He added that the Department of Natural Sciences had a very important proposal to make in connexion with the United Nations scheme for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

(7) Mr. BOURGEOIS felt offhand that, as the understanding was that all the changes made in the programme were provisional, it might be worth waiting until the remaining chapters had been examined and then reviewing the whole programme with a view to a judicious redistribution within the prescribed budget ceiling; probably it would be an easier matter then. He would also like to make a personal suggestion to the Director-General and the General Committee of the next Conference. It might be worth following the example of the Advisory Committee and not scrutinizing the various chapters of the programme always in the same order. He would, in conclusion, tell the Programme and Budget Commission that the figures it had adopted would remain provisional until the whole programme had been examined, at which time the Commission could make the necessary adjustments.

(8) Mr. BEEBY thought it essential that the Programme and Budget Commission should be as conscious as its Chairman of the need to keep within a budget ceiling. If the Commission thought of increasing any items, it should at the same time think of other items which it was prepared to propose for suppression.

(9) Mr. BOURGEOIS asked whether the Director-General agreed to his telling the Commission that, in principle, each chapter should be kept more or less to the percentage laid down in the proposed programme and budget and that large transfers between chapter and chapter were undesirable.

(10) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that one of the Conference's most important tasks was to decide whether or not the percentage allocated to each programme chapter was appropriate. The existing percentages were only his own proposal and he was anxious, not only for the Conference to take a decision in respect of the programme for 1955-56, but also to give him guidance for the preparation of the programme for 1957-58.

(11) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS wondered whether the two suggestions made were not compatible, that was to say, the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission might make the statement he had suggested, and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, working parallel to the Programme and Budget Commission, might study the cuts proposed by the Director-General and make a statement to help the Commission when the latter came towards the end of its work.

(12) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES agreed that the Advisory Committee could consider the Director-General's proposals for adjustments in the programme chapters, but, having seen how little the Committee's advice was followed in the Programme and Budget Commission, he doubted if it would serve any useful purpose.

(13) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS sympathized with the feelings of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, but pointed out that the position had changed since the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission had undertaken to inform the Commission that it must work within a budget ceiling. As it was the Advisory Committee's task to help the Commission to do that, the experience of the Chairman of the Committee might thenceforth be happier.

(14) Mr. KABIR thought that the difficulty which had arisen was inherent in the procedure followed: if every item of the programme was brought before the Programme and Budget Commission, it was impossible to ensure that percentages were adhered to. He agreed with the Director-General that the Commission should decide upon the overall percentages, but it should not go into every detail. He therefore suggested that the Director-General, in consultation with the Executive Board, might be asked to work out a better procedure for the ninth session of the General Conference, providing, for instance, for an initial general debate in the Programme and Budget Commission, when the overall percentages for the programme chapters would be laid down.

(15) Referring to the proposal of the delegate of the

United Kingdom, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL did not think it possible for the Advisory Committee to work parallel to the Programme and Budget Commission. However, when the Commission had terminated its consideration of all the programme chapters, it could refer the matter of cuts to the Advisory Committee for advice, giving it a number of general considerations for its guidance. The Advisory Committee could then work as an expert working party, and the Director-General could be invited to make proposals to it for cuts. The Advisory Committee might undertake that task for a day and a half during the election of new members of the Executive Board and, during that time, the Programme and Budget Commission might adjourn.

(16) Mr. BOURGEOIS fully approved the general lines of the proposed procedure, always assuming that the Commission had time to follow it. If the Advisory Committee was to meet meanwhile and report back thereafter to the Programme Commission, the latter would be obliged to complete its scrutiny of all chapters by Wednesday, 8 December.

(17) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES said that the Advisory Committee would accept the task, if it were possible for the Programme and Budget Commission to complete its first examination of the programme chapters in time.

(18) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS moved that the Committee approve the procedure suggested by the Director-General, even if it meant that the Programme and Budget Commission was obliged to hold night meetings.

(19) Mr. BOURGEOIS had no objection to night meetings and had warned his Commission that they might be necessary if there were too many speakers and they talked too long.

(20) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS said that his delegation had been much concerned at the length of speeches in the Programme and Budget Commission. He suggested that members of the Commission be asked to limit their speeches to ten minutes.

(21) Mr. BOURGEOIS asked whether the delegate of the United Kingdom would be willing to ask delegates to limit their speeches to five minutes, with ten minutes as the outside limit. Scientists might reasonably be expected to be more terse than educationists. Besides, the earlier discussions had been a sort of running-in process; they could now hope for greater concentration. While he did not at that stage wish to lay down a hard-and-fast rule, he himself was not losing sight of the fact that a strict time-limit might have to be imposed on speeches.

(22) The CHAIRMAN announced that the procedure would be as follows: first, provisional decisions by the Programme and Budget Commission; next, reference of these to the Advisory Committee; lastly, return of the items to the Commission, with the Committee's comments, for final approval. In addition, speeches in the Programme and Budget Commission would be limited to a maximum of ten minutes.

(23) Agreed.

(24) Mr. LEROY (France) asked leave to submit a draft recommendation on natural disasters. The Committee would recall the damage recently caused by the hurricane "Hazel", the sympathy of the United Nations with the sufferers and their invitation to the Specialized Agencies to associate themselves with those sentiments. It was much to be feared, however, that such an expression of sympathy would remain empty words unless some funds were provided. The French delegation had therefore felt that the logical step was to work out a proposal involving neither an increase in the budget nor the appropriation of any part of the present budget. It consisted essentially (1) in asking the Director-General to give absolute priority to forwarding to the technical assistance services requests from victims of natural disasters for help to restore the economic situation and alleviate the sufferings of the victims; (2) in asking the Director-General to request the technical assistance services to give similar absolute priority to the examination of such requests.
(25) What procedure should be followed in submitting such a draft recommendation?

(26) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that it was for the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission to say whether the Commission could revert to the Technical Assistance chapter. If it could not, the proposal of the French delegation might be included in the General Resolutions, which had yet to be considered.

(27) Mr. BOURGEOIS said he would find it difficult to reopen chapters which his Commission had just finished discussing; several requests to that effect had already been made to him and he had always turned them down.
(28) He felt that the Director-General's concluding suggestion might well provide an answer. The Commission could examine that project as a general resolution, if it had no budgetary implications, while the Advisory Committee embarked on a general survey of the programme.

(29) Mr. LEROY (France) admitted that the project was being submitted rather late and quite agreed to its being discussed at the end of the session.

(30) It was agreed to refer the French delegation's proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission, with a view to its possible inclusion in the General Resolutions.

(31) Mr. BEEBY asked if the Spanish delegation's proposal, contained in document 8C/DR/90 and concerning amendments to the Financial Regulations and Rules of Procedure, was to be referred to the Administrative Commission.

(32) It was agreed to refer document 8C/DR/90 to the Administrative Commission.

The meeting rose at 10 a.m.

# NINTH MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 9.15 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. MALAKUL (Thailand)

(1) The CHAIRMAN asked the Chairmen of Commissions and Committees to report on the progress of the work of the various organs of the Conference.

(2) Mr. BOURGEOIS said that the Programme and Budget Commission had completed its study of the Education chapter (item 8.4.1 of the agenda), and of the Natural Sciences chapter (item 8.4.2) except for one question which could not be decided until the Secretariat supplied certain figures. He intended to convene the Commission at 3 p.m. that same day, in order to complete the study of the Natural Sciences chapter and begin that of the Cultural Activities chapter.

(3) Owing to the limited time available, it had been necessary to restrict the number of speakers, and he envisaged the possibility of having to curtail the number of speakers on each question.

(4) Budget questions would be dealt with on the following Tuesday, 7 December, after the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had first met in order to adjust the programme to the budget ceiling fixed by the Conference. He expected that the Advisory Committee would find it difficult to meet all the wishes of the Programme and Budget Commission.

(5) Mr. BEEBY said that the Administrative Commission had begun to examine the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations; it was difficult to estimate how long those discussions would last. When they had been completed, the headquarters question would be taken up. He was of opinion that, after consideration of the Staff Regulations had been completed, the Commission could conclude its work in two meetings.

(6) Mr. AL-HANI stated that the Committee on Reports of Member States had set up four working parties on a linguistic basis, one for each language of the General Conference; he read out the draft resolution adopted by the Committee, appearing at the end of document 8C/REP/1.

(7) Mr. AWAD said that the Legal Committee had only one or two supplementary items left to examine, and would need to meet once during the next few days for that purpose.

(8) After consultation with the Secretariat, it was decided that the meeting in question could be held the following morning.

(9) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO said that he would present the report of the Headquarters Committee to the Administrative Commission on Thursday afternoon.

(10) Mr. KABIR, referring to the coming election of the Executive Board, stated that he would like to receive directives from the General Committee with regard to two problems which would confront the Nominations Committee: that of the geographical distribution of posts and the procedure to be followed for the election.

(11) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL felt that the General Committee should send the Nominations Committee a communication on the matter; the Secretariat could inform the General Committee, at its meeting on Friday, of the policy adopted in previous years with regard to geographical distribution.

(12) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser), referring to the method of election, pointed out that there was a contradiction between Rule 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, permitting pluralities in the case of a second vote, and Article IV of the Constitution, according to which all decisions of the General Conference required an absolute majority vote. He felt that the Article of the Constitution should prevail in the matter.

(13) Mr. KOTSCHNIG did not think that the problem envisaged by the Legal Adviser would arise in practice.

(14) Mr. BEEBY did not see how it would be possible to resolve the geographical distribution problem at a plenary meeting, unless the Nominations Committee presented a list of the candidates which it proposed.

(15) Mr. KABIR said that that was why he had raised the question before the General Committee.

(16) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ felt that the General Committee should take a decision on the application of Rule 89. With regard to the method of election, the principle so far adopted was that each candidate had to be proposed by one or more delegations other than his own; Mr. Bernal Jimenez asked whether it would not be possible to group candidates by geographical regions.

(17) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS felt that the Legal Committee should be consulted on the method of election and that on the following Friday the General Committee should examine the memorandum, to be drawn up by the Secretariat, on the policy previously adopted with regard to geographical distribution.

(18) Mr. HAGUIWARA raised the problem of the validity of ballot papers containing fewer names than

there were persons to be elected to the Board. He also asked whether candidates not proposed in plenary session by the Nominations Committee would be eligible.

(19) Mr. RUIZ-GIMINEZ felt that the General Committee should decide and give a clear indication concerning the form of the election. With regard to geographical distribution, he thought that the best distribution possible should be aimed at but that no mathematical formula could be established. That was more a matter for the Nominations Committee than for the General Committee, as all Member States were represented on the former but not on the latter.

(20) Mr. SHARIF, referring to geographical distribution, also thought that it concerned the Nominations Committee rather than the General Committee, and that the former should be given all possible information (e.g. as to precedents), with a view to assisting it in its work. As for the method of election, he felt that the Legal Committee's opinion should be sought, having regard to the problems which had been raised by the Japanese delegate.

(21) Mr. KABIR recalled that it would be difficult to consider in advance the best form of geographical distribution, seeing that candidates could be nominated up to the last moment in the plenary meeting itself. He expressed the hope that on the following Friday ideas could be clarified and a practical decision arrived at.

(22) Mr. AWAD asked what kind of report was expected from the Legal Committee. If it were simply a question of the legal aspect of the method of election, he saw no great difficulty. In any case, he asked that the request should be expressed in a concrete form.

(23) Mr. MIGONE, with a view to avoiding a debate by the Nominations Committee, proposed an unofficial meeting of heads of delegations in order to deal with the matter of the Board's election.

(24) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that, for Friday's meeting, the Secretariat would supply the information for which it had been asked concerning the question of geographical distribution.

(25) The questions which the General Committee referred to the Legal Committee were as follows:

(a) Validity of ballot papers containing fewer names than there were persons to be elected (Rule 14 of the Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Secret Ballot);

(b) Eligibility of candidates not nominated by the Nominations Committee (Rule 95, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference);

(c) Discrepancy between Article IV 8(a) of the Constitution and Rule 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, with regard to the majority required for election on a second ballot.

The meeting rose at 10 a.m.

# TENTH MEETING

*3 December 1954 at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

**REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMEN OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES**

(1) Mr. BOURGEOIS said that the work of the Programme and Budget Commission was proceeding slowly. In fact, the Commission was at the moment in a very difficult position and its only possible course was to hold night meetings. Although the time allowed to speakers had been reduced to three minutes, the study of Part II of the programme was still far from finished, and the discussion of chapter 4 (Cultural Activities) had not been completed. The situation was due to the fact that the Commission had been unable to begin its work until the provisional budget ceiling had been adopted and the report on methods of financing the programme drawn up. A week had passed at the beginning of the session without the Commission's being able to hold a meeting. Mr. Bourgeois stressed that appropriate measures should be taken to enable the Commission in future to begin its work not later than three days after the opening of the Conference. It was very unfortunate that it should be necessary, as at present, to limit the time allowed for speeches, when the purpose of delegates' attending the Conference was to make known their views. Everything possible should be done to ensure that a similar situation did not arise in the future.

(2) Mr. Bourgeois also mentioned that the Commission had unanimously adopted, by acclamation, a draft resolution on peaceful co-operation, presented jointly by the United States of America, India and Czechoslovakia (document 8C/DR/115).

(3) Finally, he said, the Commission would like to refer project 3.4 (Social science and problems of international understanding and tensions) back to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. The

Commission considered that the budget estimates and plans for the project were not satisfactorily balanced.

(4) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES said that the Advisory Committee had completed its work in connexion with the remodelling of the future programme, and the report it had prepared would probably be considered by the Programme and Budget Commission early in the following week.
(5) The Advisory Committee would also meet early in that week to adapt the programme to the approved budget. He assumed that the Secretariat would submit a certain number of proposals on the matter.
(6) Turning to the request made to the Advisory Committee by the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission, he recalled that the Committee had already expressed its views. Those views had not, it appeared, met with the Commission's approval, and it was hardly logical for the Commission to turn again to the Advisory Committee for more advice.

(7) Mr. KABIR said that all delegations were concerned at the slow progress being made at the Conference. In order to expedite matters at the present session and more particularly at future sessions of the General Conference, he wished to make the following suggestions:
(a) the budget ceiling should be established at the beginning of the Conference so as to ensure that full use was made of the advice of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget;
(b) there was no need to vote on all the paragraphs of the programme and budget: voting should be confined to the amendments to resolutions and budgetary items;
(c) delegates should be requested to keep to the agreed time-limits for their statements, which would thus become clearer and more relevant to the matter under discussion;
(d) it should be possible to discuss certain activities, for example, mass communication and cultural relations, simultaneously.

(8) Mr. BOURGEOIS pointed out to the General Committee that it might be helpful to set up working parties like that established the previous day to deal with the scientific and cultural history of mankind.
(9) He also wished to mention that the secretarial and interpreting staff available for Russian was very limited. That staff was consequently overworked, and something should be done to avoid a repetition of the difficulty at later sessions.
(10) Mr. Bourgeois agreed with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget that it was scarcely possible to have the same questions studied by the Committee several times. The Programme and Budget Commission would therefore discuss the decisions to be made with regard to project 3.4 without referring back to the Advisory Committee.
(11) Finally, he said if it was considered desirable to limit the time allotted to speakers in a particular Commission, delegates should be informed, at the opening of the Conference, about the decisions made.

(12) Mr. SHARIF said that the question of future procedure had already been discussed on several occasions and there were many conflicting views on the subject. In his opinion, the Secretariat should prepare a note with proposals for the best and most expeditious form of procedure and circulate it to Member States with a view to its being adopted at the earliest opportunity.
(13) With regard to the present session, he proposed that the number of delegations wishing to speak should not be restricted, but that they should speak only on resolutions and specific paragraphs; no more general discussion should be allowed.

(14) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS said that he had had occasion to be present at several meetings of the Programme and Budget Commission and had noted a subtle correlation between the work of that Commission and the prospect of election to the Executive Board. In order to remedy that situation, it might be useful, he thought, to make the work of the Nominations Committee precede that of the Commission.
(15) Secondly, he submitted the following draft resolution:

"That the General Conference instructs the Executive Board to study the problem of the organization of the ninth session in order to determine ways of curtailing the length of the Conference as a whole and of improving the efficiency and expediting the work of the main Commission".

(16) The preamble to the resolution could contain a tribute to the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission and to the interpreters serving with it.

(17) Mr. BOURGEOIS considered that it would be unwise to try to fix a final budget ceiling at the beginning of the Conference. Such a course would involve the danger of having to give up highly important projects for the lack of a few hundred dollars. The disadvantages of fixing too rigid limits at the beginning of a session had been experienced in the past.
(18) Mr. Bourgeois urged once again the advisability of distributing work among several study groups.
(19) It was not always possible to avoid general discussions on the whole of a chapter or section. Certain delegates might have views to express on adjustments that they thought should be made between the different sections in one chapter, or the projects in one section.

(20) Mr. VERONESE seconded the United Kingdom delegate's proposal that the Executive Board be invited to consider means of avoiding, at later sessions of the General Conference, the current difficulties due to shortcomings in the organization of the work. He also hoped that the Executive Board would be invited to undertake the study in the near future, before the recollection of the difficulties had had time to fade.
(21) As far as the current session was concerned, Mr. Veronese considered that the only means of helping the Programme and Budget Commission out of its difficulties was to give the Chairman all the powers he required to speed up the discussions as he thought fit.

(22) Mr. KABIR supported the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom and again emphasized the desirability of fixing the budget ceiling at the beginning of the Conference.

(23) Mr. HAGUIWARA asked the meeting to confine itself for the moment to discussing the organization of work at the current session and to leave until later any proposals about the organization of work at future sessions.

(24) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the report of the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission and on the motion, proposed by the United Kingdom and seconded by Italy, that the Executive Board be instructed to draw up regulations for the conduct of the Programme and Budget Commission's debates.

(25) Both motions were approved.

**PROGRAMME OF WORK FROM 2 TO 12 DECEMBER**
**(document 8C/BUR/3)**

(26) Referring to document 8C/BUR/3, which in his opinion required some amendment, Mr. MAHEU gave the Secretariat's views on the conduct of work up to the end of the session. He explained that, although Parts I, III and IV of the draft programme had already been discussed by the Administrative Commission, it was logical that they should also be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission for consideration, since that Commission had to prepare the appropriation resolution.
(27) The Secretariat had thought that time could be saved by having the budgetary adjustments examined by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, which would then report to the Programme Commission. With regard to the report on the future programme, in the opinion of the Secretariat it should not be considered by the Programme and Budget Commission until all the discussions about the draft programme for 1955-56 were over.
(28) Finally, the Secretariat suggested that the report of the Legal Committee be submitted direct to the General Conference in plenary meeting without passing through the Administrative Commission.

(29) Document 8C/BUR/3 was adopted, with the amendments suggested by Mr. Maheu.

**REPORT OF THE LEGAL COMMITTEE ON THE PROCEDURE FOR THE ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**
**(document 8C/JUR/5)**

(30) Mr. AWAD said that the question which had been referred to the Legal Committee was that of the legal aspects of election procedure. The Committee had noted an obvious disparity between the provisions of the Constitution and the Organization's Rules of Procedure in that matter, and had decided to alter the Rules of Procedure in accordance with those of the United Nations.

(31) Mr. SABA commented briefly on the report.

(32) Following a remark by Mr. HAGUIWARA, a discussion began on whether the report should, as Mr. Maheu had suggested, be submitted to the plenary meeting without first being studied by the Administrative Commission.

(33) Mr. KABIR observed that the General Committee had already taken a decision on that point, and there was no need to go back to it.

(34) As Mr. Kabir's statement was contested, Mr. MAHEU pointed out that the Legal Committee was not a subsidiary organ of the Administrative Commission. It had sometimes reported to that Commission on certain questions, but that was because of the nature of the questions concerned and not because of any obligations resulting from precise links. There was therefore no reason of principle why the Committee's report should not go direct to the plenary meeting, and the Secretariat considered that it would be preferable to have only one discussion on the report.

(35) The question was put to the vote, and it was decided that the report of the Legal Committee should be sent direct to the plenary meeting.

(36) Mr. MONTAGNIER said that the plenary meeting at which the Legal Committee's report would be studied could take place on Monday, 6 December, at the beginning of the afternoon, before the Nominations Committee met.

The meeting rose at 10 a.m.

# ELEVENTH MEETING

*6 December 1954 at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

(1) Mr. MONTAGNIER submitted document 8C/BUR/3 (rev.) containing the work plan for 4-12 December 1954, and pointed out that it would require some slight modification.
(2) The Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget would meet that afternoon, 6 December, if the Programme and Budget Commission had completed consideration of Part II, Chapter 7 of the proposed programme and budget in the morning.
(3) The election of the 22 members of the Executive Board was to take place at the plenary meeting of 7 December in the afternoon. If only one ballot were required, the Conference could pass to item 16 of its agenda - decision on the place of the ninth session of the General Conference - and commence study of the report of the Committee on Reports of Member States.
(4) Mr. Montagnier then stated that, at its final plenary meeting, the Conference would have to consider draft resolutions 8C/DR/4 and 8C/DR/120, submitted by India and China respectively (item 20 of the agenda).

(5) Mr. BEEBY announced that the report of the Administrative Commission, an extremely voluminous document, had not yet been distributed to its members. If, as a result, the Commission did not finish its consideration of the report that morning, he asked if it would be possible for it to hold a short meeting in the afternoon.

(6) Mr. MONTAGNIER suggested that the Administrative Commission should meet between 3.30 and 4.30 p.m. during the plenary meeting, and before the meeting of the Nominations Committee, which was to take place, also in Room 2, at 4.30 p.m.

(7) Approved.

(8) Mr. KABIR proposed that there should be only one and not two meetings of the Nominations Committee, and that its nominations should be submitted straight to the plenary Conference, without any interval. The Nominations Committee might meet the following morning, 7 December at 9.30 a.m., reporting to the plenary Conference at 12.30 p.m. He proposed that, if possible, the Nominations Committee meet in the main Conference Hall, where there was more room for balloting.

(9) Mr. SHARIF fully endorsed the views of the Chairman of the Nominations Committee regarding the desirability of eliminating any interval between the meetings of the Nominations Committee and the plenary Conference. However, referring to the two procedures outlined in No. 2 on page 2 of document 8C/NOM/40, he pointed out that the procedure proposed was materially different from that of previous years; as the whole list was automatically open, he did not see why there was any need for the Nominations Committee to meet at all.

(10) Mr. BOURGEOIS preferred the system proposed in document 8C/NOM/40, and did not think that the votes of the Nominations Committee and of the General Conference duplicated each other. It seemed, moreover, desirable that delegations should be able to exchange views between the two ballots.

(11) Replying to the delegate of Pakistan, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, if his proposal was to be effective, the Rules of Procedure would have to be changed. The whole purpose of the Nominations Committee was that it should reduce the number of candidates before the elections took place in plenary Conference. Although it was true that the work of the Nominations Committee was only partially effective, since the plenary Conference could take up and adopt rejected candidacies, the Nominations Committee was obliged, under the Rules of Procedure, to meet and make nominations. As for the interval between meetings, he pointed out that, on previous occasions, the two operations had taken longer than half a day. With regard to the suggestion that the Nominations Committee meet in the main Conference Hall, the Director-General reminded the delegate of India that it was a closed meeting and limited to one representative of each delegation. He thought that it would be difficult to exclude the public from the main Conference Hall.

(12) In view of the Director-General's explanations, Mr. SHARIF said that he would not press his proposal, but might make a suggestion to the General Conference at its ninth session.

(13) Mr. HAGUIWARA asked how long it would take to count the votes. He pointed out that 22 names would have to be read each time from the 60 odd voting papers of the delegations. He suggested, therefore, that the Nominations Committee should meet that afternoon solely for discussion, and vote the following morning. In that way the interval between its vote and that of the General Conference could be reduced.

(14) The CHAIRMAN replied that, in the Secretariat's estimation, the voting procedure would take about an hour and a half.

(15) Mr. KABIR was perfectly willing to accept the decision of the Secretariat, if it considered

it unsuitable to hold the meeting of the Nominations Committee in the main Conference Hall.

(16) With regard to the remarks of the delegate of Japan, Mr. Kabir urged the General Committee to support him in ruling that discussion in the Nominations Committee be limited to matters of procedure. He was most anxious that the Committee should not embark upon a discussion of the merits of the various candidates and countries. As far as geographical distribution was concerned, Unesco had already established a workable formula, and he would be loth to see it disturbed. Members of the Nominations Committee might simply be asked to bear in mind that Latin America, Eastern Europe and Asia all had strong claims to the two additional seats. He therefore requested the delegate of Japan to withdraw his proposal for a discussion.

(17) Mr. HAGUIWARA fully sympathized with the wishes of the Chairman of the Nominations Committee. He hoped there would not be too much discussion about the merits of candidates; the Chairman of the Nominations Committee might appeal to the Committee in that sense. But he considered that a discussion on geographical distribution and on the election procedure was more or less inevitable. If two ballots proved to be necessary, it would be difficult to finish in one morning.

(18) Mr. BOURGEOIS agreed with Mr. Haguiwara's suggestion. He also pointed out that in the main Conference Hall each speaker had to go to the rostrum, which slowed down debates considerably.

(19) Mr. VERONESE did not think that the General Committee could settle beforehand how the discussions within the Nominations Committee should be conducted. Whatever the General Committee might desire, it was difficult to foresee how those discussions would proceed. He considered that it was for the Nominations Committee to decide, at the suggestion of its Chairman or one of its members, not to engage in a discussion on this or that point.

(20) Mr. SPILHAUS seconded the proposal of the Chairman of the Nominations Committee that the latter's discussions be limited to matters of procedure.

(21) Mr. HAGUIWARA asked the Chairman of the Nominations Committee whether he was prepared to accept the following programme:

Meeting of the Nominations Committee on 6 December at 4.30 p.m., it being understood that the Committee would not vote until its meeting on the morning of 7 December.

(22) Mr. KABIR pointed out that, until the voting actually started, new names could be submitted; any discussions beyond that of matters of procedure would therefore be inconclusive. He had been startled to hear a suggestion that, to some extent, personalities could be discussed. The curriculum vitae of each candidate would be before the Committee and all the candidates were very distinguished people, so that there was no need for the Committee to waste time in eulogizing. He therefore asked the General Committee to agree that he move from the Chair that no individual candidates should be discussed.

(23) Mr. LEROY associated himself with the Indian delegate's request. A discussion of the various candidates' merits would occupy more than an hour; and as the candidatures were already known to the Conference, such a discussion was unnecessary.

(24) Mr. SHARIF seconded the proposal that the Nominations Committee meet in the afternoon to hear the Chairman and the Legal Adviser explain the procedure, and to consider the matter of geographical distribution. A discussion limited strictly to procedural matters could then be held. The candidates would then be elected the following morning, the plenary Conference meeting immediately after the Nominations Committee had completed its work.

(25) Mr. KABIR replied that the procedure outlined by the delegate of Pakistan was entirely acceptable to him.

(26) The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said that the General Committee was agreed that the discussion within the Nominations Committee should deal with procedure and not with the personalities of candidates.

(27) The General Committee would make a recommendation to the Nominations Committee accordingly.

(28) There remained for further discussion the proposal of the Pakistani delegate that the Nominations Committee should hold a first meeting and, after the first ballot, suspend it for twenty minutes, continuing afterwards until it finished its work.

(29) Mr. MONTAGNIER pointed out that delegates had already been informed that the plenary meeting for the election of the Executive Board would take place in the afternoon of 7 December. As certain delegates were absent, it would be difficult to inform them in time if the meeting were to be held in the morning.

(30) Mr. KABIR observed that there was great force in what the Secretary had said. He did not believe however that, even if three ballots were necessary in the Nominations Committee, the meeting would last more than three and a half hours. He therefore proposed that the plenary Conference meet in the afternoon at 3 p.m.

(31) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should conclude its work in the morning and that the plenary meeting be held early in the afternoon. He asked if there were any objections and, there being none, that proposal was unanimously adopted.

(32) Mr. HAGUIWARA thought that arrangements might well be made for two plenary meetings on 11 December; but, as several delegates had already arranged to leave Montevideo, it seemed desirable for the session to end before 1 p.m. He accordingly suggested that the Nominations Committee meet in the afternoon of 10 December, instead of in the morning of 11 December, to make recommendations on the composition of the smaller committees for the ninth session.

(33) Mr. MONTAGNIER thought that, having regard to the decisions which had just been taken with a view to expediting the work, Mr. Haguiwara's suggestions could be accepted.

(34) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Director-General had received the sum of $5,503, being the amount of Bolivia's contribution in 1952. Consequently, Bolivia was fully entitled to vote at the General Conference and in all its Commissions.

(35) Mr. MONTAGNIER reminded the Committee that the French delegation had withdrawn draft resolution 8C/DR/114. The Colombian delegation now intended to assume sponsorship of that draft resolution; but, under Rule 78 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, that proposal should have been submitted before the end of the seventh day of the session. It was therefore for the General Committee to decide whether the provision should be waived.

(36) Mr. RUIZ-GIMENEZ was in favour of the provision being waived. It was most desirable to encourage international friendship among children, such a welcome proposal should not be obstructed for mere reasons of procedure.

(37) Mr. KABIR seconded the proposal of the delegate of Spain, particularly as it had no budgetary implications. Any project designed to bring children of the different countries closer together was welcome. He recalled that a competition of children's paintings, in which seventy countries had participated, had been organized in India.

(38) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ said that most delegations had, since 1950, made great efforts to secure Unesco's acceptance of that move in favour of children. He himself had done no more than sponsor it, and was in no way responsible for it; that being so, he invited the General Committee to arrange for such procedure as would enable it to be adopted, although it might involve difficulties, particularly of a budgetary nature.

(39) The Committee could deal with the proposal in the way best calculated to secure its approval, an approval which would be a fitting reward for the generosity and tenacity of its proposer.

(40) Mr. HAGUIWARA enquired whether the draft resolution in question had any budgetary implications. If, moreover, the General Committee agreed to waive the provisions of Rule 78 (3), the proposal should be studied either by the Administrative Commission or by the Programme and Budget Commission.

(41) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS pointed out that it was not for the General Committee to discuss the merits of the proposal and that it was too late in the session to refer it to the appropriate organ of the Conference.

(42) Mr. BEEBY was sure that all members of the Committee were much in sympathy with the Colombian proposal, but he agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom that it was too late to submit it to the Advisory Committee or to either of the big Commissions. Moreover, it was not a new proposal, since a resolution on the subject had been adopted by the General Conference at Florence in 1950. It was therefore not an urgent matter, and he proposed that it be deferred until the ninth session of the General Conference.

(43) Mr. BOURGEOIS moved that the resolution be transmitted to the Secretariat as a suggestion, under the procedure already applied in the case of a number of proposals which had arrived late.

(44) Mr. Bourgeois' proposal was adopted.

(45) Mr. MONTAGNIER said that the representative of the YMCA had asked to address the plenary Conference on the occasion of his Association's centenary. The General Committee had already decided not to permit representatives of non-governmental organizations to speak at plenary meetings, unless it was on a matter within their competence.

(46) It was decided not to grant the YMCA representative the authorization requested.

(47) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS enquired what was proposed with regard to draft resolutions 8C/DR/4 and 8C/DR/120.

(48) Mr. MONTAGNIER replied that they would be considered at the final plenary meeting.

The meeting rose at 10 a.m.

# TWELFTH MEETING

*8 December 1954, at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. RUIZ-GIMENEZ (Spain)

(1) Mr. MONTAGNIER proposed a programme of work for Wednesday, 8 December and Thursday, 9 December. If the Advisory Committee and the Programme and Budget Commission completed their work the following day, 9 December, the Conference could devote its two last plenary meetings, on Friday, 10 December, to considering the Programme and Budget Commission's report, a draft resolution submitted by India and amended by China on the necessity of making Unesco a universal Organization (documents 8C/DR/4 and 8C/DR/120), and a draft resolution submitted by Denmark, Norway and Sweden (DR/118) on the organization of the work of the ninth session. The Conference would adopt a resolution, expressing its gratitude to the host country, and would also celebrate Human Rights Day, which, falling on 10 December, happened to coincide with the last day of the session.

(2) Mr. KABIR pointed out that the United Kingdom delegation had submitted a resolution (DR/119) calling on the Executive Board to study the problem of the ninth session of the General Conference and suggested that, as the new Executive Board had a new Constitution which would give it greater authority in relationship to governments, it would be better to leave it to the new Executive Board to set up any necessary committees after it had considered the United Kingdom resolution.

(3) Replying to a remark by the DIRECTOR-GENERAL that the Executive Board had no powers to set up committees of the General Conference, he said that the General Conference could give it the necessary powers.

(4) Mr. SHARIF expressed satisfaction that the General Conference would finish its work on 10 December and hoped that definite information would be given on that point in the course of the day so as to enable delegates to make the necessary preparations for departure.
(5) With regard to the point under discussion, he did not think that it would be correct for the General Conference to give powers to the Executive Board to do work which it should undertake itself.

(6) Mr. MONTAGNIER reminded the Committee that, during its current session, the Conference had amended Rule 30 of its Rules of Procedure in order to enable the Nominations Committee to appoint the members of the various small committees.

(7) Mr. VERONESE asked for further information on the proposals regarding the organization of work of the ninth session. He appreciated that the Executive Board might be given the right to appoint members of the Advisory Committee. He nevertheless shared the doubts expressed in that connexion by the delegate of Pakistan.
(8) As the new Executive Board would represent only 22 of the Member States, it was a matter of doubt whether it should be given the power to set up the Advisory Committee. Moreover, the Advisory Committee might be regarded as superfluous, in view of the changes made in the structure of the Executive Board. The question could be studied at the same time as the Administrative Commission's report.

(9) Mr. MONTAGNIER pointed out that there were in fact two draft resolutions regarding the organization of work of the ninth session: document 8C/DR/118, submitted by the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish delegations, which requested the Executive Board to revise the organization and methods of work of the General Conference in collaboration with the Director-General, and document 8C/DR/119, submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, making the Executive Board responsible for determining ways of expediting the work of the ninth session and rendering it more efficient.
(10) Mr. Montagnier considered, moreover, that the desirability of retaining the Advisory Committee should be discussed by the Programme and Budget Commission.

(11) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE drew attention to the distinction between: (a) the Legal Committee and the Committee on Reports of Member States, which were appointed in accordance with normal procedure, and (b) the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget and the Contributions Committee, the desirability of whose appointment by the Executive Board had been questioned.

(12) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES did not share the view expressed by the delegate of Spain. The Contributions Committee was a committee of the Administrative Commission and could be set up by that Commission. The other three committees should be treated alike.
(13) A brief discussion had already taken place in the Advisory Committee on the future of the Committee, and some delegates had expressed the view that it could still play a very useful part despite the governmental structure of the Executive Board. Other delegates had been of the opinion that an Advisory Committee would be unnecessary. The matter would be discussed again at the afternoon meeting of the Advisory Committee.
(14) In his opinion, the Advisory Committee should be

allowed to discuss the question and to make recommendations to the Programme and Budget Commission in due course.

(15) Mr. SHARIF said that the question of an Advisory Committee was tied up with the two resolutions concerning the reorganization of the work of the ninth session of the General Conference. If the General Conference set up an Advisory Committee, the Executive Board would be faced with difficulties when studying the problem of reorganization.
(16) He suggested that it should be left to the Executive Board to decide whether it was necessary to set up an Advisory Committee. If the Executive Board decided that it was necessary to have such a committee, the ninth session of the General Conference could set it up.

(17) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the essential value of the Advisory Committee was that it studied the programme and budget in advance and was ready with its first report when the Programme and Budget Commission began its work.
(18) One solution was that the members of the Advisory Committee should be elected at the current session of the General Conference and that it should be left to the discretion of the Executive Board to decide when the Advisory Committee should meet.

(19) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS pointed out that any recommendations to the General Conference at the current session would be subject to recommendations made by the new Executive Board after it had considered the organization of the work at the ninth session of the General Conference. He emphasized the necessity of mentioning the transitional nature of any recommendations being made to the present session.

(20) Mr. BOURGEOIS entirely agreed with the Director-General's proposal and was strongly against any suggestion that the Executive Board should designate the members of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. That responsibility devolved upon the General Conference alone. He therefore agreed that the Advisory Committee should be set up at the current session - the Executive Board being responsible for convening it when the time came.

(21) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES agreed with the solution proposed by the Director-General. The General Conference would have to decide whether or not it wanted to have an Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(22) The General Committee adopted the solution proposed by the Director-General.

(23) Mr. MONTAGNIER thought that, in that case, the Nominations Committee might meet at the beginning of Friday afternoon, reporting immediately to the Conference during the plenary meeting, which would no doubt be the last of the session.

(24) Mr. KABIR said that he would be unable to be present at the meeting of the Nominations Committee and asked if he should send a substitute from his delegation.

(25) Mr. MONTAGNIER reminded the Committee that, according to paragraph 4 of Rule 29 of the Rules of Procedure, the Nominations Committee elected a chairman only.

(26) Mr. BOURGEOIS thought that it would be more appropriate to allow the Nominations Committee to choose another chairman itself, in the absence of Mr. Kabir, rather than to impose upon it a chairman designated by the General Committee.

(27) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he was unable to give a firm date for the end of the Conference. The plans made by the General Committee had increased the possibility of the necessity of holding a plenary meeting in the morning of 11 December. He assured the delegate of Pakistan, however, that most of the important business of the Conference would have been completed by the evening of 10 December.

The meeting rose at 9.40 a.m.

# THIRTEENTH MEETING

*10 December 1954 at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. ZAVALA MUNIZ (Uruguay)

(1) Mr. MONTAGNIER gave some explanations concerning the programme of work appearing in the Journal of the General Conference.
(2) At the last plenary meeting of the previous day, the General Conference had almost concluded its examination of the Administrative Commission's report. The meeting had been presented with two draft resolutions on the use of Russian as a working language, and a draft amendment to Part III of section F (page 41) of the Commission's report, changing the section into resolution form (document 8C/ADM/35 corrigendum).
(3) A corrigendum to the Programme and Budget Commission's report had also been issued (8C/PRG/30 corrigendum and addendum).
(4) With regard to item 20, an amendment to the Indian delegation's draft resolution (document 8C/DR/4) had been proposed by the Chinese delegation (document 8C/PRG/120). The draft resolutions had also been submitted on the organization and working methods of the General Conference (documents 8C/DR/118 and 119).
(5) The discussion of item 19 would have to be postponed, pending receipt of the Nomination Committee's report.

## COMMEMORATION OF UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(6) Mr. LEROY, recalling the proposal that there should be one or two speeches commemorating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights at the plenary meeting in the afternoon, asked which delegations were to be asked to speak. He added that Mr. Laugier was prepared to do so.

(7) Mr. VERONESE, without denying that such a commemoration was timely, considered that it should be as restrained as possible. Too many speeches could not fail to detract from the solemnity of the occasion.

(8) Mr. SHARIF recalled that, on the last occasion, the only two speakers designated to speak on human rights had been the President of the General Conference and the delegate of France. He thought it wiser once again to limit the number of speakers on that subject to two.

(9) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS remarked that, since speeches on human rights had become a biennial event, it would be advisable to establish some standard procedure. The Conference should avoid informality and should not recognize any vested right in a particular State to speak on human rights. He therefore proposed that the Executive Board be asked to present a resolution, which would be moved by the host country - in the present case Uruguay - and seconded by the next host country, namely India. The resolution would then be put to the vote without any further speeches.

(10) The CHAIRMAN proposed that, instead of speaking himself as President of the General Conference, the Chairman of the Executive Board should speak, in accordance with the United Kingdom proposal.

(11) Sir Ronald ADAM hoped that the General Committee would allow him to depute his right to speak to a member of the Executive Board. He moved that Mr. Henri Laugier be authorized to speak on human rights as representative of the Executive Board.

(12) Mr. LEROY was sure that Mr. Laugier would be very happy to speak, not only on behalf of the French delegation, but also as representative of the Executive Board.

(13) The proposal of Sir Ben Bowen Thomas, as amended by the Chairman of the General Committee and the Chairman of the Executive Board, was adopted.

## REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE PLENARY CONFERENCE

(14) Mr. MONTAGNIER announced that the representative of the Universal Esperanto Association had asked to speak at a plenary meeting on the Programme and Budget Commission's report.
(15) Under Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure, the General Committee could grant that authorization, but, in order not to set a precedent, it had never yet done so.

(16) Mr. BOURGEOIS did not wish either to support or oppose the granting of the authorization, but he felt bound to remind the General Committee that the speeches made against the Association's proposal had been made in terms that were hardly fitting That, together with the fact that speakers were allowed only three minutes each, explained why the Association's representative might have some cause for dissatisfaction and might wish to express himself more fully in a calmer atmosphere.

(17) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that,

normally, he would not intervene in such a matter, but he felt it his duty to call attention to the fact that the speeches to which the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission had referred, had given rise to a somewhat difficult public relations problem vis-à-vis a large, influential and determined Organization. Moreover, it seemed that there was some basis for a grievance. He therefore proposed that, in order to ease Unesco's relations with the Universal Esperanto Association, an exception be made in the present case.

(18) While sympathizing with the Director-General's point of view, Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS pointed out that, if the test were to be public relations and the removal of a sense of grievance, there were several other organizations which had lost their case before the General Conference and would carry their sense of grievance to the ends of the earth. He felt that to allow the representative of the Universal Esperanto Association to speak, would create a very dangerous precedent.

(19) In view of the difficult situation which had arisen, Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ thought that the Director-General's proposal should be adopted, but that it would be still more appropriate to authorize the General Committee, if it so agreed, to allow the representative of the Universal Esperanto Association to speak, only on condition that time was available.

(20) Mr. BROWNELL fully appreciated the Director-General's problem and was glad that Unesco realized that its usefulness was dependent upon the support of organizations in sympathy with its aims. The Universal Esperanto Association had undoubtedly done much to further Unesco's aims. At the same time, the request of the representative of the Association did not seem to be in Unesco's interests, as it would be liable to alienate the sympathy of certain other groups. The United States delegate therefore proposed, as a possible solution, that a small committee be formed to assist the Director-General to solve the public relations problem by talking over the Association's case with its representative.

(21) Mr. LEROY considered that the question of working languages was of vital importance to an organization like Unesco. However, in supporting the Director-General's proposal, he hoped that the General Committee would stress the exceptional nature of the authorization granted.

(22) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom that a dangerous precedent would be created if the representative of an organization whose case had been rejected were allowed to speak on the merits of his case at a plenary meeting. In the present circumstances, however, there was no question of reopening a discussion on the merits of the resolution; it was simply that the representative of the Universal Esperanto Association felt that he had been the victim of a procedural injustice. The Director-General appreciated the suggestion made by the delegate of the United States of America, and proposed that the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission, one of the Vice-Presidents of the General Conference and the Director-General form a committee to listen to the case of the representative of the Universal Esperanto Association.

(23) Mr. VERONESE was in complete agreement with the solution proposed by the United States delegate and accepted by the Director-General, but he would have preferred less emphasis on the aspect of righting an injustice, the procedure followed at the meeting in question having been perfectly in order.
(24) He suggested that the representative of the Universal Esperanto Association, after his talks with the Director-General and the Chairman of the Executive Board, be given the opportunity to circulate a document amongst the delegations, if he desired to do so.

ITEM 19 OF REVISED AGENDA

(25) In connexion with item 19 of the agenda, Mr. HAGUIWARA wanted to know whether the Acting Chairman of the Nominations Committee had been appointed, whether the list to be presented to the Committee had already been drawn up, and what decision had been taken about the nomination of members of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(26) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the usual procedure was for the Chairman of the Nominations Committee, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to prepare a list of States for submission to the Committee. In the present case, however, the Chairman of the Committee had been obliged to leave, and there was no Vice-Chairman. Either the Nominations Committee or the General Committee would, therefore, have to appoint an Acting Chairman. The Secretariat had already prepared a tentative list of States.

(27) Mr. VERONESE considered that, although the election of a new Chairman for the Nominations Committee was legally entirely in order, the most elementary justice demanded that the Indian delegation be asked to choose a deputy from amongst its members. He wished to propose that as a formal motion.

(28) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the Programme and Budget Commission had recommended to the General Conference that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget be elected that day, 10 December, that it consist of 17 members, a majority of whom should belong to Member States not represented on the Executive Board. The Secretariat had prepared a list of States, of which six were represented on the Board and the rest were not.

(29) The Indian delegation having agreed to nominate another member of the delegation to replace the Chairman of the Nominations Committee, the proposal of the delegate of Italy was adopted.

(30) Mr. HAGUIWARA asked whether the number of members to serve on the three committees had been definitely fixed. It happened only too often that certain delegations not represented on them proposed that the committees should be enlarged, which was not conducive to efficient work.

(31) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL announced that, under Rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure, the Legal Committee consisted of 15 members and that the membership of the Committee on Reports of Member States had been raised to 15 members; if the Conference adopted the proposal of the Programme and Budget Commission, the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget would have 17 members; the Headquarters Committee had 14 members. Although the members of the Headquarters Committee had already been elected, its membership should perhaps be reviewed from the point of view of geographical distribution.

Draft resolutions 118 and 119

(32) Referring to item 4 (1) on page 2 of the Journal of the General Conference (No. 24, Montevideo, 10 December 1954), Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS thought that the phrasing of the proposal was too casual. He proposed that there be a rider to draft resolutions 8C/DR/118 and 119, requesting delegates, on return to their own countries and in consultation with their governments and National Commissions, to formulate their ideas on the organization of the General Conference and to submit them in good time to the Executive Board.

(33) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL welcomed the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(34) Mr. VERONESE moved that the United Kingdom delegation, responsible for draft resolution DR/119, contact the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish delegations, which had submitted draft resolution DR/118, with a view to combining the two proposals in one, since they were identical in substance and very similar in form.

(35) Mr. Veronese considered that the revision of the methods of work of the General Conference should be studied as soon as possible, so that the experience gained at the current session might be used to the best advantage.

(36) Adopted.

(37) The CHAIRMAN thanked members of the General Committee for their co-operation, which had enabled the Committee's work to be brought to a successful close.

(38) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman of the General Committee. He himself had been a member of the General Committee at three or four sessions of the General Conference and had never known a happier atmosphere in the Committee; that was certainly due to the Chairman's skill and wisdom in guiding its work.

(39) The motion was adopted by acclamation.

The meeting rose at 10 a.m.

# CHAPTER IV

# PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

## FIRST MEETING

*17 November 1954 at 5.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.1 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: ELECTION OF THE THREE VICE-CHAIRMEN AND THE RAPPORTEUR**

(1) The CHAIRMAN expressed his gratitude for the honour to his country which his appointment as Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission implied.
(2) The first meeting, which would be a purely business one, would be devoted to arranging the Commission's work. The first item on the agenda was the election of three Vice-Chairmen and a Rapporteur. The Chairman did not intend to impose a list of nominees for the election; the suggestions he was about to put forward had been collected from delegations before the meeting and the Commission was perfectly free to make any changes it wished.
(3) The three countries which had been suggested for the offices of Vice-Chairmen - the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Burma and Uruguay - seemed satisfactory from the point of view of geographical representation.

(4) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) expressed the gratitude of his delegation for the honour of the invitation to act as Vice-Chairman, but said that Uruguay had already received the still greater honour of having the Head of its delegation elected President of the General Conference; he therefore declined the new honour offered to his country and proposed Ecuador in its place.

(5) The CHAIRMAN found the Uruguayan delegate's suggestion acceptable and proposed that the delegates of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Burma and Ecuador be appointed Vice-Chairmen of the Commission by acclamation.

(6) Unanimously approved.

(7) The CHAIRMAN said that it had been proposed that the office of Rapporteur be offered to a member of the delegation of the United States of America.

(8) Mr. ARSENAULT (Canada) proposed that Mr. Henry Hope be appointed from that delegation.

(9) Unanimously approved.

(10) Mr. HOPE (United States of America), after expressing his thanks, mentioned that he had no experience of such duties but would perform them to the best of his ability.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION'S WORK AND ESTABLISHMENT OF WORKING PARTIES**

(11) The CHAIRMAN explained that, as the work of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget and the plenary meetings had taken longer than had been expected, the Commission could hold only 34 meetings instead of 35.
(12) He proposed that the meetings should be apportioned as follows: 4 for the discussion of the reports of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, the Chairman of the Executive Board, and the Director-General; 2 for the discussion of the provisional budget ceiling and the provisional figure for Member States' contributions; 23 for consideration of the programme; 1 for discussion of Parts I, III and IV of the Budget; and 2 for the discussion of the future programme. The Commission would then devote a meeting to the examination of its report and would hold the last meeting in reserve for any unforeseen business. Should there be too many unforeseen items, meetings might have to be held at night.
(13) The Commission also had to set up working parties. The Chairman emphasized that there should not be too many of these, as the delegations were smaller than at the previous session of the General Conference and the practical problems of organizing meetings might make the work difficult. The accommodation and technical staff available would not allow for more than 20 meetings, which would have to be apportioned between the working parties of the Programme and Budget Commission and those of the Administrative Commission. It therefore seemed to the Chairman advisable to set up no more than three working parties, the first on the organization and structure of the Department of Mass Communication, the second on the

decentralization of Unesco's activities, and the third on draft international conventions relating to cultural activities and mass communication.

(14) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) proposed that a working party be set up to study the question of Unesco book coupons and gift coupons.

(15) The CHAIRMAN said that it would probably be better to wait until the subject came up for general discussion before deciding whether such a working party was necessary, and Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) agreed.

(16) Mr. SAMBURSKY (Israel) hoped that a working party would be set up to study problems connected with atomic energy, marine biology and cancer research.

(17) Mr. LAUGIER (France) considered that such important and far-reaching questions of such world-wide interest were beyond the competence of a working party and should be seriously discussed by the full Commission.

(18) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) thought that the protection of nature should be included among those major problems.

(19) Mr. BUSTAMENTE (El Salvador) agreed with the views of the French delegate. There were other subjects more appropriate for working parties. Those mentioned by the delegate of Israel were wider and of more general interest.

(20) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) mentioned that his delegation had suggested two of the three projects for which the Israeli delegate proposed a working party and the Japanese delegation therefore had great sympathy with the proposal. But the French delegate's proposal seemed to him a wise one, and he wished to second it.

(21) The French proposal was also supported by the delegates of Lebanon and the United Kingdom.

(22) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) thought that the Commission should first set up the three working parties for the purposes indicated by the Chairman; it would always be at liberty to add others if the need for them became apparent during the discussions.

(23) Mr. SAMBURSKY (Israel) withdrew his proposal.

(24) The CHAIRMAN advocated that the working parties be limited to twelve or fifteen members, to ensure maximum efficiency.

(25) He proposed that the meeting proceed to set up the first working party, to deal with the organization and structure of the Department of Mass Communication. The names of the following countries had been suggested: Belgium, Egypt, France, German Federal Republic, Iran, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, USSR.

(26) He added that, in addition to the general problems which were to be submitted to it, the working party would have to consider two specific questions: (1) Was the press clipping service in its right place in the Department of Mass Communication? (2) Was the Unesco Courier indispensable or could it be replaced?

(27) Mr. AWAD (Egypt) mentioned that his country was particularly interested in the question of decentralizing Unesco's activities, and would like one of its representatives to take part in the discussions of the working party dealing with that problem. The Egyptian delegation was quite prepared to nominate one of its members to serve on the working party to study the organization and structure of the Department of Mass Communication also, but if it were to have only one representative on the working parties, the delegation would prefer to withdraw its candidature for the latter.

(28) The CHAIRMAN agreed to bear Egypt in mind when the working party on the decentralization of Unesco's activities was set up, and proposed that the Committee approve the suggested membership of the first working party, without Egypt.

(29) Approved.

(30) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that each of the working parties would appoint its own officers.

(31) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) was sorry that Egypt had withdrawn from the first working party, thus depriving the Arabic-speaking countries of a representative on such an important group. He proposed that the Egyptian delegate nominate another country to take his place.

(32) Mr. AWAD (Egypt) suggested that a representative of Lebanon be made a member of the first working party.

(33) His suggestion was seconded by the delegate of France.

(34) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) accepted the proposal in principle, but said that he could not give a definite commitment until he was sure that a member of his delegation would be available.

(35) The CHAIRMAN noted his acceptance in principle, and requested the Commission to pass on to the establishment of the second working party, which was to study the question of the decentralization of Unesco's activities. Only one nomination, that of Egypt, had been made for that working party, and the Chairman asked delegates to suggest others.

(36) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon), referring to certain work carried out during the past two years in connexion with decentralization, proposed Italy and, in particular, Professor Veronese.

(37) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of France.

(38) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) recalled that his country was already a member of the first working party, but, so long as he was not thereby debarred, he would be willing to serve on the second party.

(39) The CHAIRMAN explained that what mattered was to appoint representatives of the countries interested in the problems to be discussed.

(40) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) said that his delegation was particularly interested in the working party on decentralization.

(41) The CHAIRMAN requested the representatives of all countries interested in the problem to offer their services and noted the names of India, Turkey, Union of Burma, Liberia, Uruguay, Pakistan, El Salvador, Indonesia, United Kingdom, Chile, German Federal Republic, Israel, Brazil and Australia.

(42) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) proposed that the procedure which had been adopted with regard to nominations for the first working party should be adopted for nominations for the other two parties. It would be preferable to be able to consider nominations overnight with a view to selecting representatives from countries particularly interested in the work of those two working parties and to obtaining a suitable geographical distribution of members.

(43) Mr. CLEGG (United Kingdom) and Mr. KABIR (India) supported the United States proposal.

(44) The CHAIRMAN agreed that it would be best to adopt that procedure; he asked delegates to submit lists of approved nominations for the two working parties still to be set up to the next day's meeting.

(45) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) asked that, when the final choice was made, preference should be given to the countries which, either because of their geographical situation or because of special circumstances, were remote from the central administration.

(46) The CHAIRMAN took note of the suggestion. He requested countries interested in the draft international conventions relating to cultural activities and mass communication to put forward their names for membership of the third working party.

(47) The following countries entered their names: France, Spain, the United States of America, United Kingdom, India, Netherlands, Argentina, Philippines, Italy, Poland, Liberia.

(48) At the suggestion of Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon), Mr. WEILENMANN (Switzerland) agreed to add his country to the list.

(49) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to appoint the members of the drafting committee which would be responsible for preparing the report; the committee should consist of three members, one English-speaking, one French-speaking and one Spanish-speaking.

(50) Mr MARTINEZ (Ecuador) proposed that Spain be appointed to the drafting committee for the Spanish version of the text. He took the opportunity of thanking the delegate of Uruguay for his proposal that Ecuador be appointed to one of the offices of Vice-Chairman, and all the members of the Commission for adopting that proposal.

(51) The proposal of the delegate of Ecuador was approved.

(52) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) proposed that the delegate of France be appointed for the French text.

(53) Approved.

(54) Mr. JOSEPH (British Caribbean Group) proposed that the English-speaking representative should be the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(55) Approved.

(56) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) asked that the membership of the drafting committee should include a Russian-speaking representative, and proposed the delegate of the USSR.

(57) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) stated that, although there was no objection to having a Russian-speaking delegate on the drafting committee, very few members of the Secretariat were able to work in that language.

(58) Mr. LAUGIER (France) seconded the Czechoslovak delegate's proposal.

(59) The proposal was approved.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

# SECOND MEETING

*18 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.3 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56** (documents 8C/5, 8C/5 Corr. and Add., 8C/PR3/20 to 22, 8C/BUD/1)

(1) The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in accordance with the decisions taken at the first meeting, the three vice-chairmanships had been allotted to the Soviet Socialist Republic of Byelorussia, which had nominated Mr. Imreyko; to the Union of Burma, which had nominated Mr. Tha Hla, and to Ecuador, which had nominated Mr. Martinez.
(2) He announced that the Commission's officers had, on the basis of proposals received the previous day, established its working parties with the following membership:
(3) 1st working party (reorganization of the Department of Mass Communication): Belgium, France, German Federal Republic, Iran, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Switzerland, Thailand, USSR, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay.

(4) Approved.

(5) 2nd working party (decentralization of the Organization's activities): Brazil, Egypt, German Federal Republic, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Pakistan, Spain, Turkey, Union of Burma, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay.

(6) Approved, with the addition of Chile, at the request of that country's delegation.

(7) 3rd working party (international regulations): Argentina, Chile, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Netherlands, Philippines, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

(8) The CHAIRMAN having suggested that one of the Arabic-speaking countries should be added to the list, Lebanon was included.

(9) The membership of the 3rd working party, with the addition, at his request, of the delegate of Burma, was then approved.

(10) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that hitherto the preparation of programme and budget had been the joint responsibility of the Executive Board and the Director-General. Document 8C/5 was the first which had been prepared by the Director-General under the amended Article VI, 3 of the Constitution. The Executive Board's comments had already been published in document 8C/5 Add. 1, and, accordingly, in presenting the proposed programme and budget, he wished only to select certain points for emphasis.
(11) The Executive Board considered that the programme and budget and the report on the remodelling of the future programme of Unesco (document 8C/PRG/13) were closely related. The Director-General's original draft programme had been discussed by the Board in March 1954, and during its November 1953 meeting it had given him preliminary ideas on remodelling. It had proposed that he should endeavour in 1955-56 to complete certain minor projects, make an initial test of technical aid to Member States, and evaluate past work, provided that the Conference approved the ideas in the remodelled programme. He wished to pay a tribute to the Director-General and the Secretariat for having within a short time substantially transformed the programme in the light of the Board's suggestions. He hoped that the Conference would find the document as great an improvement on previous ones as had the Board. A great deal was owed to the brilliance of the late Mr. Hodson, whose death was a loss both to Unesco and to the United States of America.
(12) The programme for 1955-56 placed increasing emphasis on the activities in, and consequent responsibilities of Member States. The view had been expressed during discussions in the Board that many National Commissions were not as effective as they might be. A document setting out the Board's views on that question and on decentralization was in preparation.
(13) In connexion with activities in Member States, he wished to draw special attention to technical aid - a term which he, personally, hoped would be replaced, since it was too often confused with technical assistance. Technical aid was an integral part of Unesco's programme. Unlike technical assistance, it was not related to social and economic needs and was not restricted to underdeveloped countries; there was in fact a two-way traffic between the developed and the underdeveloped countries. It was not a new activity, but the Board wanted more emphasis to be given to requests and contributions from Member States.
(14) Finally, the Executive Board had had some difficulty over the form of the budget. The seventh session of the General Conference had instructed the Director-General and the Executive Board, in preparing and discussing the 1955-56 programme, to take account of the report of the Working Party on the future programme and

development of Unesco and also of the comments of Member States. The Working Party had recommended establishment at two levels and, in the absence of adverse comment from Member States, the Board had felt bound by that recommendation. The method of working out the budget was the Director-General's responsibility and had the Executive Board's approval. The Board also supported the whole programme and budget, including the lower and higher level.

(15) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Secretariat considered that the main task of the Conference was to decide on the kind of programme it wanted for 1955-56 and for subsequent years. The problems, although different, were closely linked, but he proposed at the present time to comment only on the draft programme and budget for the coming two years.

(16) The Chairman of the Executive Board had pointed out the respective responsibilities of the Director-General and the Board, and had referred to the two important meetings of the Board: in November 1953 to discuss policy and in March 1954 to discuss details. He (the Director-General) worked in close co-operation with the Board, considering it in the Organization's interests to take the Board fully into his confidence at various stages, and he looked on the Board as the Secretariat's partner in the work. The practice of giving the Director-General final responsibility for deciding what should be included in the programme and budget was a good one, since such decisions were difficult to make in a committee.

(17) In presenting the programme and budget to the Conference the Secretariat had deliberately raised certain questions requiring a decision by the Conference on future policy and trends. In making recommendations for the preparation of the programme and budget for 1957-58 the Conference would do well to bear in mind a comment, made by one of the delegates, that it would be necessary to think clearly on the machinery for developing programmes and activities in various domains between the eighth and ninth sessions of the General Conference.

(18) During the general debate on the Director-General's Report, many delegates had urged consultation with Member States in the formative stages of the programme and budget and also with groups of States linked by common bonds and purposes, and he was ready to take all possible action in that direction. A general consideration in the minds of those preparing the programme and budget was that Unesco was a member of the United Nations family; and references would be found throughout the documents to requests and observations from the Economic and Social Council and other bodies of the United Nations and also from other Specialized Agencies. Far from infringing Unesco's sovereignty, co-operation with the family of the United Nations would increase efficiency and achievements.

(19) As well as consulting the Executive Board on the preparation of the programme, the Director-General had consulted many Member States. He had visited seven States in each of the continents of Latin America and Asia, and had been in touch with European governments frequently and with the United States Government at the time of the meetings of the National Commission in September of the previous year. The Chairman and other members of the Executive Board had accompanied him on some of his journeys and many valuable ideas and suggestions had been acquired. The impression gained was that the main trend of Unesco's work in the future must be in the direction of responding to the requirements of Member States, *not only* by technical aid, but in the permanent services. He instanced Member Governments in so-called underdeveloped areas who had stipulated that technical aid should not be given at the expense of permanent services. Many governments too had made it clear that their needs went beyond the concept of economic aid, mechanized civilizations or increasing competence in technology, and some had indicated that their highest priorities lay in the cultural and spiritual fields.

(20) An important characteristic of the programme and budget was the division into two parts - originated by the Assistant Director-General. The Secretariat would welcome any comments and suggestions for improvements. In that connexion he emphasized that the two parts were not isolated, but had a mutual bearing and value. Terminology had presented difficulties, and it had not always been possible to be as precise as was desirable. "Permanent Services", for example, were not fixed and might be subject to change; the use of the word "project" sometimes led to confusion.

(21) With regard to technical aid, he stressed that it was a service given to countries which might be either recipient or donor countries under the United Nations programme of technical assistance. The system of Special Projects had brought out two ideas to which he was opposed: first, that response to needs of Member States should lead towards regionalization; and secondly that the new emphasis would detract from the intellectual activities that were the lifeblood of the Organization. The stabilization of Part 1 of the programme and the increase of Part 2 was a provisional measure for a period of two years and subject to revision.

(22) Some progress had been made in the important direction of concentration, though no extreme measures had been proposed. The Secretariat was ready to accept guidance from the Conference.

(23) Finally, a cautious move was being made towards evaluation, which hitherto had been supported more in theory than in practice. Evaluation was a difficult process, needing a careful and planned approach; if the Conference supported the idea, the Secretariat would present further proposals to the ninth session.

(24) The Director-General then turned to the separate chapters of the programme and budget.

(25) Education. One of the chief problems was that of education for international understanding; everyone believed in its importance, but the difficulty was to put it into practice. In that connexion he referred to a recent meeting of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation, whose report would shortly be available, and to a proposal made by the United

States delegate for the establishment of an inter-departmental committee headed by the Director-General. He himself was not opposed to the idea but did not wish to commit himself before it had been discussed.

(26) Another important problem, and one on which many Member States had asked for assistance, was that of the school curriculum. There was a need to study machinery for advising countries on a continuing service basis.

(27) With regard to fundamental education, two centres had been established with technical assistance support, and Unesco had now taken over the main responsibility under the normal programme. He was opposed to establishing others, on an international basis, because the principal areas where language and homogeneous culture provided a basis for success had been exhausted. There was no objection, however, to centres being formed nationally or by two or more countries with common interests. Emphasis had also been placed on the development of Associated Projects.

(28) An important development in fundamental education was assistance to Member States in training rural teachers.

(29) Other activities were co-operation with the United Nations in community development; literacy campaigns based on methods of teaching adults to read and write, and assistance to countries in the preparation of reading material; support for the Unesco Institutes in Germany; assistance for educational reconstruction in Korea and for Arab refugee children.

(30) Natural Sciences. Unesco was interested in co-operating with the United Nations in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. A full report would be submitted later.

(31) It was also hoped to find a way of providing assistance to the International Geophysical Year; and the importance of oceanography and marine sciences had been stressed.

(32) With regard to the Arid Zone work, contrary to certain views, it was Unesco's and not FAO's responsibility, since the project was one of scientific research.

(33) Social Sciences. The need to increase geographical coverage in non-governmental organizations, while of concern to all departments, had been especially stressed with regard to the Department of Social Sciences.

(34) Cultural Activities. Co-operation was envisaged with the Department of Education on reading material, museums and libraries. Emphasis had been placed on cultural exchanges and translations. An important achievement was the successful conclusion of two conventions: one on Copyright and the other on the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict. Of especial interest to the former was the acceptance of the Convention by the United States of America, which had not ratified the earlier Berne Convention on copyright.

(35) Mass Communication. One of the most difficult problems facing the Department was whether its objectives should be aid to Member States in developing their own means of mass communication or publicity for the activities and objectives of Unesco and the United Nations family. The Secretariat would welcome discussion of the question. Mr. Tor Gjesdal, who it was hoped would accept the position of Director of the Department, would be present at the end of the week and would assist in this discussion.

(36) One of the paths it was hoped to explore was extension of the Department's work with the United Nations. Much of the work on international understanding was carried out in the Department of Mass Communication, and it was also fostering understanding and attachment to the principles of Human Rights through publications, press services, and radio.

(37) Exchange of Persons. Great success had been achieved in workers' travel and exchanges. Useful collaboration was established with the programme departments.

(38) Technical Assistance. The Conference was being asked for the first time to undertake a detailed review, as a result of the Economic and Social Council decision that that part of the programme, although financed by the United Nations, should be evaluated by the participating organizations rather than by the Technical Assistance Board or the Economic and Social Council. The Conference was therefore responsible for reviewing its quality and its usefulness to Member States in the same way as if it were financed by the Organization.

(39) Publications. Sales were rising and were expected to reach $100,000 for the current year as against $73,000 in 1953. Improved criteria were being used for selection and review of publications.

(40) Administration. It had been suggested that the new tendency in the programme would result in a new basis for organizing the Secretariat. The Director-General, however, could not foresee a change in the present organization based on intellectual disciplines. Views had been expressed on the need for co-ordinating machinery to handle large programmes, but the Secretariat was quite capable of planning special machinery and organizing task forces when needed. Such task forces, however, could only be set up under the existing organization and he hoped that the Conference would not bind the Secretariat too rigidly in the matter of administration.

(41) Budget. After deciding on a programme, the next step was to provide the funds for executing it. The higher and lower levels had been conceived by the previous Conference and not by the Director-General and he hoped the practice would not be followed in future years. It was difficult to relate the two levels to priorities, because the programme was envisaged as a whole and it was impossible to eliminate projects on the basis of a level. He had tried to retain the old-established continuing services at the lower level, but projects could be exchanged between levels if required.

(42) Finally, the Secretariat, working as a team, was responsible for the programme and budget and would endeavour to implement the wishes of the General Conference and of individual States. It was proud of the programme but ready to accept criticism or new proposals. The Secretariat had worked loyally and would continue to do so in an effort to help the Conference in its decisions.

(43) In conclusion, it had been an inspiration to the Secretariat to hear the statements at the plenary meetings on the enlarged vision and new hope which Member States saw in Unesco's work. Those views would be before the Secretariat as it pursued its work in collaboration with Unesco's Members.

(44) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia) (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) presented the Committee's First Report (document 8C/BUD/1), and drew attention to the main recommendations and conclusions which might help the Programme and Budget Commission in its work.
(45) The Committee, which had devoted the past fortnight to a detailed examination of the Director-General's programme and budget proposals for 1955-56 and the draft resolutions submitted by Member States, had unanimously agreed that the lucid drafting of document 8C/5 had made it a very much better working document than in previous years. The Committee also wished to express its warm appreciation of the co-operation it had received from the Secretariat. Collaboration between the Secretariat and delegations had been helped by the widening of the Committee's terms of reference to enable it to deal with the programme and budget aspects of the proposals at the same time.
(46) While the Committee had not taken the total size of the budget into consideration, it had, in view of the introduction contained in the programme and budget document, recommended that the Conference should not fix the total budget until it had received the Administrative Commission's report on the scale of contributions for 1955-56 and on methods of financing the budget.
(47) The Committee had borne in mind the need to examine projects in the light of the Director-General's conception of the programme as transitional leading to increased concentration of the Organization's activities. It had already prepared a report on the Executive Board's proposals on the remodelling of the future programme.
(48) On the basis of the Director-General's opinion that the division of projects into "higher budgetary level" and "present budgetary level" did not imply a differentiation in priority, the Committee had agreed to make recommendations to the Conference on the relative importance of various projects and of the draft resolutions submitted by Member States. The projects were divided into four categories:
(49) Category 1. Projects to which the Committee attributed priority, with a total appropriation of $533,377. The projects listed constituted a small part of the Organization's major activities, but the Summary Records indicated that the Committee attached importance to certain major spheres of activity for which it was not considered necessary to specify priorities.
(50) Category 2. Projects approved by the Committee for the 1955-56 programme, but for which no special recommendation was made. Draft resolutions of Member States retained for insertion in the 1955-56 programme represented a total expenditure of $99,217.
(51) Category 3. Projects which could be approved only to the extent that funds provided exceeded the appropriations required to operate the first two categories; those projects represented an expenditure of $320,752.
(52) Category 4. Projects to be dropped or deferred until later programme and budget periods: $218,669.
(53) The Committee had also recommended the following two draft resolutions, which had considerable budgetary implications: acceptance of the Government of India's invitation for the ninth session of the General Conference to be held in New Delhi, which would involve an additional budgetary provision in 1956 of $314,042; the use of Russian as a working language of the General Conference, entailing an additional expenditure of $141,350 in 1955-56 if the Conference were held in New Delhi.
(54) The Committee also drew attention to the difficulties caused by belated submission of draft resolutions by Member States, and recommended that Member States be asked in future to submit the substance of their proposals in time for them to be taken into account by the Director-General when framing the draft programme.
(55) Other decisions were: to recommend that two working parties should be set up by the Programme and Budget Commission, the first on the general question of decentralization of the Organization's activities and the second to examine the administrative structure of the Department of Mass Communication; and to express the hope that the Organization would endeavour to evaluate the results obtained in various fields of activity as a basis for future planning.
(56) The Committee considered that the proposed programme and budget was well balanced in respect of appropriations among chapters and between the two sections into which each chapter was divided; the document also maintained the continuity of the Organization's activities and met the frequently expressed wish for concentration of activities. In the last respect it was noted that the number of projects had been reduced from 242 in 1953-54 to 69 for 1955-56.
(57) In conclusion, the report was intended to help the Programme and Budget Commission in its work and, although it reported only the Committee's recommendations, the Summary Records contained many useful discussions and gave the reasons on which the recommendations were based. It was hoped that the Programme and Budget Commission would not need to repeat the Committee's examination, but would be able to accept the programme as recommended, taking advantage of experts in the various delegations represented to assure itself that the work plans for each project were the most effective and economical possible.

(58) The CHAIRMAN felt sure that the tremendous amount of work done by the Advisory Committee would greatly facilitate the Commission's work.
(59) He thought, however, that it would be easier to define the tasks of the various working parties in more detail after the general discussion.

(60) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) said that the Advisory Committee had already worked through the programme and budget in great detail, and his impression was that the majority of projects

had already been approved by the plenary meetings of the Conference. He therefore proposed that the Programme and Budget Commission should not attempt to go over the same ground as the Advisory Committee, but should limit its discussion to those projects needing substantial modification either in substance or in terms of the budget. If Member Governments would submit recommendations on precise points in the programme and budget before noon on 22 November, the work of the Commission would be speeded up considerably.
(61) The time thus saved should be used by working parties composed of specialists and experts within the Commission, which, with the help of the Secretariat, would concentrate on improving and refining the programmes approved by the Commission.
(62) The procedure outlined would not restrict general debate, but would direct it towards matters of most concern to Member States.

(63) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) asked the Chairman to allow him to speak after a vote had been taken on the United States proposal, which he supported. He added that he wished to speak, whatever the result of the vote.

(64) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) supported the proposal made by the United States delegate; he considered it useless to go into the details of projects which had already been carefully examined by both the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee.
(65) It seemed to him that the moment had come to leave purely material matters aside and get down to basic problems, in order to determine what methods and procedure should be adopted in order to achieve the aims proposed.

(66) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) supported the United States proposal, as she thought it would save time. She recalled that the Chairman had explained on the previous day that it would take the Commission thirty-five meetings to complete its study of those matters, which would mean that, at the end of the General Conference, it would still not be in a position to make its report unless it held night meetings. She believed that, if it approved the United States proposal, the Commission would have more time to deal with the section relating to education, for instance, to which the Director-General had alluded.

(67) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) was surprised that the United States delegate, by suggesting the establishment of new committees of experts, should wish to return to a working method which had already been severely criticized at the seventh session of the General Conference, and which was also contrary to the previous day's decision to limit the number of working parties to three.
(68) Moreover, although decisions taken by small groups might carry a certain weight, on questions of such great importance they could not be binding upon all delegations.
(69) The delegate of Italy was therefore in favour of holding a general discussion immediately before the vote on the United States proposal.

(70) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) was of opinion that there was much to be gained by setting up working parties to examine the programme.
(71) He hesitated, however, to agree entirely with the United States proposal, for it seemed to him that the Programme and Budget Commission should discuss not so much specific points in the draft programme, but rather broad plans of campaign designed to meet both the requirements of Unesco's own particular fields of activity and the felt needs of Member States.
(72) Otherwise, he did not see that there was any contradiction between the United States proposal and the Chairman's suggestion that the Commission briefly survey the problems which were of interest to all delegations.

(73) The CHAIRMAN thought that it would clarify the debate if the United States delegate would explain his ideas on the new working parties which he wished to see set up.

(74) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America), referring to the statement of the delegate of Italy, said that "working parties" was perhaps an ill-chosen term; he had in mind groups of experts or consultants. His idea was to eliminate discussion on projects on which delegates were in agreement and to restrict it to those which Member States considered needed alteration.

(75) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) supported the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America, but wished to raise two points. First, the time limit suggested for submitting proposals was too short: he would prefer to see it extended to the following Monday or Tuesday. Secondly, where a delegation had not itself raised a point, he would like to know whether that delegation could participate in discussion if the point were raised by another delegation.

(76) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) shared the United States delegate's wish to save time and help the Commission, and would support any practical method of achieving that end. The setting up of additional working parties, however, would preclude the participation of small delegations, who were already finding difficulty in manning the existing working parties. A more practical procedure would be for the Commission to give moral approval to projects on which there was general agreement and limit discussion to those on which delegates had raised specific questions.

(77) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) supported the United States proposal for the very reason that his was a small delegation - consisting of two members. If discussion were limited to specific points raised by Member Governments, his delegation's task of participating as widely as possible in the proceedings of the Conference would be facilitated.

(78) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) was opposed to the hasty abandonment of well-tried

practice; there were more important considerations than time. The Executive Board and the Advisory Committee had done very valuable work, the results of which appeared in the documents before the Commission; but a general discussion in the Commission would give the opportunity for exchange of ideas and the impact of minds, which was so important in an organization such as Unesco. With regard to the use of experts, he did not agree with the implication that acceptance of a project was any less a matter for experts than was refinement of a project.
(79) Finally, he considered that the United States proposal should have been discussed with the Chairman and submitted to the General Committee.

(80) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) pointed out that, if the United States proposal concerning the formation of groups of experts were approved, it would still be necessary to have a general discussion before a final decision could be taken; he did not believe that the United States delegate had intended otherwise. If the proposal were not approved, he thought that the general discussion should take place forthwith.
(81) Mr. Bernal Jimenez recalled that the Director-General, with the wisdom of experience and the impartiality which were characteristic of him, had reviewed the different chapters of the programme and had made extremely interesting comments. So also had the Chairman of the Executive Board. Both had agreed that the whole programme should fall within a budgetary framework in which programme activities were subordinate to whatever criterion the General Conference might adopt with regard to the budget. There then arose a point which he wished to explain to the Commission.
(82) He had understood that the General Conference, at its present session, was to choose between two budgetary solutions: the first, which might be called the static solution, would consist of maintaining the present level; and the other, the dynamic solution, would result in an increase in the total budget figure, due to contributions from new Member States. From what he had heard, however, he gathered that that was not the case, and that the dynamic solution was the only one to be taken into account. Perhaps there was only a difference of opinion as to when that dynamic solution should take effect.

(83) The CHAIRMAN pointed out to the delegate of Colombia that a question of procedure, and not the basic problem, was at present under consideration; he would therefore request him to restrict his remarks to procedure.

(84) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) had understood - as the Chairman himself had said - that a general discussion could be held, without a vote being taken on any proposal; and indeed it seemed to him that various delegates had already referred to questions of a general nature. It would therefore be advisable to decide definitely whether the general discussion was to be postponed, or whether the United States proposal regarding procedure was to be discussed and put to the vote as soon as possible.

(85) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) feared that the establishment of working parties might lead to a dividing up of the work, with the serious consequences that had already been noted (particularly at the Mexico session of the Conference).
(86) He therefore seconded the proposal of the delegate of Italy.

(87) Mr. LAUGIER (France) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom that the delegate of the United States of America had not submitted his proposal in accordance with the correct procedure.
(88) The French delegation was strongly opposed to increasing the number of expert committees to deal with questions which had already been debated on many occasions or were sufficiently important to be discussed by the General Conference in plenary meeting.
(89) As it was extremely difficult for small delegations to be represented on many committees, Mr. Laugier suggested that the Commission approve only the first part of the United States proposal, to the effect that delegations should inform the Commission's Officers of the subjects which they would like to have discussed, or the points on which they wished to speak.

(90) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) dealt separately with the two aspects of the United States proposal.
(91) If the discussion were limited to questions suggested by the delegations, the Commission might lose the benefit of the information which the Secretariat could supply on each item of the programme.
(92) If, however, the United States proposal were accepted, in order to gain time, could not a date be fixed for the discussion of the first part of the programme and another date for the second?
(93) With regard to the second aspect of the proposal concerned, Mr. Florkin was sure that the United States delegate intended the experts to meet after, and not before, the general discussion, in order to help the Secretariat to determine methods of action.

(94) Mr. KABIR (India) said that, if the following interpretation were correct, he would support the proposal of the United States delegate:
(95) 1. There was to be a general discussion of the whole programme and budget, bearing in mind the statements of the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General, which would provide for the meeting of minds on broad issues. The Belgian delegate's proposal would not be out of place, because, as the Director-General had explained, the two levels were integrated parts of the whole programme.
(96) 2. To prevent repetition of discussion, the Commission would concentrate on aspects where differences of opinion and misunderstandings needed clarification.
(97) 3. As the United States delegate had himself explained, there was no question of setting up working parties: the intention was, after approval of the programme and budget by the Commission and the Conference, to bring to the Secretariat's notice any specific issues in which delegations were interested.
(98) The Conference had never intended to commit the Secretariat to a rigid programme and, in making

improvements and modifications - provided they did not conflict with the general outline and principles - assistance from experts would be invaluable. (99) Finally, he supported the delegate of Denmark's proposal to extend the time limit for submission of proposals by delegates.

(100) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) observed that one of the main difficulties with which the Organization had always had to contend was the disparity between the funds available and the programme. In the present case there was a disparity between the amount of time available and the programme. Considering that the United States proposal would reduce that disparity, he would support it and moved that it be put to the vote.

(101) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) suggested that, before a vote was taken, the two parts of the United States proposal be separated, since, as the French delegate had pointed out, at least one part deserved consideration.

(102) In view of the short time available to the Commission, Mr. ARSENAULT (Canada) did not see what advantage there could be in reconsidering projects which had already been thoroughly examined. He would vote therefore for the proposal of the United States delegate.

(103) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) thanked the delegate of India for his clarification. He approved the proposals of the delegate of Denmark and said that he would have no objection to the discussion of the programme in two parts.

(104) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) reminded the meeting that he had suggested fixing two dates for discussion, corresponding to the two groups of chapters.

(105) The CHAIRMAN suggested that noon on Monday, 22 November, be fixed as the deadline for delegations to submit their requests to speak on the first three chapters - Education, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences.

(106) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom), on a point of order, said that a vote should first be taken on his proposed amendment, which was as follows: first, the Commission should proceed with a general discussion; and, second, the United States delegate's proposal should be referred to the General Committee of the Conference to consider, in the light of the discussion, its practical application and its effect on the time schedule of the Conference.

(107) A vote was taken, and the result was 23 votes in favour, 23 votes against, with 6 abstentions.

(108) Mr. KABIR (India) pointed out that the first part of the amendment was not in fact amending any proposal, since no objection had yet been made to the holding of a general discussion.

(109) It was agreed that the second part of the amendment was the point on which a decision was needed.

(110) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) reformulated his proposal as follows:

"That the United States delegate's proposal be referred to the General Committee of the Conference to consider, in the light of the discussion, first, its practical application and, secondly, its effect on the time schedule of the Conference."

(111) The proposal was adopted by 25 votes to 19 with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

# THIRD MEETING

*18 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.2 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56** (continued)

(1) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) thanked the Chairman and the Executive Board for the excellent documentation supplied to the Commission and the Director-General for the extremely helpful statement he had made at the morning meeting, and commended the report of the Advisory Committee. Assuming that the Commission was ready to start on a general discussion, he would make some brief comments.

(2) Firstly, the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation with regard to the proposed programme was based on the fact that it considered that the Unesco Secretariat, in association with the Member States, was trying to carry out the aims to which the Organization was pledged in its Constitution. In that connexion, he thought that, if success was to be achieved, the most important contribution

must come from Member States themselves.
(3) Secondly, in its comments on the various projects, the United Kingdom delegation, while appreciating the proposals made on both the higher and lower budget levels as well as those contained in the various resolutions which had been submitted by Member States, would apply only one standard. That standard would be one of merit. He had been heartened by the statement that no priority would be attached to the location of any proposed project.
(4) Thirdly, the United Kingdom delegation would apply the criterion of relevance to the aims and objectives of Unesco. It would not consider projects relevant if they covered a field of activity which was in the sphere of another Organization.
(5) Fourthly, his delegation was interested in maintaining the balance between fundamental education and intellectual co-operation. He warned against accepting new cultural responsibilities at the expense of neglecting Unesco itself. It was important to the work of Unesco for the staff of the Secretariat to have contact with the best in human intellect and intelligence.
(6) Fifthly, the United Kingdom delegation would approach with a critical eye the grants to non-governmental organizations. In its opinion, Unesco should only give assistance to those non-governmental organizations which could prove that their existence was justified and which had the support of their members.

(7) Mr. RIVET (France) wished to make a few remarks on behalf of his delegation.
(8) He recalled that Unesco had made substantial progress in co-ordinating previously disjointed efforts in the fields in which it was interested, and went on to stress that Unesco should above all act as an instigator or catalytic agent. It could and must intervene in countries where deficiencies had been noticed, but it should not assume responsibilities which fell within the competence of autonomous organizations playing a rôle which Unesco could not fulfil entirely; in every instance where Unesco's efforts had failed, it was because attempts already made had been abandoned too quickly.
(9) The delegate of France saw no reason why the Unesco programme should not be divided into two parts, permanent activities and technical aid activities, provided that those who drew the programme up did not lose sight of the vital link between the two categories. Those responsible for permanent activities could give very useful help to those dealing with technical aid, and vice versa.
(10) On the other hand, Mr. Rivet thought it extremely regrettable to reserve no more than 33% of the Unesco budget for permanent activities, while any additional resources would be devoted to technical aid. He recalled that Unesco's most substantial achievements had been in the fields of the Natural Sciences, the Humanities and Social Sciences. In his view, certain organizations, such as the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, should not have the same credits but be given increased funds.
(11) With regard to the second part of the programme, the delegate of France considered that the term "technical aid" was ill-chosen, "aid" implied "charity". But, as the Director-General had pointed out, the needs of underdeveloped countries were not only of a material kind, but were considerable at the social and intellectual levels. Mr. Rivet thought that the term "human solidarity" would be more appropriate.
(12) Furthermore, the delegate of France wished to know whether Unesco would give ear to Member States' requests, or whether it would itself make suggestions to them. He considered that, in order to help the States concerned to the greatest extent possible, and to avoid wasting money, Unesco should make a careful, impartial and all-embracing choice excluding all political considerations.
(13) In addition, Mr. Rivet regretted that two of Unesco's vital tasks, education for international understanding and education for living in a world community, had not been sufficiently stressed in the programme.
(14) The delegate of France favoured the creation of an international school. The public must be made to understand that great hopes lay in Unesco as a means of securing lasting peace.

(15) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) welcomed the new presentation of the budget and indicated his general agreement with the Director-General's remarks. He supported the higher budget level but did not consider that it was sufficiently high for the work of Unesco to be truly effective. There was too much concentration of effort and not sufficient concentration of resources. He hoped that the great nations, such as the United States of America and the United Kingdom, would approve the higher budget level and, in so doing, take over the responsibilities of the less fortunate nations, which could not find the means to undertake the urgent tasks facing them. He outlined the points in the programme which his Government considered important, namely, cultural exchange, the pooling of technical knowledge in the building of cultural institutions all over the world, the translation of literary and philosophical works and participation of the masses in the highest forms of culture. Emphasis on such features would make for international understanding and peace. Burma, although having only very small economic resources, upheld the philosophy of kindness, helpfulness and peace.

(16) Mr. KABIR (India) thought that the crucial point raised by the Director-General was decentralization. If decentralization or regionalism was to be interpreted as dividing the offices of Unesco amongst the various regions of the world, it would be harmful, but, if it was to be interpreted as meaning regionalizing the programme of Unesco, it would be beneficial. Priorities were not the same in each country and should be determined by the requirements of each individual country. Referring to the two resolutions submitted by India on the subject of decentralization, he said that objection had been made to the setting up of "regional offices", and explained that what the Indian Government wanted to see established were area offices under any name.
(17) Referring to the remark by the delegate of Burma that the budget was not sufficient to meet

the needs of Unesco, he pointed out that, however big the budget was, it would never be big enough to do all that Unesco would like to do or ought to do. The question of remuneration of primary school teachers should be treated as one of great urgency, but, as long as the budget was inadequate to meet the urgent programme requirements of Unesco, it would be impossible to tackle such a task. The programme had of necessity to be selective and Unesco should use its resources to stimulate interest in projects which, once started, would be carried on by their own momentum and the interest of the communities affected. He fully supported the higher budget level and pointed out that the additional money required to carry out the programme under that level could be found from the contributions of the new Member States.
(18) With regard to the permanent services, he warned against economizing at the expense of efficiency. He advocated greater use of National Commissions in carrying out projects.
(19) He agreed with the Director-General that greater efforts were required, but asked the Commission to remember that it took time to see and evaluate results and advised against too stringent criticism of work in hand.
(20) He did not think that the subject of international understanding should be treated under a separate heading in the programme. International understanding should be the controlling spirit of Unesco in all branches of its work starting with the very young. The same spirit should permeate all work concerning the exchange of persons.
(21) Finally, he wondered if it might be advisable to consider the question of priorities area by area.

(22) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) said that she would be speaking more in her capacity as a school-teacher with wide experience than as government delegate. She wished to comment on a few points raised by the Director-General at the morning meeting. In the first place she considered that international understanding had been watered down in all spheres. The idea should be started in the home and continued at school. In Uruguay, streets were named after outstanding foreigners or foreign achievements, children were taught to sing the songs of other countries and in the schools learned about other countries' heroes. The Junior Red Cross was very active and included millions of young people throughout the world. In that field, Unesco had given assistance in various forms. International understanding was the responsibility of every country. It was better to work along those lines than to found an international school, from which only a few pupils would draw benefit.
(23) Secondly, with regard to school curricula and an advisory committee thereon - a theme raised by the Director-General - she considered that education was a national responsibility. Each country knew its own problems and needs. An advisory committee on curricula would have to take into account the particular characteristics of each people, for example, the large number of children living in rural areas in many countries.
(24) Thirdly, she did not know exactly what the Director-General had said about the centres at Patzcuaro and Sirs-el-Layyan. But the speaker considered that those centres must be given more help than they had received up to the present. They had a great deal of work and their usefulness was incalculable.
(25) Very often school-teachers in rural areas had neither good schools nor appropriate equipment. They were not paid as they should be. Their material position must be improved and their training and professional prestige raised. Uruguay had set up a teachers' training school for rural school teachers. It was in the heart of the country and was thus in touch with the surroundings in which those teachers would later work.
(26) The Director-General's statement had emphasized the importance of literacy and fundamental education. It was a great misfortune to be unable to read or write. Unesco must devote large resources and show more interest in that field. It served to raise the living standards of the people. Uruguay had been asked to send school material and to help repair the damage caused by war, notably in Korea. They had done all they could to reply to that call and continued to take interest in the matter.
(27) The speaker said that in her view cultural exchanges were useful and would bear fruit. But a watch should be kept over the way in which they functioned; it would be desirable to organize and make a close study of the time which fellowship holders should give up to their travel and studies. She mentioned the case of a group of teachers who had arrived in Uruguay and had stayed there three months; later they had gone on to Argentina where they remained six months. The length of those stays was perhaps excessive, and it might be that detailed and carefully studied preparation would help to avoid drawbacks of the kind. The speaker recalled how she had taken part in the San Francisco Conference, when there were great hopes in the work of the United Nations. Today it could be affirmed that those hopes were well-founded and as far as concerned the cultural undertaking embodied in Unesco had borne fruit.

(28) Mr. CHEN CHI-PAO (China) considered that the new programme was an improvement on past programmes and that it pointed the way to even better future programmes. The Chinese delegation felt that Unesco was overburdened with different types of activities and it would welcome simplification in that respect. Unesco should only undertake the type of activity which it alone could discharge and should act as a co-ordinating body for other types of activity which could be handled by other agencies, for example, non-governmental organizations assisted by Unesco, or National Commissions. The impression should be avoided that Unesco was omnipotent and had unlimited resources. Other agencies receiving assistance from Unesco, which could carry out work for Unesco, should be called upon to do so. A fairer distribution of tasks would lead to better co-operation and relationship between the agencies of Unesco.
(29) More emphasis should be put on three groups of people - teachers, youth and women. At present

insufficient attention was given to mobilizing those three groups to carry out the objectives of Unesco.
(30) He would also like to see more emphasis put on the universality of culture. It was necessary to emphasize eastern culture as being equal to western culture. The East showed more readiness to study Western culture than did the West, Eastern culture. Western culture formed the core of the present programme and Eastern culture was only being used for reference purposes. The East was underdeveloped from a technical point of view but had much to offer the world in matters of ethics, philosophy, etc. The fault was on both sides, the West being unwilling to study the culture of the East and the East failing to present its case to the West.
(31) With regard to technical aid, he thought that the word technical was inadequate, as a two-way traffic was essential. Material aid was of more value than personal aid.

(32) Mr. PAIK (Korea) said that he had been moved by the remarks made by the delegate of Uruguay concerning his country and thanked the Director-General for the references he had made in his statement. He pointed out that an emergency was of the highest priority but that Korea was not included in the emergency assistance programme. Korea had only consultative relations with the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, but Korea as a Member State of Unesco had a right to participate in the programme. He asked whether the Commission would recommend providing the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency with a new impetus for implementing its rehabilitation programme in Korea by including Korea in the programme for emergency assistance. The Korean delegation thanked all Member States for the help which they had extended to Korea.
(33) He supported the higher budgetary level for the programme for 1955-56.

(34) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) pointed out that the work of the Programme Commission consisted of putting the proposed programme into a form which would be acceptable to the General Conference, and suggested that the Commission should limit itself to that field. The programme had gone through various important stages before appearing in its present draft form. The Secretariat, Director-General and Executive Board had considerable experience in the execution of previous programmes, and had contacted Member States in their preparation.
(35) The process of consulting Member States was an important stage, without which the General Conference could not properly discharge its responsibilities. The Director-General had already obtained information regarding the requirements of the various Member States before putting his programme into draft form; which being so, the programme should be acceptable to the General Conference.
(36) On that understanding, a programme acceptable to the General Conference would be a coherent reflection of views which came from decentralized areas, and which had been channelled through the central body of Unesco. The problem of regionalization or decentralization was not purely a matter of administration or of rearranging the programme, but essentially determined the efficiency of the General Conference and of Unesco.

(37) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) congratulated the Director-General on the compilation of the programme. With regard to the projects affecting South Africa, he pointed out that the Committee for Technical Co-operation in Africa south of the Sahara had already built up a good record of work in co-operation, and he wondered whether Unesco would not be advised to channel its proposed projects through that committee. In the interests of economy and efficiency Unesco should consult the committee before undertaking any projects in Africa south of the Sahara. The South African Government considered it undesirable to start activities unless it was certain that they could be implemented. His Government was not opposed to projects being undertaken in the South Saharan region, but felt that the resources would be better used, if consideration were given to the desirability of consulting with the Committee for Technical Co-operation in Africa south of the Sahara.

(38) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) said that his Government, the Ministry of Education and the National Commission believed that the proposed programme and budget presented by the Director-General for 1955-56 should be supported, because of its structure, and because of the balance it maintained between general and special activities. The Mexican Government had helped and would continue to help in projects carried out by Unesco in Mexico, and would above all assist the Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro. In the speaker's view, the success of programmes depended upon a good choice of experts and fellowship holders. Technicians and experts should be selected who had a good knowledge of the country that they were visiting, and who were acquainted with its special conditions, possibilities and limitations. It was not enough that an expert be competent unless he had a due knowledge of his field of work. The Mexican Government was favourably impressed by the interesting and important chapters dealing with general activities. There was no reason for reducing the budget; it should on the contrary be increased wherever the importance and urgency of the programme required it. His delegation would therefore support the "higher budgetary level".

(39) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) associated himself with the remarks already made with regard to the clarity of the programme. He regretted that the studies of the school curriculum and of the humid tropical zone had been postponed on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, and hoped that the Commission would reverse that decision.

(40) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, referring to the intervention of the delegate of Uruguay, said that there appeared to be some misunderstanding. The policy of the Secretariat was to put more funds

from the normal budget at the disposal of the two existing fundamental education centres. The Secretariat did not think Unesco should start centres of that type elsewhere, but was ready to support national efforts. It would also support a centre serving two or three countries having the same language. That was his recommendation.
(41) The Director-General assured the delegate of South Africa that it was the policy of the Secretariat to consult the Committee for Technical Co-operation south of the Sahara. He would be pleased to follow the suggestion to channel certain projects through that Committee, if it was for comments only.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

# FOURTH MEETING

*19 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.2 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56 (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN stated that the General Committee had examined the proposal of the United States delegation, submitted to it by the Commission the previous day. The General Committee had requested delegates to let the Chairman of the Commission have a list, for his guidance, of the items which they wished to discuss; delegates could tell how to assign priorities to those various items, by referring to the classification system adopted by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
(2) The Chairman also called on the specialists concerned to communicate with the appropriate Directors of Departments in person, in order to arrange informal talks with them, during which they might consider ways of carrying out resolutions in the draft programme.

(3) Mr. LAUGIER (France) wanted an assurance that the questions which had not been given a high priority would not be overlooked altogether. He thought that it would be best to assign priorities in order of time.

(4) The CHAIRMAN emphasized that the priorities mentioned by delegates were intended for guidance only, and should be in no way restrictive. All that it was required to know was how much importance delegates attached to a particular question.

(5) Replying to a question from Mr. PANNETON (Canada), the CHAIRMAN explained that delegates were in no way bound to observe the priorities suggested by the Advisory Committee.

(6) After a statement by Mr. FAWZI (Egypt), the CHAIRMAN remarked that he saw no reason to set a time-limit for speeches during the morning's discussion.

(7) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) expressed his delegation's great appreciation of the work done by the Director-General, the Secretariat, the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee, particularly on the difficult problem of achieving a balance between general and special activities in the programme. While sharing the general approval of the programme expressed by the majority of members, he had the following comments to make on behalf of his Government.
(8) The first point he wished to stress was the desirability of seeing the remodelled programme put into operation. With regard to the programme of 1955-56, he believed that it could be strengthened and that the increased services necessitated by the addition of Member States could be provided with little or no increase in the total assessment as compared with 1953-54, and perhaps even some reduction. He supported the opinion expressed by certain delegates that broadened participation in Unesco would strengthen support for the programme. He was anxious to see a concentration on fewer projects with better results. While most Unesco projects were worth while, some were superior to others, and it was essential to apply Unesco's resources in staff, time and money, to the most effective. It would be well to bear in mind the five criteria for selection suggested by the United Kingdom delegate, and the method of evaluation referred to by the Director-General.
(9) He welcomed the opportunities given by the programme for cultural exchanges between countries, and was especially pleased to see Asia and Africa included in such activities. The United States of America was interested and active in that field.
(10) He supported whole-heartedly the delegates of France and other countries who had referred to the need for developing Unesco's work for

international understanding. Mutual understanding and respect among the peoples of the world was the fundamental purpose of Unesco and should be borne in mind by all who were connected in any way with the Organization's work.

(11) Mr. DE SALIS (Switzerland) had some general comments to make on the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56. While he realized that the total budget figure would not be fixed until a later debate, he wished to mention that his delegation considered that an increase would undoubtedly be necessary.

(12) After hearing the statements of the previous day by the delegates of France and the United Kingdom, the Swiss delegation had come to the conclusion that Unesco's general policy should be outlined by the Commission. He drew attention to the importance of recognizing the essential unity of Unesco's work, however disguised it might be by the number and diversity of the Organization's projects. That unity of action, which should be based on unity of thought, was all the more necessary since Unesco's aim was to give every country in the world a share in its work, irrespective of differences of language, culture, social and technical development or even political systems. That diversity need cause no alarm since the majority of Unesco's projects could only be carried out on a world scale. The Swiss delegation had thus always attached primary importance to the universal aspect of Unesco and continued to believe that the Organization should welcome as many as possible of the nations and peoples of the world.

(13) It was in that spirit that the Swiss delegate wished to support the remarks made the previous day by the delegate of France. Whatever it was finally decided to call it, the part of the programme dealing with technical aid should be in keeping with the notion of human fellowship. Switzerland, while maintaining her independence in foreign policy, attached great importance to that notion of human fellowship and never ceased to be conscious of her responsibilities as a member of the family of nations. Switzerland placed the interests of mankind as a whole before those of any one part of the world, or any one political or ideological group. The French sociologist, André Siegfried, had remarked that the Swiss were accustomed by their own constitution to regard other nations as partners, rather than potential enemies. Mr. de Salis thought that that remark reflected a very profound feeling on the part of the Swiss nation, whose one endeavour was to be, as far as it could, the partner of all those in Unesco who were engaged in furthering the fellowship of mankind.

(14) Unesco could not be expected entirely to forget international politics and their resultant divisions. The Swiss delegation was nevertheless convinced that all the Member States of Unesco were united in their desire for peace. Under its Constitution, they were pledged to collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples in the interests of peace.

(15) While agreeing entirely with the delegate of the United Kingdom that it was wisest to steer a middle course between heaven and earth, Mr. de Salis thought that, in the present troubled time, to seek a way to better understanding between nations was eminently realistic and practical. He therefore believed that the promotion of international understanding should be regarded as the clue to the labyrinth of Unesco's varied activities. The Swiss delegation was in favour of setting up an office to give tangible form to the desire for human fellowship and peaceable understanding which should underlie all Unesco's work. That office could be entrusted with the task of ensuring that the true aims of Unesco were never forgotten. As the Uruguayan delegate had said the previous day, a serious endeavour should be made in every country and at every educational level to accustom children - the scientists, writers and politicians of the future - to the idea that other races of men, other nations and other cultures had the same right to respect as their own. The point was to explain to them and make them understand why other nations behaved as they did, but without glossing over the difficulties with which they had to contend. All that was needed was intellectual honesty and tolerance.

(16) The Swiss delegation was also glad to note the trend in the Commission towards better concentration and co-ordination of the Organization's work.

(17) It was essential to divide the programme into various chapters according to subject, provided that those different aspects formed a whole.

(18) Criteria should be laid down for the examination of the many requests which Unesco had received from all sides. The Swiss delegation hoped that the Director-General and the Executive Board would see that Unesco's subventions policy was as coherent as possible. Such coherence was one aspect of the underlying unity of the programme, and the Swiss delegation shared on that point the views expressed by the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(19) Whether dealing with fundamental education, intellectual co-operation or technical aid, or with any other branch of Unesco's activity, it was essential always to bear in mind certain basic ideas which served the real aims of Unesco. On the basis of the foregoing general ideas, the Commission would be able to take detailed decisions and fix the final budget total.

(20) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the structure of the proposed programme and budget for 1955-56 would be more clearly understood when considered in conjunction with the report on the remodelling of the future programme of Unesco. He proposed to comment on the two outstanding characteristics: concentration and increased aid to Member States. With regard to concentration, too much had been said from the budgetary angle and it had been claimed that concentration was necessary because of Unesco's limited resources. Yet those who advocated concentration were at the same time recommending higher levels for Unesco's budget. The idea of concentration had emerged at a time of growing expansion in the fields of activity and in the activities within Unesco, due chiefly to a desire to find the ideal projects which would fulfil Unesco's aims. Years of experience, through success and failure, had taught Unesco what to

discard and how to concentrate. But there was a danger that the conception would become an end in itself. It was impossible to set numerical targets in respect of major projects. The correct method was to examine each one on its merits, in the light of experience, and the resulting concentration would be not for the purpose of economizing, but in the interests of greater efficiency and achievement. It was essential to be as ready to embark on new and promising activities as to discard unsatisfactory projects: the process should be not a diminishing and freezing of activities, but a concentration and stabilization.

(21) Turning to the second principle: increased aid to Member States, Mr. Avidor favoured it as being the most effective means of implementing Unesco's aims. Here, again, it was a method and not a goal, since Unesco was also concerned in helping Member States to help themselves. In giving aid, it should be Unesco's aim not only to train local leaders in the fields of education, science and culture, but to endeavour to build up national efforts into pilot projects for other countries. Thus the Organization's general activities and its aid to Member States, though appearing as separate parts in the programme and budget document, were in fact an integrated whole, wherein general, regional and national activities complemented one another. He gave an example in the field of workers' education.

(22) Mr. Avidor then referred to the important subjects of decentralization and evaluation.

(23) The former subject would be coming up for discussion on another occasion, and he wished only to point out that the working party had drawn a clear distinction between decentralization of activities, which his delegation favoured, and decentralization of Unesco's administration, to which it was strongly opposed.

(24) Evaluation required a careful approach and, as the delegate of India had pointed out, there could be no exact standard for measuring activities in the realms of education, culture and even most of the sciences. It was important to plan carefully, and to check and criticize activities from time to time, but evaluation must not be pursued at the expense of the programme.

(25) The Director-General had asked for clear-cut instructions; but, while the Conference could lay down broad policies and give general instructions, there would inevitably be issues for which there were no hard-and-fast rules, and the Director-General must be left with the difficult but challenging task of finding the solution to such problems himself.

(26) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) first of all added his own congratulations to the Director-General and his assistants for the clear and thorough way in which the draft programme and budget had been prepared. He had a few comments to make, however, on points of detail: (1) the "Index" to document 8C/5 should have appeared at the end of the document when it was distributed to Member States; (2) it would be useful to be able to refer rapidly to the corresponding passages in the Director-General's report; (3) a brief summary of previous work should precede each item; (4) lastly, it might be well to state briefly at the beginning of each of the main chapters why certain activities had been abandoned. It would then be easy to see where, in preparing each new programme, the Secretariat had attempted to achieve concentration.

(27) The Belgian delegation was also in agreement with the views so forcibly expressed by the delegates of France and the United Kingdom. It did not consider Unesco as an international ministry of education, but as a great and noble undertaking whose aim it was to pool the achievements of human intelligence and use them for the good of all mankind.

(28) The Belgian delegation therefore most warmly approved the idea of adapting Unesco's programme to meet the needs of Member States on a wider scale than hitherto. It hoped that increasing resources would be available for that purpose.

(29) Mr. Florkin went on to say that, whether Unesco concerned itself with their fate or not, thinkers, artists and scientists would continue to enrich the cultural heritage of mankind; but it was essential for the future of Unesco that the Organization should be able to rely implicitly upon the international collaboration of creative workers.

(30) The Belgian delegation would therefore view with anxiety the stabilisation of Unesco's general activities at their existing level. The Director-General had pointed out the previous day that it was a question of a transitional two-year period. The Belgian delegate hoped that it was not a case of what lawyers called a "deferred judgment".

(31) The activities planned in the chapters on education, natural sciences, social sciences and cultural activities seemed to maintain a very high level and the Belgian delegation hoped that important international organizations such as IBE, ICSU and CIPSH, the International Social Science Council and the International Association of the Visual Arts would play an increasingly large part in them.

(32) One of the main distinctions between Man and the animal world was that Man could inherit a wealth of masterpieces, knowledge and high moral principles from his forebears. It had been said that every man saw further than his ancestors, because he was borne on the shoulders of a giant, who symbolized the entire intellectual heritage of the past, and its extension in the present. That giant had lived in every part of the world and had been fed by them all. It was greatly to be hoped that he would wax in strength, so that there would soon be room on his broad, firm shoulders for all the peoples of the world.

(33) Mr. SAWADA (Japan) expressed great appreciation of the Director-General's statement on future programme and policy and of the report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. Since most questions covered by the two reports had been studied by the Executive Board, he hoped the Commission would, in its discussions, bear the Board's views in mind.

(34) During the discussions prior to the acceptance of the idea of remodelling the programme, much attention had been given to regionalization. While he did not like the word and hoped that it would be

possible to find one which better expressed the aims in mind, he was in favour of Unesco giving more help to Member States. He also agreed with the view expressed by many delegates in plenary meetings that the rôle of the National Commissions should be extended. National Commissions had an important part to play in educating the masses concerning Unesco; the Organization could not achieve its objectives without the goodwill and help of the people. For that reason the Japanese delegation had presented a proposal to encourage the development of Friends of Unesco Clubs, which he hoped would receive support.

(35) In the field of natural sciences, Japan was interested in scientific research to raise standards of living and improve economic conditions. That was why Japan was anxious to see oceanographic studies developed by Unesco, and he desired that the draft resolution submitted by his delegation to the present Conference on the establishment of an advisory committee on oceanographic research be adopted at that juncture. He also welcomed the resolution of the Indian delegation on the peaceful use of atomic energy and referred to his own delegation's proposal for scientific research on injuries and harm caused by radioactive material. A resolution on the subject was at present under discussion at the United Nations, and he looked forward to the report on the situation promised by the Director-General.

(36) The Japanese delegation was especially interested in fundamental education and technical aid, which subjects had been studied by the Japanese National Commission. His country was anxious for help from Unesco, but also ready to give whatever assistance it could by intellectual and moral co-operation. Much had been achieved by Unesco in fundamental education, but there was still room for improvement. Every effort must be made to accomplish the objects for which Unesco had been set up, and he anticipated good results from the discussions in the Programme and Budget Commission.

(37) Mr. MENCEL (Poland) stated that, in his delegation's opinion, the principle of universality was fundamental to Unesco, the prime condition for its success and the very justification for its existence. Yet, the General Conference at its present session had decided by a majority vote to exclude certain countries.

(38) The Polish delegation considered that absent countries should not be discouraged, but that, on the contrary, they should be included in at least part of the programme, and should be invited, even if they were not for the moment Members of Unesco, to co-operate with the Organization in useful cultural activities.

(39) With regard to the question of priorities, it had been said that the difficulty lay in the diversity of the countries concerned, and particularly in their cultural, political and economic differences. The Polish delegation considered however, that there was one criterion for priority which undoubtedly held good for every nation; that of safeguarding peace. The Polish delegation therefore urged the Commission to give priority, among the numerous draft projects listed, to those likely to make the most immediate and practical contribution to the reduction of international tension and to the creation of a spirit of understanding and co-operation between the nations.

(40) To that end, the Polish delegation would suggest that priority, from the point of view of time, effort and expenditure, be accorded to action in the field of mass communication, with a view to abolishing war and hate propaganda, and fostering an atmosphere of tolerance and understanding likely to stimulate international cultural and economic exchanges.

(41) In the field of the social sciences, the Polish delegation would also support any research on the lessening of tensions, on the principle of negotiation in international relations and particularly on the problem of building up a system of collective security between all nations both in Europe and the rest of the world.

(42) The Polish delegation likewise thought it important to support any attempt to organize international meetings of scientists and artists, and to give publicity to those meetings, not only among intellectual leaders and specialists, but also among the workers and educated people in every country. Unesco should, in addition, encourage the publication, in a number of languages, of the recommendations of such meetings and congresses, including editions intended for the general public.

(43) Further, the Polish delegation would support any action and expenditure designed to facilitate and broaden artistic exchanges throughout the world, international theatre tours, exhibitions likely to spread knowledge of national cultures, while drawing attention both to their diversity and their common human qualities. Thus, as defender of the peace and intermediary between the various national cultures, Unesco would be able to achieve more than by means of publications and exhibitions about the Organization itself.

(44) Mr. Mencel recalled that, in the United Nations, his country had supported the programme of technical assistance to economically underdeveloped countries. Poland would also support those sections of Unesco's programme which concerned technical co-operation with such countries on a basis of equality and mutual respect.

(45) As the Polish delegation saw it, the most important task facing the Commission was to ensure that the budget, without any undue increase, was concentrated on a few particularly important projects, enabling Unesco to discharge the most urgent duty which the nations expected of it, namely, to construct the defences of a lasting peace.

(46) Mr. CALO (Italy) recalled that the Head of the Italian delegation had already put forward its general views. For his own part, he would merely draw the Commission's attention to a few important points. In the first place, some doubt might exist as to the utility of the many filters through which material submitted to the Commission had to pass.

(47) Secondly, in collaboration with National Commissions, a new procedure for the preparation of the programme should be worked out, but without encroaching upon responsibilities belonging

essentially to the Director-General and the Secretariat. Once those decisions had been taken, the objectives assigned to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget might be seen in a different light, and an almost inevitable drawback at present, namely, the tendency of Member States to submit their draft resolutions too late, might be overcome. The Advisory Committee proposed to remedy the situation by altering the prescribed intervals between the submission of draft resolutions and the opening of the Conference, but, in view of the difficulties of publishing the draft programme and budget any earlier and the considerable delays involved in forwarding documents to certain States, it might not be easy to carry out that suggestion. At all events, it should be clearly understood that the Commission and the Conference should remain fully entitled to examine the programme in detail, while at the same time exercising the self-discipline which was necessary if their work was to be effective.

(48) The Italian delegation considered that Unesco should cease to spend money on unprofitable undertakings, such as staff travel, tours of inspection and seminars. Instead of an international seminar, it was often better to organize local courses, if necessary with technical aid. Greater emphasis should be laid on fellowships, study abroad and exchange of persons.

(49) In that connexion, it was worth while remembering that, after a series of seminars held at La Brévière, the Consultative Committee on Adult Education had come to the conclusion that they should be terminated and that La Brévière should be used as a centre for research and experiments.

(50) Such were the ideas behind the draft resolutions and amendments submitted by the Italian delegation, particularly in respect of education. Their aim was generally either to simplify procedure, or to promote economy, to view certain problems more rationally in the light of national needs and assuming more effective co-operation between National Commissions; or to suggest tasks deserving Unesco's attention, or, lastly, to suppress tentative action where intervention by Unesco was bound to be useless and ineffective.

(51) There would always be problems which could be dealt with only at the national level, others calling for scientific research which Unesco could not undertake itself, and others which required no more than an exchange of information on the results of certain enquiries. It was particularly important to decide to which category each of the proposed tasks belonged.

(52) The Director-General had expressed the firm and praiseworthy intention of achieving a good balance. In the opinion of the Italian delegate, what Unesco should do was to make a general appeal for co-operation, whenever it seemed evident that the aims in view could not be achieved by isolated efforts.

(53) The Italian delegation shared the views expressed by the delegate of the United Kingdom. The cause of culture in general could not be served if fundamental education and the implementation of the right to culture were neglected. Furthermore the success of popular education would be jeopardized if creative forces and activities of the mind were not stimulated. Civilization had veered from the high cultural level of a small minority to the shallow culture of the masses. A link should be established between those two spheres, and it would be a grave mistake to believe it possible to develop fundamental education without tapping the sources of a higher culture.

(54) The Italian delegation wished to submit certain remarks on the remodelling of the programme. First, it urged that closer links be established between all educational activities. Problems concerned with the teaching of particular subjects, such as the natural and social sciences, should be dealt with by the Department of Education. In such cases, educational considerations should be uppermost. It might be necessary in the end to set up mixed working parties in the Department of Education on the lines suggested by the United States delegation.

(55) Still more radical changes appeared necessary in the field of Mass Communication. A clear distinction should be made, for example, between the cinema as a specific art form and the cinema as an instrument for the spreading of news and propaganda. As an art form, the cinema should count as a cultural activity.

(56) As far as information was concerned, the activities under that heading were extremely complex and should be classified according to their purpose:

1. Information for schools and educational purposes (cinema, radio, press and television);
2. Information for the adult population as a whole;
3. Information about Unesco and other international organizations working for international co-operation and understanding;
4. Technical improvement of information media.

(57) Half Unesco's work in that field might, however, prove useless if the right of all men to know the truth and to have free access to every source of information were not effectively safeguarded. To do violence to men's minds by deliberately fostering ignorance was a crime against human dignity and one of the worst forms of encroachment upon freedom.

(58) Mr. Calo next referred to his delegation's draft resolution concerning the study of the harmful effects of mass media on children. There was merely a question of continuing enquiries already undertaken by the Secretariat in accordance with instructions given by the General Conference at its seventh session. Many Member States had replied that they were in favour of the enquiry. In Italy those concerned attached great importance to the problem. There was no question of introducing any form of censorship, nor of overlapping in any way with activities already underway. The proposed centre would merely co-ordinate the work of existing bodies. For the time being, the Italian delegation simply proposed that Unesco continue its consultations with Member States, and it recommended that a committee of experts be convened at the end of 1955. In conclusion, Mr. Calo hoped that the Italian proposal would be accepted.

(59) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) observed that his delegation was taking part for the first time in the discussions of the General Conference and found it a very interesting experience. He had perceived that, despite the differences of culture, outlook and aims, there was an underlying sense of human unity, conducive to agreement and solidarity. He was on the whole in favour of a higher budget level. Unesco's resources would never suffice to satisfy all demands, but a budgetary increase would facilitate the implementation of Unesco's programme, and would help it to launch new projects. States recently admitted to Unesco were not only prepared to pay their contributions, but also hoped to submit new projects.
(60) Mr. Zamorano explained that he was against any rigid stabilization of the budget and advocated considerable flexibility in carrying out the programme, so that Unesco's work might become more universal. While considering it inappropriate to increase Member States' contributions, he thought that the contributions of new Member States should be usefully employed. Further, there should be closer relations between Unesco and its Member States.
(61) He did not consider it fitting for Unesco to concern itself with research on cancer. Such work was the responsibility of other international organizations working in other fields and, if necessary, Unesco could make suitable suggestions to them. He supported the view of the Indian delegation that Unesco's work should be imbued with a spirit of international understanding and human fellowship. It was not necessary to create special bodies to take charge of such activities. France had suggested that international understanding and education for living in a world community should be the subject of special chapters. There could be no doubt that the ideas underlying the proposals of India and France were identical. All classes of society should be associated with the activities and aims of Unesco, but that would depend upon the work done by National Commissions. Unesco should serve as a catalytic agent, co-ordinating and encouraging efforts, information and new endeavours.
(62) While approving the decentralization of Unesco's activities, the delegate of Chile was against administrative decentralization. Attempts at decentralization should take the form of training teachers, not only primary teachers, but also secondary school teachers and university staff. The following month, an Inter-American Seminar on Secondary Education would be held at Santiago, Chile, and all countries, particularly those of Latin America, were invited to take part. In Chile, an Institute of Oceanographic Research already existed. If, in accordance with the draft resolution submitted by Japan, an advisory Committee on Oceanographic Research were set up, Chile would wish to take part in it.
(63) In conclusion, Mr. Zamorano hoped that priority would be given to all projects likely to advance international understanding and peace.

(64) Mr. DIAZ SAMAYOA (Guatemala) praised the layout and content of the draft programme and budget for 1955-56, its approach to the various problems, and its eagerness to meet the needs of Member States. While approving many of the new projects in the programme, the speaker considered that they should not impair the activities which Unesco already had in hand. Work should be intensive rather than extensive. During the next two-year period, Unesco's budget ought to be increased.
(65) Mr. Diaz Samayoa emphasized the importance of fundamental and adult education, literacy campaigns, public libraries, and the use of radio and films as means of raising the general cultural level. He advocated that projects be carried out over longer periods, as they would thus be more effective and might lead to the formation of a cultural tradition.
(66) He thanked Unesco for the help it had given Guatemala in sending a Technical Assistance Mission to advance the country's industrial development. The experts sent had achieved practical results. He also thanked Unesco for the fellowships awarded to Guatemalans for industrial studies; that would encourage students, including members of native groups, to go in for vocational training. For the training of industrial teachers, the Government of Guatemala had set aside over 190,000 quetzales, the scheme would last for at least ten years. There was an Industrial Training Committee and an Agricultural Institute at Retalhuleu, as well as four engineering schools and an engineering institute. Guatemala had asked for Unesco's assistance in a programme for the production of textbooks and other teaching materials; the Government had set aside 25,000 quetzales for that programme.
(67) Mr. Diaz Samayoa was in favour of encouraging research, especially in the social sciences. The University of Guatemala had set up an institute for social science research, and had asked Unesco for technical aid in that new venture, which would contribute to the well-being of Guatemala and to international understanding.

(68) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) pointed out that, since Spain had joined Unesco two years previously, efforts had been made to keep in close contact with the Organization. He wished to make a general statement in connexion with the presentation of the draft programme and budget for 1955-56
(69) With regard to the stabilization of the budget, Spain would not, for the time being, express any final opinion. It seemed to him, however, that any budget increase should go to help underdeveloped countries and to new projects to be undertaken by Unesco at the request of Member States.
(70) The delegate of Spain recommended that decentralization be effected by means of regional institutions, established by Unesco in close co-operation with the States concerned. He also thought that the programme should be adjusted to the particular conditions of each country and each cultural or linguistic group.
(71) Furthermore, Mr. Estelrich considered that education should include the humanities. The part of the programme relating to humanistic studies should be considered in relation to general

education. Only thus could men be imbued with the eternal spiritual, intellectual and cultural values. The inclusion of the humanities did not in any way conflict with the acquisition of scientific knowledge, which was necessary. In many countries, the people's cultural level and the technical instruments at their disposal were out of all proportion.
(72) Unesco was turning illiterates into literates, but new literates might find themselves without reading matter. It might not be wise to furnish them with extracts from Don Quixote or Shakespeare, but the humanities should not be excluded from their education. There was a relevant project in the programme which should be attached to the education chapter.
(73) Further, Unesco applied political and geographical criteria to activities which should be judged only on the basis of cultural criteria. For example, Unesco did not seem to take account, in any of its projects, of the cultural values of the Spanish, Arabic or Germanic groups. Unesco, owing to its very nature, should apply cultural criteria alone. The speaker drew attention to the fact that very interesting cultural activities were going on in America. He was in sympathy with the motion presented by the Union of South Africa for the development of the African continent, and was in favour of better interpenetration of eastern and western cultures. A knowledge of other cultures widened people's horizons. He would therefore advocate the translation into Spanish, under Unesco's auspices, of classical Arabic, Indian, Chinese and Japanese works. Spain would be glad to co-operate in that work.

(74) Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had followed the Commission's debates with great interest. Some of the points put forward were of basic interest and deserved attention. His delegation considered that Unesco propaganda and information should be used only for encouraging a spirit of peace and international understanding and not for stimulating a spirit of aggression. Information was perhaps being abused at the present time with the idea of creating anxiety and eagerness to go to war among the public. Culture should not be placed at the service of any cause other than that of peace. He therefore hoped that support would be given to the resolution put forward to that end by his delegation.

(75) Mr. LOEFFLER (German Federal Republic) joined in the congratulations offered to the Director-General on the clarity and conciseness of the draft programme, which succeeded in emphasizing the essential points and set out the joint work plans so well.
(76) Mr. Löeffler approved the idea of dividing each chapter into two main sections and considered that the Executive Board's report on the remodelling of the future programme deserved close study. He believed that the work of the National Commissions should be made more effective by bringing them more closely into touch with Unesco's activities and with the preparation of the programme, although that should not mean lessening the responsibilities of the Secretariat.

(77) The delegate of the German Federal Republic was keenly interested in the project to provide for co-operation between the Secretariat and intellectual leaders in all Member States to promote the spread of information and foster international understanding.
(78) He further approved the division of the budget estimates into two levels provided that those two levels continued to be regarded as an integrated whole. While a higher priority might be assigned to certain projects, and others suppressed, they should nevertheless be judged as part of a single programme.
(79) The German delegation noted with pleasure that the Secretariat planned to subsidize the three Institutes which Unesco had set up in Germany. The activities of those bodies had assumed considerable importance and they could complement Unesco's programme by making their influence felt beyond the frontiers of the country in which they were established.
(80) Mr. Löeffler congratulated the Director-General on having introduced into the programme certain proposals relating in particular to school education, education for international understanding, and the improvement of school textbooks and teaching materials to further such understanding.
(81) He drew attention to the fact that the appropriate bodies in the German Federal Republic had done a great deal to put Unesco's ideas on education into practice.
(82) Mr. Löeffler concluded by saying that, although his delegation had some criticisms to make on points of detail, it would always try to be constructive in its criticism.

(83) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) emphasized the need to strengthen the Organization's work of co-ordination. He thought that Unesco should try to give greater support to important organizations such as IBE, ICSU and CIPSH. The means at present made available to them were out of keeping with the balance which should exist in the distribution of Unesco's funds.
(84) Unless Unesco gave fuller support to the freest forms of intellectual co-operation, in the light of current requirements, scientists, humanists and sociologists would continue to take less interest than they should in Unesco.
(85) The secretariats of such bodies were in fact working for the very ideas that Unesco stood for. They lacked the funds, however, to carry out effectively work which was indispensable to the Organization's development.
(86) Mr. Photiades was convinced that Unesco should develop on the lines of intellectual rather than of political co operation, since there were other bodies to deal with that angle. Unesco should rely more on those working to raise intellectual standards.
(87) He did not think, however, that that warranted a cut in the funds for the Department of Education. It should be possible to economize on activities deserving a lower priority than that assigned to co-operation between scientists and cultural leaders, who were the backbone of Unesco. Unless Unesco remained true to that principle, the thread of continuity linking all its activities

would be broken, and objectives of a different kind would assert themselves.
(88) In Mr. Photiades' view, the aim should be to make Unesco more universal in its own fields, but without encroaching on the universality of other Specialized Agencies, or on universality as conceived in the sphere of politics.
(89) The Greek delegation thought it desirable for delegates to take more interest in organizations for intellectual co-operation, with the aim of broadening Unesco's whole cultural scope.

(90) Mr. RIEGNER (Conference of International Non-Governmental Organizations having Consultative Arrangements with Unesco) drew the Commission's attention to document 8C/PRG/21, containing the observations made by the non-governmental organizations after a meeting to which they had been invited for consultation by the Director-General.
(91) Mr. Riegner thanked the Director-General for enabling those organizations to meet twice to examine the future programme of Unesco with members of the Secretariat, and expressed the hope that the practice would continue to be adopted in future.
(92) He also wished to convey the satisfaction felt by the non-governmental organizations at seeing that the Director-General and the Executive Board had, in their reports to the General Conference, drawn special attention to the importance they attached to the co-operation of such organizations with Unesco.
(93) Anxious though he was not to encroach on the right of individual organizations to put forward their comments on Unesco's programme, Mr. Reigner pointed out that there was full agreement among those organizations in regard to certain problems raised before the Commission.
(94) The non-governmental organizations had been unanimous in hoping that the General Conference, at its eighth session, would adopt the higher spending level as expressed in the draft appropriation resolution.
(95) The Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations likewise welcomed the emphasis laid in the new programme on projects corresponding to particular needs of certain Member States. It considered, however, that it would be dangerous to stabilize the budget for permanent activities promoting international co-operation on an international scale.
(96) After drawing attention to certain aspects of the above-mentioned document, and particularly to the observations regarding ways of strengthening co-operation between Unesco, its National Commissions and its Secretariat, on the one hand, and the international non-governmental organizations, on the other, Mr. Riegner concluded by assuring the Commission of the devotion of those organizations to the ideals and work of Unesco.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

# FIFTH MEETING

*19 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.2 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56** (continued)

(1) Mr. KOVAL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) felt that in 1955-56 Unesco should begin to implement the recommendations put forward at international conferences in Geneva in 1953 and 1954 on the promotion of fundamental education, the use of the mother tongue in the various countries and free secondary schooling. In that connexion, he referred to the Uruguayan proposal regarding completely free schooling.
(2) Speaking of the natural and social sciences, he was in favour of the measures to provide technical aid, the clearing house for information in the social sciences, and aid to international organizations contributing to the development of scientific co-operation.
(3) The cultural bodies of the Ukraine were ready to take part in preparing a history of the scientific and cultural development of mankind, and in promoting scientific and cultural exchanges.
(4) Mr. Koval was also in favour of the technical and economic assistance requested by the underdeveloped countries from the United Nations. It should not be confined to sending out specialists and giving expert advice. He thought that Unesco's administrative costs should be cut, and that the savings should be devoted to the technical assistance programme.
(5) The Ukrainian delegate hoped that the General Conference would not miss any opportunity of fostering mutual understanding among the peoples and helping to solve the problems of safeguarding international peace and security. His delegation particularly approved the proposals put forward by India with regard to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy and the insertion in the Conference

agenda of the item concerning the possibility of peaceful coexistence for differing systems of government. The delegate added that such peaceful coexistence was a basic principle of the foreign policy of the USSR.
(6) Lastly, Mr. Koval supported the Soviet Union's proposal to prohibit the use of the means of mass communication for spreading war propaganda and imperilling international co-operation and economic and cultural relations between the peoples.

(7) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) drew attention to the clarity and originality of the form in which the proposed programme and budget was presented, and its division into two parts: (1) established service activities of the Secretariat, and (2) programme activities. He added that the division had a practical counterpart in the execution of the programme but thought that it was possibly artificial in one respect, since it was impossible to make a clear-cut distinction between the two phases of Unesco's work - the collection and classification by the Secretariat of material obtained from the Member States, and the use of that material in programme activities. The Lebanese delegate considered that the natural link between the two phases had not been made clear enough.
(8) In that connexion, Mgr Maroun stressed the direct relationship between the development of the permanent service activities and the programme activities; he was uneasy about the possible outcome of certain proposals for the final stabilization of the budget for the permanent services; such a decision, he thought, would result in a sort of petrifaction of services, which should be kept flexible to match the programme.
(9) Referring to Part II of the document, the Lebanese delegate noted the efforts made to balance the various activities in the Unesco programme, but he perceived two rather serious shortcomings. He felt that the purely technical side of the conduct of educational activities received too much attention compared with the content of educational programmes, which he thought regrettably meagre. He remarked that there had been no systematic effort, until the current year, to knit culture into education, of which it was, however, part.
(10) A second shortcoming in Mgr Maroun's view was the unimportant place apparently given in the programme to contacts between intellectuals. Whenever the budget was discussed, many voices were raised against aid to non-governmental organizations. He thought, however, that it was Unesco's duty to foster international co-operation between intellectuals. He considered that delegations should have sufficient courage and understanding not to begrudge cultural activities and international co-operation the appropriations they needed.

(11) Mr. UMREIKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the activities in the programme which he favoured most were those which aimed at developing international understanding, science, national culture and education in all Member States.
(12) With regard to fundamental education and the literacy campaign, the delegate stressed the importance of practical steps to provide schooling for all children in all countries without distinction of race, sex, language, material circumstances or social background, and urged the need for such measures. He favoured the Uruguayan proposal for free schooling at every stage, and regarded it as essential that all children should have the opportunity of primary and, if possible, secondary education.
(13) He had no objection to the budgetary proposals for educational aid to underdeveloped countries in 1955-56. With regard to technical assistance, his Government was not opposed to the expanded programme of technical assistance for economic development. His Government could provide such assistance by sending experts and samples of machinery to the underdeveloped countries and by undertaking to train specialists from those areas.
(14) With regard to the natural sciences, the 1955-56 programme should be directed towards assisting in the scientific study of questions concerned with raising the standard of living and improving social conditions. In that connexion, he was in favour of the scientific study of methods of fighting cancer and also of the draft resolution of the Indian delegation for the peaceful use of atomic energy.
(15) Unesco's work in the social sciences and cultural activities should tend during 1955-56 toward the lessening of international tension, and his delegation would not oppose the allocation of funds to non-governmental organizations genuinely concerned with the spread of science, culture and education.
(16) Mr. Umreiko supported the principle, put forward by the United Kingdom, of basing the 1955-56 budget on the present level, but he might approve certain additional expenditures occasioned by the admission of new members.
(17) He drew particular attention to the part of the programme dealing with mass communication. In his view, the media of communication should be used to promote the ideas of peace, friendship and mutual understanding between nations, together with education, science and culture. Accordingly, his delegation supported the draft resolution of the USSR to prevent the use of such media for war propaganda.

(18) Mr. PAZUR (Czechoslovakia), alluding to the remarks of previous speakers, urged that the programme be organized so as to concentrate to a great extent on a limited number of important items. He considered that education should come first among all Unesco's activities, because the problems arising in connexion with it throughout the world were so vast. He approved the Organization's programme of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries.
(19) He endorsed the ideas expressed by the delegations which had urged that greater emphasis be placed in the programme on the idea of human fellowship and international understanding based on peaceful coexistence, and he referred in particular to India, France and Switzerland.
(20) He would like Unesco to take steps to have that idea suitably incorporated in teaching syllabuses, school textbooks and the work of teachers themselves.

(21) The Czechoslovak delegate also considered that Unesco tended to overlook the international phenomenon of films and books that glamourized crime in every form and exercised a bad influence on the upbringing of children. The harm done was causing grave concern to parents, teachers and even the judicial authorities and the legislatures in many countries. The same considerations applied to the glorification of crimes against international law and the lauding of war criminals. Unesco should see that, in future, education was free of such influences and it could do so only by overruling the Advisory Committee's recommendation for the rejection of India's proposal on peaceful coexistence.
(22) In the hope of seeing the proposal adopted and implemented, the Czechoslovak delegation wished to submit an amendment to the draft resolution of the Indian delegation.

(23) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) was in agreement with the approved principle that, before deciding on the content of the programme, the budget ceiling should be set. Projects logically depended on the financial provision made for them.
(24) In the Director-General's introduction to the proposed programme and budget, it was proposed that the amount of contributions from new Member States for the years 1953-54 should be used for financing the budget for 1957-58. The proposed course of action showed prudence but would retard the impulse to expansion and revitalization which everyone wished to see in Unesco's future work. It would perhaps be possible and, as things were, more appropriate, to use the new revenue in the budget for 1955-56.
(25) Another question requiring consideration was the concentration of the programme. Colombia was perhaps the first country to set forth the need for such action, as early as the Florence session of the General Conference. In view of the wide field covered by Unesco, there were many temptations to disperse its efforts in a multitude of sectors; but a cautious policy should be adopted to ensure that those efforts were concentrated on a limited number of large-scale projects. And those projects should have a close bearing on the objects for which the Organization had been established.
(26) In the detailed debate on the various chapters of the programme, the delegation of Colombia would again speak on other problems of interest to it, such as National Commissions, technical assistance, fundamental education centres, etc.

(27) Mrs. SCHROEDER (Catholic International Union for Social Service) drew attention to a statement in the Director-General's report, in connexion with a resolution of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, that economic development was inseparable from social development. Social service was designed principally to improve family life and could make no progress without the help of economists, doctors, teachers and social welfare workers, all of whom were concerned with educational work.
(28) With regard to the discussion concerning methods of measuring the cultural standards of peoples, what mattered was the number of healthy families and men equipped to cope with life, far more than the number of schools, libraries, etc. For that purpose, an enquiry would have to be carried out in all countries on the standard of family life. Its results would reveal the real standard of living. The Catholic International Union for Social Service was ready to give Unesco the benefit of its experience and all the help in its power in such an investigation, which would suggest what should be done to raise living standards.
(29) Again, Unesco's aims in education should not lead it simply to teaching people to read and write. It was quite as important to help in the training of good fathers, good mothers, good workmen and good citizens.
(30) Non-governmental organizations were nearer to the life of the people, were in a position to accomplish their objectives, and carry out useful work for international co-operation, since they were concerned not with governments but with their citizens. Those organizations had started their work before Unesco had attempted to bring governments together to achieve the objects set it. The financial resources they used in that work were greater than those available to Unesco.
(31) Consequently, the Catholic International Union for Social Service asked that a distinction be drawn between three classes of activities: those directly initiated by Unesco; those undertaken at the request of Member States, and those carried out at the instance of the non-governmental organizations.

(32) Dr. STEINBERG (World Jewish Congress) was grateful for the opportunity given him to express his views to the Commission. It was a great privilege to be in Montevideo as an observer at the General Conference of Unesco, where the believers in its mission were together examining the future work of the Organization. The World Jewish Congress, which he was representing, had the benefit of the views of both believers and critics.
(33) It was the opinion of his organization that Unesco was proceeding steadily, if slowly, towards its goal. It saw in the present draft programme the significance of its main theme, which was education for living in a world community; the whole programme seemed to subordinate itself to that main theme.
(34) He thought, however, that the programme took much for granted and did not appreciate the real world situation. In evaluating that situation, it could be seen that many were strong opponents of the principle of education for living in a world community and, if the General Conference did not take that into account, the programme would not be the best means to the desired end: it would have to cure what it had not succeeded in preventing.
(35) He welcomed the emphasis which the programme put on vital necessities, particularly in the spheres of school curricula and the social sciences; it was essential that people should be educated to meet the situation which faced them. He also welcomed the inclusion of special projects which indicated that Unesco was taking steps to solve fundamental problems.

(36) The World Jewish Congress was co-operating with Unesco in the fields of education, social science and cultural activities and asked permission to comment on the relevant chapters of the programme at a later stage.

(37) The CHAIRMAN summed up the general discussion just held, which, he noted, had been of a very high order.
(38) Paying tribute to the sense of fellowship shown throughout the debate, he urged delegates to make every effort to arouse similar sentiments among all taking part in the Conference.
(39) He also noted the apparently general determination to consider the programme as a whole and hoped that in the subsequent discussions emphasis would also be placed on keeping the programme flexible.
(40) Finally, the Commission had, he thought, shown its desire to base action on the needs of Member States and, wherever necessary, to call on the services of non-governmental organizations. The latter, for their part, were very ready to furnish their assistance in Unesco's work.

**CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD (document 8C/PRG 13) ON THE REMODELLING OF THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF UNESCO**

(41) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board), giving a brief outline of the history of document 8C/PRG/13, said that discussion in November 1953 by the Executive Board on the possible remodelling of the programme had brought to light four points. Disappointment had been expressed that Unesco had not made its expected impact on Member States, on leaders and on the masses, the National Commissions were not doing the work which had been expected of them; more use of regionalism should be made in planning Unesco's programme, and, in the programme, there was too wide a dispersion of effort. In March 1954, the Executive Board had given those points to the Director-General for guidance in drafting the programme for 1955-56 and, at its meeting in Venice in the summer, had set up a small drafting committee which had drafted document 8C/PRG/13. That document had been agreed to in its present form by all the members of the Executive Board with the exception of one.
(42) It was divided into two main parts, the first containing criticisms about what had not been achieved by Unesco and praise of achievements, and the second containing the main matter, the structure of the programme itself. The second part of the document divided the programme into two parts, relating, on the one hand, to general or continuing activities and, on the other, to special activities. Part I of the programme would include activities of interest to all Member States, while Part II would include special activities dealing with specific problems affecting the requirements of individual Member States.
(43) He had heard some delegations expressing anxiety about the position of general activities under the proposed remodelling and pointed out that the Executive Board had stated in paragraph 19 of its report that it considered that the general activities provided the basis of the programme, without which Unesco would be unable to carry out its special activities.
(44) Further, he had heard some delegates say that they did not agree that the major part of the budget should be devoted to Part II of the programme - special activities. In answer to that, he pointed out that, in the past two programmes, the proportion of the budget devoted to general activities and special activities was substantially the same as that proposed for the 1955-56 programme.
(45) With regard to Part II of the programme, the Executive Board had stressed the necessity for concentrating on major projects. That theme had been repeated at every General Conference and, in his opinion, the time had come when a General Conference must give the Director-General guidance on what it meant by concentration.
(46) He drew the attention of the Commission to the concentration of efforts between Agencies when dealing with common problems and hoped that greater co-operation between such Agencies would materialize in the future.
(47) The Board did not like the term "technical aid" because it would be confused with technical assistance. He hoped that a better term would be found. Technical aid would be given to any Member State requesting it. The Board felt that technical aid should be asked for because then it would fulfil the wishes of a particular Member State. The Member State would play its full part and, in doing so, would become interested in the work of Unesco and stimulate the National Commissions in their work.
(48) The Executive Board hoped that the Commission and the General Conference would give the Director-General clear instructions for the preparation of the 1957-58 programme without going into detail, leaving the question of balance between the two parts of the programme to the Director-General to decide in the best interests of the work of Unesco.

(49) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that he had little to add to what had been said in the report of his Committee (document 8C/BUD/2). The Committee wished to express its satisfaction with the spirit in which document 8C/PRG/13 had been drafted and its approval of the proposed modifications.
(50) Two problems on which adequate guidance had to be given to the Director-General appeared to confront the General Conference. In the first place, there was the problem of the structure of the programme and the balance which should be maintained between general activities and special activities. The Committee had felt that it would be harmful to attempt to fix the proportion of the budget to be allocated to each of those categories of activities and had agreed with the Executive Board that the essential interdependence of the permanent services and of the activities concerning direct aid to Member States should not be overlooked.

(51) The second problem was that of concentration, which had been the subject of so much previous discussion. The Committee considered that it was essential to give the Director-General guidance in that matter in order that he could prepare the programme for 1957-58. In particular, it would be necessary to have a decision whether the recommendation of the Executive Board to concentrate on a limited number of major projects aimed at solving specific problems should be followed. The choice of such projects and the definition of methods of implementation were two fundamental questions on which the General Conference would be asked to advise.
(52) The Advisory Committee had recommended that the General Conference should formulate and adopt the necessary measures for implementing the principles contained in document 8C/PRG/13, either through working parties or through the Advisory Committee itself. The procedure, criteria and stages of implementation would have to be established for obtaining a solution of major projects.
(53) He repeated, in concluding, that the General Conference would have to try and provide the Director-General with clear instructions to enable him to draw up specific plans in 1955-56 for remodelling the programme for 1957-58.

(54) The CHAIRMAN suggested the following procedure for the discussion: (1) delegates would be asked for their opinion on the advisability of dividing activities into the two proposed groups; (2) the Commission would determine the criteria on which the division should be based; (3) it would consider the ratio in which each group should stand within the programme as a whole.

(55) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) began by making a general comment: the Swiss delegation was inclined to say that document 8C/PRG/13 did great credit to the Executive Board as it had been constituted to date, but it did not wish to stress that point lest it seem to be desirous of influencing the Conference's decision on a proposal which a majority was apparently already prepared to support.
(56) The delegate of Switzerland considered that the report of the Executive Board owed its value entirely to the fact that it was based on self-examination and self-criticism. The difficulties and disappointments recorded in paragraphs 1 to 6 made paragraph 9, dealing with achievements, stand out all the more, and account should be taken of that in devising satisfactory and well-grounded propaganda. If the document were approved, it would at once furnish the Commission with criteria for its subsequent work; Mr. Barbey thought, however, that it would be better to study it as a whole rather than paragraph by paragraph.

(57) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) expressed satisfaction with document 8C/PRG/13 and gratitude to the Executive Board for having undertaken such a task. His Government was satisfied with the proposed division of programme. He was of opinion that, while general activities of a world-wide nature should receive due consideration, emphasis should be placed on general activities and special activities having a field of limited application. Unesco should act as a catalytic agent, the Director-General making direct contact with the Member States to interest them in Unesco's work.
(58) As to the details of the programme, he thought that, although non-governmental organizations contributed to the success of Unesco, greater emphasis should be put on their truly international character. Certain of the non-governmental organizations which were assisting Unesco had not been heard of by some Member States and should be encouraged to extend their membership and activities on a global basis. Subventions should be kept at a level necessary for carrying out Unesco's work. To further that idea, he was in agreement with the Executive Board that substantial subventions should be given to a limited number of recipients.
(59) He thought that more support should be given to National Commissions and, in that connexion, it would be helpful to have the occasional presence of the heads of departments of the Secretariat at meetings of National Commissions. Further, joint meetings of the National Commissions in a particular area could be held, which would have a greater effect than a meeting of a single National Commission, and would encourage collaboration in Unesco's activities in that area. He did not think that consideration of the geographical distribution of activities was necessary except in the case of problems which were common to all or many Member States. Unesco should be an agency to stimulate and guide the efforts of its Member States.
(60) The internal activities of Unesco should be co-ordinated more closely to give better results. Departments should consult with each other to see that a maximum effort was at the disposal of any project.
(61) It was also essential that States benefiting from technical aid should make their contributions to any project being undertaken. The resources of a beneficiary Member State should be fully explored, not only for reasons of economy, but for psychological reasons. The people of a country receiving aid would show more interest in a project if they felt that they were playing an active part in it.
(62) The Indian delegation considered the report excellent and would like to have it sent to the National Commissions of Member States for comments. In the past, the policy of allowing Member States to submit suggestions on the proposed programme had not been too successful. It would be better if Member States were asked to make suggestions a year before the programme was formulated in order that the Director-General could appreciate the requirements of the various Member States and take them into account when planning the programme. He suggested, therefore, that the report should be forwarded to Member States for comments within a period of six or nine months, with a request that suggestions for the programme for 1957-58 should be made within that period.

(63) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that earlier

Unesco programmes did not deserve all the criticisms heaped upon them. In his view, the disappointments and failures recorded had always been mainly due to the exiguity of Unesco's budget. Unesco's budget, which amounted to less than the cost of ten bombers or one light cruiser, was approximately the same as that of a French department; and, in France, the functions a department was required to fulfil were strictly limited. The French delegate thought that another cause of inefficiency was that policies were too often changed, and activities which failed to show spectacular results were abandoned too soon. In the third place, he thought that responsibility for the Organization's failures also lay partly with the National Commissions.

(64) The French delegation approved the distinction made between general and special activities, provided that the two groups of activities were not completely separated, and that any increase in funds for the latter category automatically brought with it an increase in those for the former.

(65) Quoting the example of the bilateral revision of school textbooks undertaken by France with Germany and the United Kingdom, he pointed out that the success of the work had been due not only to the assistance given by teachers but also, and above all, to the co-operation of historians, which had made it possible to present certain events in their true light. That, he thought, was proof that theorists should be asked to play their part in carrying out practical activities.

(66) With regard to the section of document 8C/PRG/13 dealing with general activities, the French delegate felt obliged to mention that he was uneasy about item E.

(67) He had the impression that public information activities were to be limited to propaganda, whereas what was chiefly needed was education, and the collaboration not only of specialized agencies and scholars but also of educators.

(68) With regard to the special activities, Mr. François thought it difficult to lay down a list in advance; the activities should be chosen as the different chapters of the programme came up for discussion.

(69) Turning to the question of progressive concentration on major projects, the French delegate pointed out that, if too much attention were given to such concentration, Unesco's activities might become set in too unchanging a mould; it was wise to have an eye to the future and to pave the way for subsequent action on the part of the Organization, and, from that point of view, it would be wise to maintain a reasonable variety of activities.

(70) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) proposed the following amendments to document 8C/PRG/13:

(71) Paragraph 19. Add: "Through the investigations and studies they include, they provide material for the preparation of future programmes of action".

(72) Paragraph 20. Add: "and these studies".

(73) Paragraph 23. After E, add: "F. The investigation and study of fresh subjects with a view to the preparation of future programmes of action".

(74) After paragraph 36, add a new section, in the following terms:

"F. Investigations and studies.

If the Organization is to be able to submit to the General Conference well considered proposals for action and to suggest methods for their implementation, worked out in adequate detail, it must carry out investigations and studies of subjects which might later give rise to practical undertakings. The subjects might be suggested by the General Conference, the Executive Board and National Commissions. The methods of study might include:

consultations with international, governmental and non-governmental organizations;

contacts between members of the Secretariat and appropriate persons and institutions;

work carried out by experts under contracts;

finally, at a later stage, meetings of experts to formulate conclusions on the results achieved".

(75) The Brazilian delegate also proposed the following amendment to the report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (document 8C/BUD/2):

Paragraph 12. After the phrase, "for the solution.... future programme", add: "for the purpose of guiding this selection, and enabling the appropriate procedures to be defined, the Secretariat must undertake investigations and studies bearing on fields and problems which are not included in the list of projects in the concentrated programme, but which are necessary for the preparation of future programmes. It is suggested that in the first section of the programme of each department (general activities) explicit mention should continue to be made of investigations and studies. This part of the programme will include for each biennial period a list of subjects from among which the Director-General will select, in consultation with the Executive Board, those on which he will arrange for the departments to concentrate. This part may account for only a small proportion of the budget of each of the programme departments. It is in the light of the results secured from these investigations and studies that the Director-General will subsequently be able to make definite proposals with regard to the programme of the next biennial period".

(76) Mr. Berredo Carneiro explained that his aim in making his proposals was solely to help the Secretariat in planning its future work so that improvisation would be unnecessary.

(77) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) recalled that, as a member of the Executive Board, he had taken part in the drafting of document 8C/PRG/13.

(78) He stressed the importance of the document, which had been approved by his delegation. Speaking as a member of that delegation, he had a few comments to make on the way in which the document should be used.

(79) The first point he wished to make was that the Conference should not forget the need for bold decisions after such dispassionate self-criticism. The Executive Board, for its part, would have greater responsibilities to shoulder in drawing up future programmes, since the most important part of the work, to be carried out with the

co-operation of the Secretariat, would devolve upon it.
(80) In the Italian delegation's view, document 8C/PRG/13 was a starting point; it would therefore be unwise to draw from it any hasty conclusions.
(81) The division of activities into two categories appeared to have its uses, provided that a careful balance were maintained between the two parts of the programme, that their interdependence was clearly shown, and that they were not treated as alternatives. It would also be necessary to define exactly the activities falling into each category.
(82) The Italian delegation also approved the report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. Mr. Veronese, however, stressed that the various stages in the implementation of the proposed projects should not be rushed. He agreed with the Indian delegate that the Conference would have made a considerable advance if it prepared a basis for future work and secured the collaboration of Member States and National Commissions both at national and at regional level.
(83) In addition, the Italian delegation approved the plan for the reorganization of the Secretariat, to which reference had been made, but felt that here again it was advisable not to precipitate matters and that the problem need not be taken up immediately.

(84) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) wished to draw the attention of the Director-General and the Secretariat to a project on which work had been interrupted in January 1954: the Haiti pilot project. He reminded the Commission that ethnologists and sociologists had been sent out to Haiti and that instructors had been trained to give the inhabitants of the Marbial Valley the basic knowledge of which they stood in need, and that some results had been achieved.
(85) The delegate of Haiti regretted that the project was no longer included in Unesco's budget; the Government of Haiti had assumed responsibility for it and was continuing to run the two training centres and the 386 fundamental education centres, but the funds it could devote to the work were very small. The needs, on the other hand, were considerable, as there were large numbers of illiterates in the country, and, in order to save time, the length of the training courses for instructors had been reduced to three months.
(86) The Government of Haiti accordingly hoped that consideration would be given to the possibility of according it some aid, not in the form of money but in that of cinema equipment, films, duplicating machines, and paper for printing books in the vernacular.

(87) The CHAIRMAN remarked that the request of the delegate of Haiti had no bearing on the current discussion, which was concerned with the structure of the future programme, not the examination of the programme for 1955-56. He assured Mr. Faublas, however, that his request would receive the closest attention when the part of the programme to which it referred came up for discussion.

(88) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) expressed his satisfaction with document 8C/PRG/13, a critical review which should be most useful as a guide to policy in the future programme.
(89) He noted that Unesco had concentrated on the preparation of the programme and budget, drawn up in co-operation by the Executive Board and the Secretariat, which had worked as it were centrifugally, moving out from the centre towards Member States.
(90) In his opinion, however, the efforts of the Executive Board and the Secretariat had been able to make little impression on the Member States. Of 72 States, a bare 50 had sent in reports for the Conference. The first need, therefore, was to do something to combat the lack of interest and the laxity on the part of Member States. Unesco was not an entity existing apart from those States; they had themselves engaged in work in the fields of education, science and culture before Unesco had been set up. The Organization's task was to promote collaboration at the international level; in order to do so it needed the help of all its Members; otherwise the programme would be a dead letter. Some States had not yet set up National Commissions and that was a consideration to be borne in mind when future programmes were being drawn up.
(91) Mgr Maroun was convinced that, once Unesco had succeeded in enlisting the efforts of all its Members, funds would not be lacking. As a churchman, he believed that the first thing to do was to establish faith and then material resources would be forthcoming.

(92) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) thought that the General Conference should be guided by two principles in considering the future activities of Unesco, namely, the principle of promoting human dignity and the principle of procuring better international understanding. To achieve those two aims, a list of activities of greatest use to all Member States and to the common good should be compiled.
(93) In the field of education, all Member States had apparently the desire to see an equal opportunity for education given to the citizens of all countries. It was equally important to provide the opportunity of improving the quality of education. That could be one of the general services of Unesco. All countries needed assistance in the fields of adult and fundamental education - not necessarily material assistance, but advice about techniques, materials and general trends.
(94) Another general service should be the popularization of science. Science would dictate the fate of the world and every State must work to channel knowledge in the desired direction.
(95) With regard to cultural activities, he would like to see the spreading of information about unknown or little known cultures, for only through its culture could a country be properly understood. Unesco could play a part in eradicating all kinds of discrimination which existed in every country in the world, by entering into or encouraging international agreements on culture or in the field of social science.

(96) Some countries did not require technical assistance, but, in his opinion, it should be encouraged and promoted in order to link the givers and receivers and facilitate better understanding.
(97) He concluded by saying that he had briefly quoted a few examples of what he considered should be general services of Unesco. If the list were added to, it would be of the greatest assistance to anybody connected with remodelling the programme.

(98) Mr. SIDDIQI (Pakistan) expressed appreciation of the work done by the Executive Board and by the Director-General in preparing the programme for 1955-56.
(99) He drew attention to the matter of technical assistance. He understood that countries concerned in technical assistance were helping to discharge a basic function of Unesco, which was to advance the principle of equality of educational opportunity. That principle was of the utmost importance to Unesco, because, if underdeveloped countries were not helped in that respect, it would be impossible for them to collaborate on an equal footing with other countries. Without equality in the level of education, it would be impossible to establish real world understanding and solidarity.
(100) Efforts devoted to technical assistance were often frustrated by the technical means used to translate ideals into action. It was unfortunate that countries with ancient cultures lagged behind in scientific knowledge. If that were not fully understood by the administrators of technical assistance, frustration manifested itself in unrest and impatience. Solidarity should be promoted in the interests of peace and steps taken to further the principle of educational equality.

(101) Mr. TREJOS DITTEL (Costa Rica) referred to two points brought up by previous speakers concerning the structure of the programme. The first related to the rôle of National Commissions; the second to the general activities described in the Executive Board's Report in document 8C/PRG/13, paragraph 23.
(102) Success or failure in co-operation between the National Commissions and Unesco depended upon the co-ordination of the work of those commissions. Many of them were still by no means fulfilling their real purpose. That situation was due to failure to secure the necessary co-ordination and, for that reason, it was preferable for Unesco to consult them after having worked out its programme instead of asking them to send in their reports beforehand, as some delegates had suggested.
(103) Paragraph 23 E, speaking of general activities, referred to "public information activities on behalf of the objectives of Unesco, particularly in its service of human rights, in the maintenance of peace and the spirit of international co-operation". Teaching should be included amongst those objectives, since the permanent, fundamental work of Unesco was concerned with children of school age. And it should be particularly stressed that such work was called for on a wider basis in Spanish-speaking countries and in Costa Rica itself.
(104) Useful experiments had been made in connexion with education for living in a world community; but they had not been closely enough associated; indeed, in some States, nothing was known of what had been achieved in others. The most praiseworthy of the current projects was the one prepared by the Department of Education, which merited all possible support.
(105) The lack of co-ordination in that respect, like the lack of co-ordination with regard to the functions of National Commissions, resulted in a waste of effort which should be avoided in the interests of Unesco's noble aims.

(106) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) said that his Government had watched the growth of Unesco with great interest and had always tried to persude the General Conference to integrate and co-ordinate projects that would show practical results. It had always considered better international understanding the paramount criterion for any of Unesco's activities. It welcomed, therefore, the sincere approach of the Executive Board in its attempt to remodel the programme.
(107) The proposed programme for general activities should be concise and any subventions granted should go to organizations having a truly international character.
(108) The public information activities should be given new emphasis in the remodelled programme for 1957-58. Up to the present, the efforts of the National Commissions to enlighten public opinion had not been successful. Unesco had failed to reach the intelligentsia or the masses and it was hardly to be hoped that they could be reached on a publicity budget. However, he thought that a valuable group could be reached, namely the middlemen. The middlemen between Unesco and the masses were the college and university professors, directors of museums and theatres etc. and they were the people who were in touch with both the intelligentsia and the masses. A campaign could be undertaken to make known the work and ideals of Unesco, using as campaigners the non-governmental organizations.

(109) Before closing the meeting, the CHAIRMAN requested the Commission's approval of the programme of work he had outlined at the beginning of the discussion on the remodelling of the future programme.

(110) Approved.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

# SIXTH MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.2 OF THE AGENDA CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56** (continued)
(documents 8C/PRG/13, 8C/BUD/2 and 8C/DR/86)

(1) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL opened the meeting with a few general remarks. He was satisfied with the basis on which the division of the programme had been made in the draft budget, as explained in the introduction. He pointed out that general activities were not stable and were liable to change according to resolutions of the General Conference. He would welcome any suggestions in that field. Special activities were defined largely in terms of Conference decisions in a given session. The degree to which the General Conference ought to define special activities for the 1955-56 programme and to ask the Director-General to be specific in his proposals for succeeding programmes was a difficult matter. It was undesirable to leave it completely open, but it was not possible to be very specific.
(2) The years 1957-58 would be transitional ones, as the 1955-56 years were, and it would be unwise to embark on more than one or two major projects, although special projects, the Director-General thought, would to some extent be absorbed by the bigger ones.
(3) He referred to the confusing terms programme, project and campaign, and suggested that a project should be regarded as something precise which could be organized and budgeted for (such as certain activities in Fundamental Education), while a general activity in support of an idea such as human rights could not be fully defined as a project. A great project was clearly not limited to any one of the chapters as they now stood. Member States, he suggested, when submitting a project, should first state the specific field to which it more properly belonged, though there would later be contacts with other departments.

(4) Mr. LEE (United States of America) was in favour of most of the ideas contained in the report on remodelling (document 8C/PRG/13). They pointed the way towards concentration, a balance between continuing and special activities and the acceleration of aid to underdeveloped areas, which his country had always regarded as very desirable.
(5) The report of the Executive Board was a statement of principles. In the light of that report and of the debate held the previous day, the Commission should proceed to formulate practical measures for their implementation. It should provide the Director-General with general guidance for future planning, without imposing any rigidly crippling instructions.
(6) The delegate of the United States of America supported the suggestions made by the Chairman the previous evening that the Advisory Committee should serve as a working group for the Commission, and prepare for it draft statements on (1) criteria for choosing major projects, (2) the balance between permanent and special activities and (3) a directive to serve the Director-General and the Executive Board in their further implementation of the report under consideration, especially in respect of procedure and schedule of timing.
(7) Mr. Lee hoped that the Committee would take note of the various ideas voiced in the Commission about consultation with Member States.

(8) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) strongly supported the position taken by the delegate of the United States of America against any too rigid planning. He considered that not only the next budgetary period but all periods were transitional, and planning needed continual reshaping in the light of experience. He hoped the whole machinery of Unesco would be employed in the process. Non-governmental institutions should be contacted early in order that they might bring their scientific knowledge to bear on any new plans.
(9) He appreciated the words of the Director-General on the meaning of special activities and projects. A division between permanent and special projects would place undesirable fetters on activities that were liable to change. Many special activities would, he hoped, become permanent ones, not spasmodic dashes in this direction or that.

(10) Mr. STANKOVIC (Yugoslavia) preferred to keep the greater part of his remarks for the discussion on the particular items of the programme and budget. He considered, however, that a remodelling of the future programmes was necessary and that the methods for putting the various projects into effect should also be reviewed.
(11) He agreed in principle with the Executive Board's proposal to divide the programme into two sections - general activities and special activities. But the two categories should not be allowed to conflict, they represented a single whole. A fixed allocation of budget expenditure between the two would be artificial and valueless.

(12) Mr. Stankovic thought that the concentration of the programme was a question not purely of finance, but one of substance. Unesco should concentrate its efforts on a few carefully chosen projects.
(13) One of Unesco's main criteria should be the safeguarding of peace through co-operation between the peoples of the world.
(14) With regard to the methods of implementation, the development of the National Commissions would make wider national action possible. The regional work of the National Commissions was especially important, and Mr. Stankovic mentioned, as an example, the good understanding that existed between the Turkish, Greek and Yugoslav National Commissions, which were planning to co-ordinate their activities and collaborate more closely.
(15) On the subject of regionalism, Mr. Stankovic said that the requirements of a concentrated programme did not seem to him to be incompatible with the promotion of regional activities.
(16) He urged that Unesco help the different countries to improve their information services.
(17) As for the non-governmental organizations and the Specialized Agencies, they could render immeasurable service in the execution of complex large-scale projects and could even, in the future, play an active part in the drawing up of Unesco's programme.
(18) Mr. Stankovic submitted these suggestions with a view to helping the Director-General - to whom he paid tribute for what had already been accomplished.

(19) The CHAIRMAN asked the delegations to put forward concrete proposals on: (1) the definition that could be given of the permanent activities and special activities between which Unesco's programme and budget were divided in the Executive Board's report (document 8C/PRG/13); (2) the balance to be established between the two categories, without loss of elasticity to the programme, (3) the criteria by which the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget might select the larger programme projects; (4) the Brazilian proposal on the remodelling of future programmes (document 8C/DR/86); and (5) methods of implementation.
(20) He then suggested closing the general discussion.

(21) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) said that the South African delegation was very glad to note in the Executive Board's report, and in the present debate, a clear recognition of the need for progressive concentration on major projects, a point on which previous General Conferences had laid stress. It was also pleased to see the equally clear recognition by the Advisory Committee of the need for establishing criteria which would enable concentration to be realized. There he suggested that the Commission could with advantage study the criteria for priorities laid down by the Economic and Social Council.
(22) Referring to the Executive Board's plea for an increased budget to enable Unesco to function more effectively, Mr. Widdowson said that, in the opinion of his delegation, the institution of a sound system of priorities and concentration on a limited number of major and productive projects would enable Unesco to carry out its work without an increased budget.

(23) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) wished to emphasize the remarks made the previous day by the delegate of India on the remodelling of the programme. Member States should have every opportunity of proposing projects adapted to the individual needs of each country. As it would not be possible for National Commissions to contribute to any great extent to the framing of Unesco programmes until they were a good deal stronger, Mr. Mendis proposed that the Secretariat, after a careful study of the reports of Member States and after visiting the countries in question, should draw up a document containing specific suggestions about the organization of National Commissions. If regional offices could be set up wherever Member States were prepared to collaborate in that work, they might contribute to the framing of Unesco programmes, and to the better utilization of the limited resources of the Organization.

(24) Mrs. LEGARDA (Philippines) appreciated the remarks made by the Director-General, and by the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, on the remodelling of the programme. The proposed programme and budget, while it left room for improvement, represented the first practical steps towards a reorientation of Unesco's activities. It had been studied very thoroughly by the Advisory Committee and the Executive Board, and she felt that it could now be adopted in toto or with the few minor changes that might still be required.
(25) A realistic appraisal of the disappointments suffered by the Organization was given in document 8C/PRG/13. As a whole, however, the Philippine delegation endorsed the programme and would support it, as well as any further changes that tended towards its streamlining, concentration or improvement in some other form.

(26) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), on a point of order, said that the Commission should avoid any confusion between the work of the working party on decentralization and the work of the Advisory Committee. That procedural problem would be solved if the working party met before the meeting of the Advisory Committee, and if the latter abstained from intervening until it had seen the working party's report.
(27) With regard to the Egyptian delegation's remark on the necessity for consulting Member States on special activities, Mr. Maheu said that that was the Secretariat's idea; what was proposed was not merely to collaborate with Member States, but, in each case, to obtain their agreement before doing anything at all to launch those activities.

(28) The CHAIRMAN then reopened the question of the division of activities into two categories, in accordance with the Executive Board's report.

(29) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that his delegation agreed to the division into general

and special activities, provided that what the Yugoslav delegate had said was accepted.

(30) Supported by the delegates of Egypt, Yugoslavia and Chile, the division of activities into two categories, in accordance with the Executive Board's report, was approved.

(31) Mr. SEDES (France) referred to his previous remarks and submitted the amended text of certain paragraphs of document 8C/PRG/13. He considered that those corrections were in keeping with the spirit at least of paragraphs 13, 18 and 21 of the document.

(32) Paragraphs 62 and 68, thus revised, would read:

"62. Unesco receives many more requests for assistance than it can satisfy, either under its regular programme or under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. However, the Executive Board recommends that, on account of the connexion existing between general activities and special activities, increases in Unesco's budget be proportionally divided between the two types of activity."

"68. In conclusion, the Executive Board's purpose in recommending changes in the structure of the programme is to make it a practical instrument better adapted to the means and ends of the Organization and more responsive to the needs of Member States. It is the Executive Board's hope that the Organization's resources and energies will be equitably distributed between the two types of activity. The special activities provide perhaps the most direct help towards fulfilling the vital needs of Member States, but the general activities are essential to the clear-sighted elaboration of particular undertakings and to their effective implementation."

(33) The PRESIDENT wished to know whether or not the Commission wanted to fix proportions.

(34) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that it was not within the competence of the Commission to amend the Executive Board's report.

(35) Mr. SEDES (France) and Mr. VERONESE (Italy) were in favour of fixing proportions.

(36) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) thought the term proportions was unsuitable, for it was a question not merely of fixing mathematical relations, but of defining two kinds of activity and their connexion, the importance of which had been adequately demonstrated to the Commission. He thought it would be better to define the two categories before fixing proportions, which might be different for each field of activity

(37) Mr. COSTA RIBEIRO (Brazil) thought the French delegation's remarks were well inspired. But the Lebanese delegate's remarks complemented them. It would be absurd to fix a ration once for all; proportions should vary according to the field of activity.

(38) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) remarked that the Advisory Committee had already given its views on the apportionment of funds between the two activities, in document 8C/PUD/2, paragraph 7. It was not possible to speak of a division between special and general activities, before agreement had been reached on the meaning of the two words.

(39) Mr. SIDDIQI (Pakistan) supported the conclusions of the Executive Board mentioned in paragraphs 62 and 68 of document 8C/PRG/13 as well as the comments of the Advisory Committee mentioned by the delegate of Egypt. His country was in favour of stressing special activities.

(40) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) said it was not possible to fix a numerical proportion between general and special activities, but the Commission could express its opinion on the tendency that relation should follow.

(41) He quoted from his speech at the plenary meeting the warning of the Netherlands delegation against exaggerating the importance of special objectives and neglecting general activities.

(42) Technical assistance was a spectacular activity, but it was only possible when general activities were sponsored as they ought to be and, if science were not promoted in the developed countries, underdeveloped countries would not be able to receive the aid they needed.

(43) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) fully supported the remarks of the delegate of Egypt. The terms general and special had not been sufficiently defined for any proportion between the two activities to be fixed. The Netherlands were in favour of general activities, while a number of other countries had spoken for special activities. Perhaps, when the definitions had been made clearer, those opposing trends of thought would be harmonized, and the question of proportions might lose its importance.

(44) Mr. KABIR (India) thought that, although it was not possible to decide on precise proportions, the general feeling of the meeting could be indicated to the Advisory Committee. His country supported the views expressed by the delegate of Pakistan: the accent should be on special activities.

(45) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) proposed that the Advisory Committee be asked to prepare a text for discussion by the Commission.

(46) Mr. CHENG CHI PAO (China) enquired whether the proportion of general activities given in the programme and budget document as 35% and of the special activities as 65% were based on past experience, or represented an assumption for the future. He suggested that the term general should apply to advisory and information services, while the term special covered promotional services.

(47) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) replied that in paragraph 44 of the Introduction to the proposed programme and budget the proportions were given for the 1955-56

programme (32.54% of the funds attributed to general activities and the remainder to special activities). There was also a note on the proportions in past budgetary periods.

(48) Mr. LAUGIER (France) accepted without enthusiasm the division of activities proposed by the Executive Board. In his opinion, it was only admissible if it could be achieved without its having paralysing effects and subsequently a reduction of general activities in favour of special activities.
(49) With reference to the second part of the report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (document 8C/BUD/2, paragraph 7) - "It would therefore be harmful to seek to determine in advance the apportionment of funds between the general aspect and the special aspect of these activities..." - Mr. Laugier entirely endorsed the Advisory Committee's opinion and suggested that the Commission deal with the contents of the programme without binding itself in advance by establishing percentages in the dark.

(50) Mr. AFTALION (Argentina) agreed with the views of the French delegate. The problem was presented in such a way as to remove it from a qualitative to a quantitative basis. A general direction could be set and criteria and priorities laid down, without going further and fixing proportions and budgetary figures.

(51) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) noted the diversity of opinion expressed during the discussion, which made it difficult to take up a position and lay down criteria to be followed in determining the allocation of budget funds. He thought that the proposed programme and budget was drafted clearly. He favoured giving preference to special activities, and agreed with the Executive Board's criterion. It would be preferable to adopt a realistic criterion, without prolonging the discussion on different concepts.

(52) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the Commission that the Executive Board had proposed the division of the programme into general activities and special activities, recommending that the latter receive priority in any apportionment of fresh resources. The Advisory Committee, for its part, in paragraph 7 of its report (Part II), had said that there was no need to fix mathematical proportions in advance.
(53) It seemed that the Commission was roughly divided into two groups: one wanted to decide forthwith for or against the recommendation of the Executive Board; the other wanted to wait until some clearer definition of the two categories of activities had emerged from the discussions. In the first group, the delegations of Pakistan, India, and it seemed, Chile, echoed the view of the Executive Board, whereas France (in its delegate's speech) and the Netherlands were against it. In the second group were Egypt, the United Kingdom, France (in the French delegate's second speech), Lebanon and Brazil. Those last-named delegations preferred to ask the Advisory Committee to define the elements of the problem better and, meanwhile, to proceed to the study of the proposed programme and budget before expressing an opinion on the proportions to be observed between the two categories of activities.
(54) Without wishing to speak on the substance of the debate but intervening on a point of order and at the request of the Chairman, Mr. Maheu thought it would be better to embark at once on the discussion of the proposed programme and budget and to return afterwards to the question of proportions without referring it to the Advisory Committee, which had already, in its report, expressed its view on the matter.

(55) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) endorsed the Assistant Director-General's remarks. It was impossible that the Commission should refer the matter to the Advisory Committee at that stage, as no new result could be produced. It should not be referred to the Committee until a clear directive could be expressed by the Commission.

(56) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed a postponement of the decision until the Advisory Committee had made its report on the matter of definitions and timing.

(57) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the view of the Assistant Director-General. He thought the discussion should be kept open until the Advisory Committee had made its report and until the programme and budget document had been discussed chapter by chapter. The Commission should not bind itself to a decision, or to precluding discussion in the Advisory Committee.

(58) In answer to a suggestion from the CHAIRMAN, who thought that the Commission could refer to the Advisory Committee the study of criteria on which the selection of the larger programme projects would in future be based, Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) said that even that course would be premature. He reminded the Commission that the exchange of views on the reports of the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee had clarified members' minds on many points. He endorsed the Secretariat's suggestion.

(59) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) reminded delegates that the Commission still had to give an opinion on criteria and the methods of implementation, and that the time factor was beginning to come into play. He considered that the Commission could suspend its discussion on that point without taking an immediate decision, and could proceed to study the special reports which had no financial implications.
(60) He also asked the Secretariat to summarize briefly what the terms of reference of the working party on decentralization might be; in that way, lengthy discussions on those terms of reference could be avoided.

(61) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) said that the Commission was tending to become involved in a dogmatic discussion of terms. The delegates had repeated

that it was impossible to take a decision. Italy and Lebanon, in particular, had maintained that point of view, and Mr. Fawzi endorsed it.

(62) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) thought that the Commission should express its wishes to the Director-General, to help him in the establishment of future programmes, but without going into details. Any suggestion of percentages would mean a recasting of the programme, if it referred to the 1955-56 period, and would in any case involve a lot of difficult work. It was not possible to go much further than the Executive Board's proposal did in stating that the greater part of funds should be devoted to special activities. A numerical definition would be harmful to the method of the Conference.

(63) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) supported the delegate of Denmark. The Advisory Committee would report on the subject with reference to the discussion of the 1957-58 programme, not the 1955-56 one.

(64) Mr. KABIR (India) supported the delegate of Denmark. He reminded the meeting that no General Conference could bind a succeeding General Conference by any of its decisions.

(65) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland), referring to Mr. Maheu's suggestion that discussion on the percentages to be fixed for general and special activities should be postponed, submitted a procedural motion in that sense.

(66) The procedural motion was adopted.

(67) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget), having asked what the Commission had decided with regard to referring the matter to his Committee, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), intervening purely on a procedural question, replied that the Advisory Committee had been charged by the Programme and Budget Commission to report on the entire substance of the matter. That would take account of the report of the working party on decentralization, but did not deal with the question of proportions.

(68) The Commission approved that conclusion.

(69) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the competent committee of the Executive Board had spent a lot of time on National Commissions. He hoped to present a resolution shortly.

(70) It was agreed that the working party would cover the other subjects, and to defer the matter of National Commissions until the Executive Board was able to produce its considered views.

(71) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) wished to refer at that stage, on the question of decentralization, to the effects of General Conference meetings outside Paris. He asked whether that subject could be included in the agenda of the working party.

(72) The CHAIRMAN replied that it had already been included.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

# SEVENTH MEETING

*22 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

(1) The CHAIRMAN announced the death of Mr. de Thibault, a member of the Belgian delegation, on 19 November. He expressed the condolences of the Commission to the Belgian delegation, and requested the latter to convey the Commission's sympathy to Mr. de Thibault's family. He asked delegates to observe one minute's silence.

**ITEM 8.4.8 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

(2) The CHAIRMAN asked members of the Commission to proceed to the examination of documents 8C/5 Annex VIII, 8C/3 and 8C/3 Add., and called upon the Director-General.

(3) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that there had been many important developments in the administration of technical assistance during the last year. It was the opinion of the Secretariat that the changes would represent a definite improvement. The most important was the trend towards country planning, which meant that technical assistance would be given to countries according to their desires and needs. Every effort would be made to keep the costs of administration low and to strengthen the scheme through collaboration with other agencies.

(4) The Commission would have to review the technical quality of the programme and recommend to the General Conference the resolutions which should be passed.

(5) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) reminded the Commission that the technical assistance scheme was in its fifth year and had still the full and continuing support of the governments concerned. Seventy-two countries were receiving assistance and the amount spent from the Technical Assistance Fund had risen from $20,000,000 in 1950 to $25,000,000 in 1954. The United States contribution to the fund still remained at about 60% of the total, in spite of the fact that some countries had substantially increased their contributions and new countries were contributing. From the Technical Assistance Fund, Unesco had at its disposal the sum of $2,500,000 for its technical assistance programme in 1954. Up to date, 300 requests for assistance had been received from 48 countries, 44 basic agreements on technical assistance had been signed and 57 projects were under way in 37 countries. Three hundred and fifty experts had been appointed, of whom 140 were in the field, and of 329 fellowships granted, the holders of 82 were still studying, whereas 230 had finished their studies and returned home, where the majority were now employed. $1,500,000 worth of equipment had been supplied and a further $2,700,000 worth would be supplied under the 1955 programme.

(6) Unesco was providing assistance to 44 countries and had five regional programmes, which in 1955 would require, for a minimum programme, the sum of $2,700,000 or, for a maximum programme, $3,200,000. Three hundred and ninety thousand dollars would be required for headquarters administration. In the programme of technical assistance, the proportion spent on education and science would remain the same, approximately two-thirds being spent on education and one-third on the natural sciences.

(7) The programme was divided into six major fields. The technical assistance programme attached the utmost importance to primary and secondary school education. Priority was given to those branches over fundamental education because the regular programme of Unesco took responsibility for fundamental education, and Unesco's campaign for compulsory fundamental education had started bearing fruit.

(18) Unesco was associating in the field of fundamental education in three different ways. It was running centres in 9 countries; it was carrying out campaigns for fundamental education in 9 countries; and it was co-operating in the same work under the overall programme of other United Nations agencies.

(9) With regard to technical education, Unesco was carrying out projects in eight countries under its technical assistance and regular programmes, by helping to reorganize existing educational systems or to establish pilot technical education training centres.

(10) The work of the Technical Assistance Department in the field of science was, of necessity, a continuing work. It consisted of work in the field of scientific and technical documentation and in the field of scientific research. It was proposed to set up four documentation centres in the four main regions of the world in 1955 and to continue work on seven major projects of scientific research.

(11) There were six main characteristics of the programme for scientific teaching. In the first place, the programme would be mainly a continuing one. The reasons for that were not only financial, but followed from the size and nature of the programme envisaged. Secondly, it was a co-ordinated programme, because assistance would be given to carry out the basic activities of the Organization, because it was necessary to mobilize the resources of Unesco as a whole and not only those of a particular department and, finally, because it involved other United Nations agencies. Thirdly, it was a programme with limited and concrete objectives. All the proposed projects had a time-limit for the giving of assistance and, in every project as yet undertaken, the government concerned had made plans for follow-up work on the termination of the period of technical assistance. Fourthly, it was a programme which contained possibilities for evaluation. The problem of evaluation was difficult, as it was not easy to isolate the United Nations investment in a project from the development of the project as a whole, and also the results of a project were often not measurable. However, a rough and ready evaluation of every project had been completed with the assistance of the Department of Social Sciences. The most difficult problem in evaluation was how to introduce an element of objectivity, for which facts and not opinions were required. In order to obtain that objectivity, it had been decided to establish a base line when starting a new project and a control situation for continuing projects. In addition, care was being taken to formulate the type of questions for questionnaires which would furnish facts. All the work on evaluation would be done at no cost. A fifth characteristic of the programme was that each project was to be continued as a training project. The last characteristic was flexibility. The three forms of technical assistance, through experts, equipment and fellowships, were to be flexible in form, allowing for some money to be spent by the recipient country on exchange schemes.

(12) In the past, the procedure for technical assistance had been for countries to request assistance and for Unesco to decide what was to be done with the funds allotted by the Economic and Social Council. New legislation had been passed by the Council to meet the requirements of the new country programme. From 1956 onwards the procedure would be to tell each country a year ahead how much money it would be allocated for the following year. Governments would then decide how the money was to be used. Unesco was firmly and unanimously in support of that new procedure. In addition, beginning in 1956, requests would be approved by a Technical Assistance Committee and by the Economic and Social Council which meant that they would be subject to intergovernmental control. Financial regulations had also been altered. A new technical assistance capital reserve fund was to be founded during 1954, 1955 and 1956, which would ultimately provide greater stability for technical assistance projects. During those three years there would be less money available for technical assistance.

(13) There would also be a change in the local cost of schemes. In the future, 50% of the per diem allowance for experts would be paid by the recipient country direct to the Secretary-General, and the Organization would then be responsible for paying all the allowances and expenses of the expert.
(14) Mr. Adiseshiah paid tribute to all the experts in the field who had devoted themselves to their work. Their quality was proved by the fact that the governments requested the extension of the terms of their service. The machinery of recruitment was also improving, owing mainly to the efforts of the countries making the largest contributions. He felt, however, that experts should not be taken only from donor countries, and that Unesco should try to discover talent and put it to use.
(15) There were some major shortcomings in the programme. In the first place there was the problem of timing. Technical assistance was absolutely useless if not given in proper time. Secondly, there was the problem of adequate planning. It was necessary to see that sufficient time was given to plan a programme. Thirdly, there was the problem of co-ordinating between agencies, between the Departments of Unesco, and co-ordinating the resources of the governments concerned.
(16) With regard to headquarters costs, the sum of $390,000 for 1955 was approximately the same sum as had been required in 1954. The problem of overwork would be serious. The country planning programme would call for a reorganization of the Department at headquarters, and emphasis would be put on the responsibilities which would be given to the four area offices. Headquarters would then be responsible for assisting governments in making plans, in assisting experts, supervising projects, and evaluating them.
(17) Mentioning that three heads of teacher training missions were present at the meeting, Mr. Adiseshiah suggested that the Commission might like to hear their comments on what was being done in their field.

(18) Mr. GARRIDO (Head of the Unesco Mission to Uruguay) said that in February 1952 the Uruguayan Government had asked Unesco to send out a mission to organize a Scientific, Technical and Economic Documentation Centre in Montevideo.
(19) In October 1953 Dr. Garrido had arrived in Montevideo to carry out the project, and the present state of the work was as follows:
(20) With regard to the union catalogue of Uruguayan libraries, 19 volumes listing the books in 46 libraries had been published, and work in connexion with the remaining 20 libraries was in progress.
(21) A catalogue had been issued of scientific, technical and economic reviews published in Uruguay since 1850.
(22) An analytico-bibliographical bulletin, to give other countries information on scientific and technological developments in Uruguay, was being prepared.
(23) The bibliographical service included some hundred bibliographical reviews and a large number of general reference works.
(24) The photographic service was working fully.
(25) The translation service was now fully equipped for functioning.
(26) The Centre was installed in the National Library building, and the equipment sent by Unesco, although it had not all arrived, was on its way. At present four persons were at work, instructing the Uruguayan staff.

(27) Mr. SABAS OLAIZOLA (Head of the Unesco Mission to Ecuador), referring to Unesco project 1504 - Primary and Secondary Education (Teacher Training) - said that it was started in Ecuador in April 1952, with the object of providing advice and assistance in the reorganization and development of teacher training.
(28) The mission, with one expert, began its work in the two Teacher Training Colleges of Quito.
(29) From the start, the authorities and local staff showed a desire for concrete achievements. It was then that the mission evolved a plan to reform the demonstration schools attached to the teacher training colleges, believing that they determined the objectives of the teaching profession, cultural callings, and the scientific means of improving the nation's manhood and its educational policy. That important problem was the central factor in Unesco's work of assistance.
(30) Intensive cultural training was advocated for teachers, but it should be in direct relation to the development of the schools, since the teacher training college was responsible for that work.
(31) In October 1952 modern teaching methods were introduced into the curriculum of the teacher training college.
(32) During the 1952-53 school year, the four reformed attached schools aroused great hopes, and in June 1953 their achievements were considered at a seminar, where the masters who took part in the experiment submitted more than 40 papers. In the following year, modernized schools were organized in remote parts of Ecuador, being started by pupil-teachers.
(33) Later, at the request of the Government, Unesco supplied two science experts for the teacher training colleges.
(34) Two modern science laboratories had been installed in the Quito teacher training colleges; and ten schools attached to the four urban teacher training colleges in Ecuador applied the project of the mission. The latter had been requested by the authorities to extend its activity to rural areas, and would do so when more experts were available.
(35) The mission's permanent aim was the foundation of new teacher training colleges.

(36) Mr. TURNER (Head of the Unesco Mission to Guatemala) said that in 1951 the Guatemalan Government asked for Unesco's co-operation in a programme of training for industrial occupations. In the following year, five technical assistance experts joined the mission.
(37) In 1952 the Committee of Industrial Education of Guatemala was established by presidential decree, with the Technical Assistance Mission acting as adviser to it. The following important developments then took place: (1) A better selection of pupils for the industrial schools; (2) an improvement in education, inspection and direction in industrial schools; (3) the mission and its local

collaborators produced more than 2,000 job and instruction sheets; (4) more than a hundred teachers and inspectors were trained, in groups or individually, (5) nineteen persons studied abroad and attended a camp connected with the mission's work; (6) Unesco supplied educational equipment and material to the value of $27,000; (7) a national plan was approved for clerical and technical training; (8) the number of machine shops in the industrial institute increased considerably.

(38) In August, the Government approved a special credit of 100,000 quetzales to expand the programme in 1955. It requested the mission to remain during 1956 and until the country had completed its programme for training Guatemalan staff. The Government also asked for Unesco's co-operation in the production of industrial training material and in the training of instructors.

(39) The CHAIRMAN felt that, after the statements by Mr. Adiseshiah and the speakers who followed him, he could express the satisfaction felt by everyone in realizing that technical assistance possessed such an effective instrument for the carrying out of its mission.

(40) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that he would be very brief, and hoped that his brevity would reflect the satisfaction of the Advisory Committee with regard to document 8C/5 Annex VIII. At its twenty-sixth meeting, the Advisory Committee had unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"The Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, having considered Annex VIII of the proposed programme and budget, and having taken into account the oral commentary and explanations provided on behalf of the Director-General, commends the document to the General Conference as a useful and lucid summary of Unesco's technical assistance activities, whose main trends appear to the Committee to be satisfactory.

The Committee approves the draft resolutions contained in the report and recommends their adoption by the General Conference, with the slight reservation that the word reduced should be replaced by limited in the preamble to draft resolution 8.52."

(41) The CHAIRMAN said that nineteen members of the Commission had intimated their wish to speak in the general discussion. Recalling that the Commission had already held a discussion on the programme as a whole, he wondered whether it would not be advisable to pass immediately to an examination of the resolutions formulated on pages 5 and 6 of document 8C/5 Annex VIII, allowing delegates every latitude to comment during the discussion. He asked for the Commission's opinion on that point.

(42) Mr. LAUGIER (France) thought that, as technical assistance was one of the main problems with which the United Nations had to deal, it would be a mistake to curtail the general discussion on that point.

(43) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) agreed with the French delegate.

(44) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to vote on the matter.

(45) By 29 votes in favour, 6 against, and 3 abstentions, it was decided to pursue the general discussion.

(46) Mr. LAUGIER (France) recalled that the position adopted by the French Government was entirely favourable to technical assistance, and that it had decided to give it unreserved support.

(47) The French delegate, paying tribute to the country which had taken the initiative in the work, described it as the United Nations' workshop of hope.

(48) Nevertheless, Mr. Laugier wished to make two comments. In the first place, he deprecated the optimism displayed in all the documents relating to technical assistance; it seemed to him exaggerated and out of place. The French delegation had studied the progress of a technical assistance project from the moment it was drawn up to the time when it was put into operation, there had been no fewer than twenty-four international stages in its journey, from the various technical assistance services to the commissions and committees of Unesco's General Conference, then to TAB, TAC, the different United Nations organs, the Co-ordination Committee and finally, it seemed, to new committees set up for the purpose of evaluation. To all those should be added consultations with the various Specialized Agencies.

(49) The French delegate thought that the tentacles of official bureaucracy might thus well paralyse work undertaken, and he was prepared to ask that a new committee be set up for the purpose of simplifying the machinery.

(50) Mr. Laugier also deplored the fact that reports made by technical assistance missions were kept strictly confidential. Distinguished men were enlisted to carry out those missions, which were financed by technical assistance funds, but their work produced no reverberations. In that connexion the French delegate mentioned Sir Charles Darwin's mission to Thailand, the results of which would be well worth publicizing in all quarters concerned with fundamental education. He therefore hoped that the missions' reports would in future be published for Member States, and given wider currency.

(51) In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. LAUGIER (France) said that he did not propose to submit a resolution forthwith on the two points to which he had referred, but that he reserved the right to do so, if necessary, after the general discussion.

(52) Mr. TREJOS DITTEL (Costa Rica) said that his Government had asked Unesco for technical assistance in 1950 to undertake investigations into the educational system and evaluate the work carried out and the results achieved in his country during more than a hundred years of primary teaching, sixty years of it free and compulsory at

the State's expense. In October 1951 the first members of the mission arrived to work on pilot projects for rural and fundamental education, and on a teacher training project.
(53) The rural education pilot project was carried out in two different areas - one in the highlands and the other in the plains. Two technicians with local assistants were in charge of the scheme, which operated in eleven communities in the highlands and in thirteen in the plains. Work on it had started in 1952 and was pursued in co-operation with the ministries concerned and the Committee for Co-operation with Unesco. The result was a series of constructional achievements, such as new wards for the hospital, repairing of water mains, local roads, sanitary installations, etc. The Inter-American Technical Service for Agricultural Co-operation and other organizations in Costa Rica also collaborated.
(54) An intensive campaign was carried through to improve primary education, the number of teachers had risen from 65 in 1952 to 83 in 1953 and, in the last period of 1954 to 102. They were given a series of special preparatory courses at seminars, held under the joint auspices of the Ministry of Education and the technical assistance experts. Thanks to that co-operation, the percentage of pupils promoted had increased from 81% in 1952 to 90.44% in 1953.
(55) The experts had carried out detailed surveys of secondary education and their recommendations were being studied.
(56) The mission had also co-operated, usefully and effectively, in the field of teacher training.

(57) The CHAIRMAN reminded delegates that special projects should be mentioned only in so far as they contributed to the development of the general discussion.

(58) Mr. TREJOS DITTEL (Costa Rica) wished to be extremely brief, but felt nevertheless that he must make some observations with regard to the technical assistance services.
(59) He considered technical assistance to be the most important form of aid that Unesco or any other United Nations organization could give to Member States. At the same time he understood that the service should be carefully planned; its results depended not only on the outcome of specific projects, but on the prestige of the organization providing the service.
(60) It was essential that in that matter Unesco should assemble all the factors essential to success. Missions should be well integrated and experts selected who had a knowledge of the social and cultural surroundings in which they were going to work, etc.
(61) Another aspect of the question to which he wished to draw attention was that of the actual concept of technical assistance. As he saw it, such assistance was not given by Unesco; it constituted action by the governments themselves. The experts in a mission were simply persons collaborating, in each country, with the ministries concerned.
(62) Yet another problem was that of supervising technical assistance missions. Unesco should evolve an effective method of superintending the experts' work, and there the Organization could benefit from the experience of other international bodies such as the Organization of American States, which in certain technical aid projects maintained, apart from the experts, supervisory units in given areas. Unesco would do even better work if it established such units.
(63) Lastly, the Costa Rican delegate considered that the technical assistance services deserved the attention of the Conference; any efforts that could be made to increase the funds ear-marked for them would redound not only to the benefit of Member States, but to the credit of the Organization.

(64) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) said that, during the four to five years for which technical assistance had existed, he had watched the struggle between Unesco and the Economic and Social Council over its scope. He had been glad to see that the Executive Board and the Director-General, when attending the Economic and Social Council meetings, had so strongly supported the idea of extending its scope to include educational and social progress in the field of technical assistance. He hoped that the Director-General would continue his efforts to broaden the interpretation of educational development.
(65) He approved the two trends which were apparent in the programme for 1955-56, namely, the emphasis which was being put on the needs of Member States and on the idea that technical assistance was a two-way process.
(66) He thought that more care should be taken in the selection of experts. Before an expert was appointed, Unesco should ascertain that he was willing to accept the conditions in the country to which he was to be sent, that he had the necessary mental flexibility to accept local conditions of work and that he was willing to stay at least three years. In addition, Unesco should make certain, before granting technical assistance, that the government of the country concerned had made plans for a follow-up programme.
(67) With regard to projects, the technical assistance project in geophysics in Pakistan was now completed and the Pakistan Government was ready to accept foreign students at the observatory in Quetta. Secondly, he had visited some Pakistani students at the Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro, and had concluded that such a centre was extremely useful for making international contacts. More emphasis should be laid on the acceptance of foreign students in national centres.
(68) He concluded by congratulating the Department of Technical Assistance on its splendid achievement, and wished it every success.

(69) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) paid tribute to the experts of the Fundamental Education Project at Minneriya. He drew attention to pages 19 to 21 of document 8C/5 Annex VIII, which dealt with that project. No doubt existed in Ceylon concerning the permanent value of the project. Next year, the Department of Rural Development in Ceylon would take over the Fundamental Education Centre. There was already a

Co-ordinating Committee of Secretaries to ensure continuity.
(70) He had been interested in the remarks made by the delegate of Pakistan that a project should not only be useful to the country concerned but should be used for training purposes for people of other nationalities. The Ceylonese delegation would welcome educators from other countries at Minneriya.

(71) The CHAIRMAN proposed that members of the Commission should collectively express their admiration and gratitude for the work accomplished by the Technical Assistance Department, as described by Mr. Adiseshiah.

(72) Approved.

(73) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) said that, in the opinion of his delegation, Unesco seemed to tackle too many problems at the same time; before embarking on new enterprises, it would perhaps have been wise to concentrate resources and efforts on fundamental education and on primary schooling in town and country. Without losing sight of its aim of creating an intellectual élite in every country, the Organization should before all else enable the masses to approach nearer to that élite.
(74) With regard to technical assistance, the Haitian delegate thought that Unesco's first task was, not to try to satisfy all the demands made upon it by Member States, but to decide which States most needed such assistance.
(75) The Haitian delegation would like to see carried out, in other countries, the same kind of work as had been accomplished in Ecuador and Guatemala.

(76) Mr. RAADI (Iran) agreed with the French delegate on the advisability of simplifying the functioning of technical assistance.
(77) *On the other hand, the Iranian delegate noted* with satisfaction that, in the technical assistance programme for 1955-56, priority had been assigned to primary and secondary education.
(78) He hoped that, in the scientific field, the countries not directly associated with technical assistance projects would be enabled to benefit from the results obtained in other countries.
(79) Mr. Raadi welcomed the news that the technical assistance programme was being rendered more flexible, as his delegation had advocated on more than one occasion.
(80) However, he thought mention should be made of the fact that fellowships were still too few and that, in order to enable their holders to derive the maximum benefit from them, their duration should be extended.
(81) With regard to the preparation of experts, the Iranian delegate agreed with his colleague from Pakistan. He thought, too, that missions should be of longer duration, so as to enable experts to adapt themselves, physically and mentally, to the country in which they had to work.
(82) He also believed that any general adoption of the system whereby the governments shared the expenses of the experts' visit would be unwise, as it might oblige certain countries which were short of funds to refuse the services of experts.

The meeting rose at 1 p. m.

# EIGHTH MEETING

*23 November 1954 at 10 a. m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

(1) The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of delegates to the final report of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation which met in Paris from 25 October to 5 November 1954 (document 8C/DIV/30). He proposed that that document be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, so that the latter might evolve concrete directives and resolutions from it.

(2) Approved.

**ITEM 8.4.8 OF REVISED AGENDA: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE** (continued)

(3) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq), referring to technical assistance projects in Iraq, said that there was need for co-ordination between the agencies involved, to prevent overlapping. A conference had been held of representatives of those agencies together with members of the ministries under whose jurisdiction the work on projects came, and plans had been made to solve the problem of duplication. The conference had also stressed the importance of the national contribution to projects. He felt that Unesco could encourage similar conferences in other countries.
(4) It was the desire of his Government to have further Unesco aid to expand the fundamental education project in Iraq. Up to the present, there was only one fundamental education centre, which was purely regional and did not meet the urgent needs of Iraq as a whole. If Unesco would

help in the training of teachers, another centre could be set up near Baghdad.
(5) Further, in the past, Unesco had confined its technical education work in Iraq to schools. He felt that much could be done, by holding evening classes and by other means, to educate skilled labourers, who were, in most cases, illiterate. There was urgent need in Iraq for such a scheme.
(6) Finally, he drew the attention of the Commission to a new experiment which was being tried out in Iraq, namely, the cultural or vocational unit. Those units were composed of a technical school, a cultural school and a teacher training school. The students lived together in one block and each department had its own building. So far, there was only one such unit in Iraq but, if the experiment were successful, others would be set up. Unesco could give assistance to each of the three schools forming every unit. There was a special need for teachers and technical assistance.

(7) Mrs. RODRIGUEZ (Philippines), speaking of community education, pointed out that the Philippines was an underdeveloped agricultural community with a rural educational system inadequate for modern needs. She emphasized that its Government was willing to co-operate with Unesco to improve its new community school programme.
(8) The Rural-Urban Education Centre, which was formally opened in 1953 at Bayambang with Unesco assistance, had overcome many obstacles and was now doing well. It had certain objectives for which special groups were working, each knowing what it was trying to do. Naturally the project was still in the experimental stage, but, if it was a success, which it showed every sign of being, it was to be hoped that similar projects would be started elsewhere.
(9) In 1952 and 1953 groups of foreign educators had visited the centre, and the Philippine Government hoped that, after the General Conference, some of the delegates might be able to pay the centre a visit.
(10) She concluded by expressing, on behalf of the peoples and Government of the Philippines, gratitude to the Director-General, the Chairman of the Executive Board and to Mr. Secco Ellauri and Mrs. Pecson for their visit to the centre and admiration to Mr. Adiseshiah and his Department for their work.

(11) Mr. CHARYAVIBHAJ (Thailand) expressed his Government's appreciation of the technical assistance which had been given to Thailand. The Government was particularly grateful for the excellent services of the experts engaged on various projects in the country.
(12) With regard to document 8C/5 Annex VIII, he had been impressed by the diversity of the programme undertaken and by the results so far achieved.
(13) He drew the attention of the Secretariat to a misleading statement in the last sentence of paragraph 4 on page 69 of document 8C/5 Annex VIII, which said that the Thailand Government had indicated that assistance to the Chachoengsao project might cease at the end of 1955. The facts were that the project had been planned in two stages (a) for a period from 1951 to 1955 and (b) for a period from 1955 to 1960. The first stage had been intended to be experimental and Unesco was to provide expert advice. The full quota of experts did not arrive in Thailand until 1953. The Government considered that the remaining period for the experimental stage was too short and would like to have it extended. The plan for the second stage had been to sift out the successful educational features from stage one, and incorporate them in schools elsewhere. During that stage, technical assistance would be reduced gradually until the Government had taken over completely. Further assistance would be appreciated.
(14) He was in complete agreement with the delegate of Iran that the length of fellowships should be extended, possibly for two years. He also suggested that regional travel fellowships might be inaugurated for short periods, as he believed that such fellowships would be highly beneficial in the fields of education, science and culture as well as for promoting international understanding.

(15) The CHAIRMAN said that there remained nine speakers on the list for the general discussion. He proposed that, once they had been heard, the Commission should immediately proceed to examine the resolutions appearing in document 8C/5 Annex VIII.

(16) Approved.

(17) Mr. JOHANNES (Indonesia) felt that social and economic development should be preceded or accompanied by educational development and that emphasis should be put on educational development in the programme.
(18) The requests for technical assistance from Indonesia had been mainly concerned with primary and secondary school education up to the present. Now, however, the Government was faced with the problem of too many students wanting a university education and not enough professors to teach them. The Indonesian Government was asking for technical assistance in the field of university education, and hoped that experts could be sent to help with science teaching at that level. It would be necessary to have experts willing to build up departments from scratch, as there were no well equipped laboratories. In order to undertake a programme to better university education in Indonesia, all three types of technical assistance would be required.

(19) The CHAIRMAN reminded delegates that the current discussion was confined to general remarks on document 8C/5 Annex VIII. He asked speakers to deal only with points likely to contribute to that discussion; the particular needs of each country should be put before the Director-General.

(20) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) said that his Government felt that the programme of technical assistance opened wide the door of hope, and was grateful for its share of help
(21) The Government had been disappointed, however, with the size of the allocation it had

received because it had been promised more. He hoped that a similar disappointment would not result from the eighth session of the General Conference. It was impossible for the technical assistance programme to meet all the needs of all countries but it was possible for countries who were in a position to give financial help, to do so.
(22) He welcomed the principle of flexibility envisaged in the new programme, because requests from countries represented their most urgent needs. He also appreciated the move to country planning, which would, he felt, give better results, but could not agree to the policy of supporting continuing projects if it meant that countries entering the field for technical assistance late would be deprived of it. He suggested that a serious evaluation should be made of the results of projects in the various countries and a system of priority set up on the relative needs of countries receiving little technical assistance.
(23) In the interests of stability, the proposed Working Capital Fund was a good idea, but, if the programme for technical assistance were to be curtailed for the three years during which the Fund was accumulating, more than three years of progress would be lost. A delay in starting a programme of education for three years would mean that three age groups would receive inadequate or even bad education. He suggested that a scheme to finance technical assistance might be elaborated which would meet the requirements of stability and at the same time avoid delaying programmes.
(24) Jordan was satisfied with the two Unesco experts, who exerted themselves untiringly in the interests not only of Jordan but also of Unesco.

(25) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) was of the opinion that too many projects started with experts and ended in reports. Reports might be excellent but they were doomed to oblivion, either because the experts applied statistical methods which were not applicable to the country in which they were working, or because the reports were impossible to implement. For that reason he had been pleased to read in document 8C/5 Annex VIII that the primary effort of Unesco was to be the development of human resources. After reading that statement, however, he had been puzzled to see, from the table on page 11 of the document, that the costs for experts were to go up in 1955 and the costs for fellowships and equipment were to be reduced, and asked for an explanation of that apparent contradiction.
(26) He did not propose moving for changes in the programme, but suggested that, in applying the 1955 programme, the principle of flexibility outlined on page 8 of the document should be adhered to, that Unesco should emphasize to all experts that their primary task was one of training for leadership and, for future programmes under country planning, that Unesco should advise countries to move the balance away from experts.
(27) He concluded by saying that his remarks about experts under technical assistance were equally true when applied to experts under the normal programme of Unesco.

(28) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) said that, even if the work done under technical assistance did not measure up to the needs of countries, it was nevertheless impressive. He pointed out that, in 1953, there were requests for technical assistance amounting to $43,000,000, whereas only half of that amount had been collected from Member States. The great problem at present was to raise enough money for the technical assistance programme. He thought that the problem of financing was not insoluble. The Swedish Government was of the opinion that technical assistance was important morally in the field of international solidarity and that the moral importance exceeded the importance of the money. He suggested that National Commissions should do all in their power to arouse public opinion in their own countries and appeal for funds from private sources.
(29) From the point of view of the underdeveloped countries, it was essential that as much as possible of the money available was spent on projects and that the share that went to administration should be as small as possible. If the administration was inefficient, the money would be badly or uneconomically used. It was therefore important to spend sufficient on administration to ensure an efficient service. He agreed, however, with the delegate of France that the exorbitant administration of the total technical assistance programme was a serious obstacle to progress.
(30) He shared the general feeling in favour of the new system of basing the distribution of funds on the requirements of countries requesting assistance, and thought that decisions whether to grant aid should be based primarily on the urgency of the project to the country concerned. In his opinion, however, assistance should not be spread out thinly.
(31) He approved the policy of greater co-ordination at all levels and thought that better results would be obtained if Unesco supported only well co-ordinated projects. He reminded the Commission that the scheme for technical assistance was still flexible and that it was important not to let it become rigid.
(32) The Swedish Government was aware that multilateral assistance through the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies had definite advantages for the receiving countries. Bilateral agreements were however of great value to the donor country and supplemented assistance given on a multilateral basis. He felt that bilateral agreements helped to promote a two-way traffic in assistance. He stressed that the Swedish Government did not prefer bilateral agreements to multilateral ones.
(33) Summarizing the points which the Swedish Government thought important, he said that Unesco should attempt to secure a stable financial basis for technical assistance programmes, that under the country programme the criteria of urgency and practicability should be applied, that the administration should be efficient and the number of committees and boards dealing with technical assistance be reduced and, finally, that the programme should be considered not as expanded but as expanding.

(34) Mr. MUJEEB (India) welcomed the emphasis on the phrase mobilize the resources in connexion

with the work of Unesco, United Nations Agencies and the Member States.
(35) The trend towards international co-operation would be of great value. By putting the responsibility of choice on governments, projects would be strengthened. In view of those factors, the Indian Government would be gratified if the higher budget level were adopted by the General Conference.
(36) The change in emphasis to primary and secondary school education was a natural development which showed the success of the technical assistance programme. There had been a gradual adjustment of the programme to meet new requirements.
(37) He hoped that attention would be paid to the amounts of money given for purchasing equipment, to the delays in supplying equipment, and to the selection of experts, so that a better distribution would be achieved.
(38) Further, Unesco had freedom of action with regard to technical assistance in cases of emergency, and he suggested that advantage be taken of previous experience in dealing with such emergencies.
(39) He emphasized two aspects of the policy of flexibility. In the first place, there should be no rigidity in the selecting of experts, and experts should be given a chance of working in their own countries. Secondly, fellowships should be granted to students for study in their own countries.

(40) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) associated himself with the general opinion on the importance of the technical assistance programme and welcomed the trends outlined in document 8C/5 Annex VIII, particularly the trend towards country programmes.
(41) He agreed, however, with the delegate of France that the document showed unreal optimism. The general tone of the document suggested that nothing was wrong, but that was obviously not so. All Unesco documents were publicity documents, whether intentionally or not. He suggested to the Secretariat that it would be helpful to have a more reasoned appraisal of the type of problems facing technical assistance workers, and of possible methods of solving them.
(42) He did not entirely agree with the delegate of France about the publication of reports. He could not agree to the publication of confidential reports. He suggested that the Technical Assistance Department should assemble material and write descriptions of projects without giving details or names, and publish a handbook on the problems in the field. Such a handbook would be interesting and valuable in attracting the interest of potential experts. This suggestion might be taken up by the Secretariat in the future.

(43) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) recalled that Unesco's basic efforts were directed towards the development of human resources through education and science. In that respect, technical assistance had up to the present time had three means at its disposal for making progress in developed and underdeveloped countries: experts, fellowships, and the supply of teams.
(44) According to the reports presented, governments had chiefly requested assistance for the training of teachers, the application of modern teaching methods, fundamental education, the training of rural teachers, agricultural training, and research centres; furthermore, somewhat exceptionally, the Government of Guatemala had requested aid for technical and industrial training; aid had also been applied for in connexion with the development of arid zones and deserts.
(45) A properly prepared teaching staff and special teaching methods were fundamental to the task for which Unesco was responsible, because without teachers the masses could not be educated.
(46) Mrs. Pinto de Vidal also considered that the appeal for aid for the training of rural teachers was opportune; in her country, a teacher training institute had been set up, and 120 rural clubs for children had been organized - similarly to what was being done in the United States of America.
(47) It was fundamental that requests should be made for agricultural training experts. The speaker stressed, in that connexion, that Unesco had worked in collaboration with FAO.
(48) She pointed out, indeed, the need for Unesco to work in collaboration with other Specialized Agencies of the United Nations, and referred to the two specialized centres - ASFEC and CREFAL. These two international centres were created in pursuance of a resolution adopted by the General Conference at its sixth session. The former, the Arab States Fundamental Education Centre, was set up in January 1953. CREFAL devoted its attention to remote rural zones or poverty-stricken areas - like those parts of Uruguay known as rancherîos (ranching areas) - where it was necessary to rehabilitate the population.
(49) She recalled that in her country education was free, secular and compulsory; that explained why Uruguay had, in that respect, received little help from Unesco. Education should however be extended, as illiterates still existed in Uruguay. The Minister of Education had formed a Literacy Commission which had carried out censuses in a ranching area, in an agricultural area and in the seventh section of the Department of Montevideo.
(50) Lastly, the speaker wished to refer to women and their very special place in society as mothers and wives. In her view, women should receive training in how to face so great a responsibility, and Unesco should encourage governments to pay due attention to the education of women, so that they might be taught the essentials of domestic science, the bringing up of children, hygiene and maternity. If women were trained in that way, humanity could count it a blessing.

(51) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) apologized for his late arrival in Montevideo and said that he felt it his duty to speak at the present meeting of the Commission, although he had not heard preceding speakers.
(52) He felt that it would be impossible for Unesco to implement the Charter of Human Rights when two-thirds of the peoples of the world had not the basic facilities for education. It was urgent that the people for whom the Charter was to be implemented should be rescued from their plight.

(53) In his opinion, the programme should be very flexible, the question of priorities should be flexible and technical assistance in terms of experts, fellowships and equipment should be adapted to the needs of each country.
(54) He did not criticize document 8C/5 Annex VIII, but thought it should be used as a yardstick to measure the different programmes in the different areas.
(55) Technical assistance was very important in Liberia, where 90% of the population was illiterate and there, as in most underdeveloped countries, Unesco was judged by the success or failure of the projects undertaken in the country. For that reason he approved the policy of country programmes.
(56) In conclusion, he regretted that the teacher training programme had been placed in category 2. In his opinion it should be in category 1.

(57) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) stressed his conviction that technical assistance was one of the spheres in which Unesco could carry out its work with regard to underdeveloped countries most effectively.
(58) When the programme of technical assistance was initiated, Member States had to be shown what it was. At that moment relatively few requests were submitted by Member States; but later the applications for technical assistance had increased to such an extent that they had exceeded Unesco's capacities, either in funds or in available experts. That was a problem to which he wished to draw attention, so that the Commission might give its assent to any proposal calculated to help in solving it.
(59) He wished to emphasize a particularly remarkable achievement in the field of fundamental education, closely linked with Unesco's action - the Educational Radio of Sutatenza. Clearly, in underdeveloped countries like Colombia, the fundamental education of the adult rural population raised grave problems. Neither the State nor individual co-operative efforts could meet the needs of adult rural education in countries of wide geographical extent, especially in areas very remote from urban centres; that was one of Latin America's great problems. The activities of the Radio School at Sutatenza were being developed as a short-term solution to those difficulties.

They had made peasants wish to improve themselves by becoming literate and acquiring general culture, as well as engaging in healthy distractions. Approximately 300,000 peasants in 283 parishes were taking part in the scheme, which was organized through 8,000 radio schools in 12 Departments, in 3 municipalities and in the State of Trujillo in Venezuela.
(60) Every possible kind of teaching material had been distributed to the radio schools. Special publications had been issued, such as the reading and writing primer, the only one of its kind in the world. Single-wave radio sets to the number of 5,000 had been acquired, at a cost of 135,000 Colombian pesos. In addition, Acción Cultural Popular (Popular Cultural Action) in Sutatenza was erecting a building to accommodate workshops, storerooms and depositories. Electronic material was being imported from the United States of America to the value of $500,000. A contract had been signed with the firm of Philips in Holland for the acquisition of 10,000 radio receivers to a value of $178,000; and 4,000 extra radio batteries had been imported at a cost of $54,000. A Unesco House was also being built in Sutatenza so that technicians might be lodged there.
(61) The delegate of Colombia said that both his Government and Popular Cultural Action at Sutatenza wished to receive fellowship holders from other countries, whether through Unesco technical assistance or despatched by their respective countries, or again by arrangement with cultural organizations or the ministries of education concerned.

(62) The CHAIRMAN declared the general discussion on document 8C/5 Annex VIII closed. He asked the Commission to take a decision on the resolutions appearing on pages 5 and 6 of the document, examining them by groups and beginning with resolution A, items 8 to 8.11.

Resolution A. Items 8 to 8.11

(63) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) did not doubt that there was justice in the criticism voiced by the delegates of France and the United Kingdom but he felt that it was a minor criticism. The United States Government considered technical assistance of the utmost importance. He moved the adoption of the resolution.

(64) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) was in favour of items 8 to 8.11 being adopted. He was however dissatisfied with the text of the second paragraph in 8. "Noting with satisfaction ... in certain regions", for he felt that it implied, as already pointed out by the delegates of France and the United Kingdom, undue optimism. He was certain that technical assistance would contribute to improving the living conditions in many countries, but doubted whether it had so far achieved the results implied in the text. He hoped that the criticisms put forward by the delegates of France and the United Kingdom would lead to a remodelling of the paragraph in question.

(65) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) considered that, in order to increase the number of experts dealing with technical assistance, their status and remuneration should be standardized. On the last point he underlined the danger of asking contributing countries to cover a share of the experts' visiting expenses, and wondered whether the text of the resolution should not mention that problem.

(66) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) hoped that his remarks had not been taken as criticism of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. It was a good programme, which would be carried out with a share of the imperfection to be found in all programmes. He agreed that his remarks were of small importance. They had been suggested to improve the reports.
(67) He supported the United States proposal.

(68) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) also supported the motion put forward by the delegate of the United States of America.
(69) He considered that the optimism in the text of resolution A, item 8, should not be over-criticized, for Unesco was a young organization and a certain amount of optimism must therefore be permitted it; otherwise its work might be compromised.

(70) The CHAIRMAN having asked him whether he maintained his point of view, Mgr MAROUN said that he did not wish to reject the proposed text formally; it gave, however, too great an impression that appreciable results had already been obtained, which could hardly be the case since technical assistance had only been in existence for three or four years.

(71) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) pointed out that the paragraph in question concerned not Unesco but the expanded technical assistance programme of the United Nations.

(72) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) withdrew his proposal.

(73) The CHAIRMAN proposed the adoption of resolution A, items 8 to 8.11.

(74) Adopted.

Resolution A. Item 8.12

(75) Adopted without discussion.

Resolution A. Item 8.13

(76) Mr. LAUGIER (France) said that the French delegation would continue to urge that social progress and economic development be placed on an equal footing, and that the former should not be considered simply as a consequence of the latter.
(77) In agreement with the delegate of Pakistan, he opposed the principle whereby social progress was to be taken into account only in so far as it could contribute to economic development; he deplored the fact that certain social projects had been rejected by technical assistance as not calculated to promote economic progress.
(78) He therefore proposed that in the text of item 8.13 the part of the sentence reading "for the economic development of underdeveloped countries, paying due attention to questions of a social nature which directly condition economic development" should be replaced by: "for the economic development and social progress of underdeveloped countries.

(79) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) said that the French delegate's remarks accorded with certain observations made by the Executive Board concerning the social aspect of economic development projects, particularly in relation to technical assistance.
(80) He seconded Mr. Laugier's proposal.
(81) The amendment was supported by the delegate of Liberia.

(82) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) also supported the French proposal. He thought that man, considered either as an individual or collectively, was the central element and that the economic factor ought therefore to be subordinated to higher social interests, and not man to the economic factor.

(83) Mr. AFTALION (Argentina) said that, in order to evaluate the technical assistance programme, it was necessary, as the French delegate had said, to bear in mind its origins - the technical assistance programme of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Unesco was associated in the development of that programme, it being understood that Unesco would be connected with the activities which were specifically recommended to it. When working out the technical assistance campaign, the Economic and Social Council had classified countries on an economico-social basis, and according to quantitative criteria. In fact, on the economico-social as on the quantitative plane, statistics of national income, production, trade, taxes etc. clearly reflected the various countries' stages of development. But thence a conclusion was usually drawn which was far less clear, viz. that the economically and socially more developed countries, which in theory provided economic and social assistance, must also be the most highly developed culturally. That conclusion was far from clear, because in the cultural field, while certain countries might be quantitatively less developed in the sense that they had a lower literacy percentage or a smaller number of universities, it could not be concluded, a priori, that such countries were qualitatively less developed.
(84) From a number of observations made by delegates, it would seem that the success of certain concrete assistance activities had been prejudiced because the experts had failed to adapt themselves to the conditions of the recipient country. That might be due to the fact that it had been sought to inject cultural standards, rather as a living organism was injected.
(85) The Argentine Republic had the greatest respect for the philosophical, political, legal and economic concepts of all nations. Naturally it had its own political, legal, economic and social concepts, which were found in the national doctrine expounded by President Perón. But, just as Argentina did not admit of intrusions into its own sphere of influence, it recognized the sovereign right of other peoples to have their own ideals, and thus respected all philosophies.
(86) For those reasons, the Argentine delegation would welcome the inclusion, in the draft resolution under consideration, of a passage to the effect that technical assistance should take due account of national characteristics, avoiding any cultural grafting foreign to the country involved.
(87) In addition, through general or special activities undertaken on Unesco's initiative, a better knowledge of the culture of underdeveloped countries should be promoted, so that it should be known that, from many points of view, so-called assisted countries could and must become

countries which, in their turn, gave assistance.

(88) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) asked whether, if the resolution were adopted, technical assistance under the United Nations system would be qualified.

(89) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) explained that the language in item 8.13 was exactly the same as that of the Economic and Social Council, which had asked Unesco for co-operation. The Executive Board had discussed the request of the Economic and Social Council, and had asked the Director-General and the Department of Technical Assistance to bring the matter to the notice of the General Conference.
(90) The amendment proposed by the delegate of France was acceptable to the Director-General without disqualifying the technical assistance under the United Nations system.
(91) He referred the delegate of Argentina to the fourth paragraph of item 8, which referred to resolution 222 of the Economic and Social Council. That reference covered the point made by the Argentine delegate.

(92) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on item 8.13, with the amendment proposed by the delegate of France.

(93) Adopted, by 41 votes in favour and 2 against.

Resolution A. Items 8.2 to 8.23

(94) The CHAIRMAN proposed that, at the beginning of item 8.2, the French word prie should be replaced by invite.

(95) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) thought it more suitable to leave, in the Spanish version of the draft resolution, the word pide (requests) instead of invita (invites), since pide (requests) had a mandatory sense, which, in that instance, should be conveyed.
(96) In item 8.21, where it said "To submit to the Executive Board", the following addition should be made: "and to the Governments of Member States". Otherwise, Member States would only learn about the application of the programme and its results every two years, on the occasion of the General Conference.

(97) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) observed that, if the term pide (requests) were changed to invita (invites), it would be necessary to say, in the Spanish text, a presentar, a transmitis, instead of que presente, que transmita.

(98) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) agreed with the amendment proposed by the Spanish delegate.
(99) In addition, he considered that in item 8.21 the text should read: "To submit to the Executive Board and to Member States the reports" etc.
(100) The reports which most interested Member States were those dealing with areas where given programmes were being carred out. He would be interested to know, for example, what work was being done in Latin America.

(101) The CHAIRMAN said that the suggestion by the delegates of Spain, Colombia and Chile would be communicated to the Drafting Committee.

(102) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) did not think it necessary to add to the text of the resolution that reports should be communicated directly to Member States. As the Executive Board was in the future to consist of representatives of those States, its members would be expected to communicate reports submitted to them to their governments.

(103) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) pointed out that the Executive Board was charged by the General Conference to look after the programme. He asked whether the Commission was authorizing the Executive Board to continue its responsibility. If that were the case, he suggested that the words "and to circulate to Member States" should be added after the words "to submit to the Executive Board" in item 8.21. He pointed out that, if that were adopted, the cost of publications would be substantially increased.

(104) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) considered that the sending of special reports to Member States on technical assistance activity raised a serious problem. He thought it would be difficult, between sessions of the General Conference, to prepare certain documents for the Executive Board and others for Member States. Documents submitted to the Executive Board were usually communicated to Member States for information; furthermore, the Director-General prepared a report every year on Unesco's activities, in which technical assistance was covered. Mgr Maroun therefore thought that the request put forward by the delegate of Chile was not justified.

(105) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) said that, as the Executive Board would consist in future of representatives of governments, it was not enough that only the States represented on it should receive that information officially. For that reason he supported the proposal that information should also be sent to all the other Member States.

(106) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) seconded the proposal put forward by the delegate of Mexico.

(107) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to vote on the text of resolution A, items 8.2 to 8.23, with the addition of "and to distribute to Member States" after "to submit to the Executive Board".

(108) Adopted by 29 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

Resolution B. Items 8.3 to 8.43

(109) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) having requested information as to the distribution of experts by nationality, Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) stated that he would find that

information in document 8C/5 Annex VIII, Addendum I.

(110) The CHAIRMAN submitted items 8.3 to 8.43 to the Commission for approval.

(111) Adopted.

Resolution C. Items 8.5 to 8.512

(112) Mr. LAUGIER (France), repeating what he had said with regard to item 8.13, asked that, in item 8.5, social phenomena should be mentioned alongside economic objectives. The Drafting Committee could have discretion to alter the text.

(113) The CHAIRMAN thought that the Commission, as it had already agreed to the alteration in principle, would have no objection to raise.

(114) In reply to a question raised by Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon), regarding the safeguarding of the rights and privileges of experts mentioned in item 8.511, the CHAIRMAN thought he could assure the Lebanese delegate that experts seconded to technical assistance services would lose none of their rights.

(115) Items 8.5 to 8.512 were adopted.

Resolution D. Items 8.52 to 8.524

(116) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) drew the attention of the Commission to the word reduced in the introduction to Resolution D and suggested that it should be replaced by the word limited.

(117) That proposal was seconded by the delegates of Iran and France and was adopted by the Commission.

(118) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) noted that item 8.523 read as follows: "To employ on the project counterpart staff who have completed their fellowship and scholarship courses..." She complained that in the Spanish text the same word, becas, was used for both fellowships and scholarships.

(119) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) supported the Uruguayan delegate's observation. He thought that, although Mr. Adiseshiah's report seemed satisfactory, the Spanish draft left much to be desired and hoped that that would be remedied in the future.

(120) The CHAIRMAN said that the errors in the Spanish text would be studied by the Drafting Committee. The latter would be asked to revise the Spanish text of the resolutions with particular care.

(121) He called for a vote on resolution D.

(122) Adopted.

(123) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on resolutions A-D as a whole.

(124) Adopted by 37 votes i. favour.

**CONSIDERATION OF TWO DRAFT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED BY THE FRENCH DELEGATION**

(125) The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider a draft resolution presented by the French delegation in the following terms:

"The General Conference,

Convinced that the reports of technical assistance missions, frequently evolved and drafted by distinguished persons, contain information and suggestions which might be of value to a large number of Member States,

Invites the Director-General, after securing the agreement of the Member State in which the mission was carried out, to arrange for the publication and dissemination of all items in reports which are of a general interest extending beyond the State concerned".

(126) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) remarked that the resolution had received the attention of the Director-General. Referring to the remarks which had been made about one report, he said that the Director-General had written to the Minister of Education in Thailand, who refused with regret to allow its publication. The Secretariat planned in the future to take sections of those reports and, after permission from the government concerned, to publish them in pamphlet form. The Director-General welcomed the resolution.

(127) The resolution of the French delegate was supported by the delegates of Lebanon and the United Kingdom.

(128) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) considered that the French draft resolution should be considered point by point. He agreed with Mr. Adiseshiah that publication of the reports of missions working in certain Member States might be extremely inconvenient for the States concerned. Indiscretions might arise from the publication of such texts.

(129) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the text of the resolution once more.

(130) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) replied that, under the resolution, no action would be taken by the Secretariat until the reclassification process had been completed.

(131) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) was uncertain of the exact scope of the French expression en accord, but said he would like the Spanish text to be more explicit and contain the expression "previo acuerdo o autorizacion del Estado interesado."

(132) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) proposed, in view of the preceding remarks, that no formal resolution be passed and that the matter should be left to the Department of Technical Assistance for action in light of the discussions which had taken place.

(133) Mr. CHARYAVIBHAJ (Thailand) supported the United Kingdom proposal.

(134) The CHAIRMAN thought he should not withdraw the draft resolution from the Commission. Its text seemed to him reasonable; it met the wishes of a certain number of delegates, and of the Secretariat itself.
(135) He called for a vote on it.

(136) The resolution was adopted by 31 votes in favour with 3 abstentions.

(137) The CHAIRMAN then submitted a second draft resolution presented by the French delegation, as follows:

"The General Conference,

Desiring to ensure a maximum return from the funds devoted to technical assistance,

Perturbed by the number of channels through which, successively or simultaneously, the study and administration of technical assistance projects of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies are passing,

Invites the Director-General:

(1) To propose to the higher authorities of the United Nations, on every feasible occasion at joint meetings, that all measures calculated to expedite procedures for study and action, and to reduce the percentage of administrative expenditure in technical assistance services, be examined and implemented in the shortest possible space of time;

(2) To endeavour, so far as Unesco is concerned, to stabilize and if possible reduce the administrative expenditure involved in technical assistance;

(3) To report to the next General Conference on the progress made in this connexion".

(138) Mr. ADISESHIAH, speaking on behalf of the Director-General, remarked, in connexion with the procedure for technical assistance, that at present a Member State drew up a year's programme and forwarded it to the Technical Assistance Board for approval. Under the French proposal the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, a committee independent of the technical assistance programme, was to be asked to give advice. That seemed unpractical.
(139) In connexion with stability and the reduction of administrative costs, only $390,000 from the total budget would be used for administration. That amounted to about 12% of the total budget. He warned the Commission that the expanded programme activities were already being subsidized from the regular programme. Unfortunately the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had not had time to examine Headquarters' costs, but the Department of Technical Assistance was running at minimum cost.

(140) He requested the delegate of France not to press his resolution and gave his assurance that, if the resolution were withdrawn, the Department of Technical Assistance would take into account what had been said during the debate.

(141) Mr. LAUGIER (France), having heard Mr. Adiseshiah's arguments, and in order to meet the point with regard to efficiency, withdrew his draft resolution. He felt, however, that the discussions to which the matter had given rise had not been fruitless, and that a current of opinion in favour of curbing bureaucratic procedures had been created.

(142) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) drew the attention of the Commission to three reports, brought to the General Conference by three delegations, which described projects being undertaken in their countries. He thought that it was a good policy to encourage governments to publish the results of projects.
(143) He further drew attention to the invitations which had been extended by the delegates of Pakistan, Philippines and Ceylon to foreign experts to visit projects in their countries.
(144) He had noted that the Commission would like future reports to contain information concerning the failures of Unesco in technical assistance. He pointed out that the document on the programme and budget could not emphasize failures and that document 8C/5 Annex VIII had been designed for the Technical Assistance Board and the Technical Assistance Committee. However, he would bear in mind the wishes of the Commission and include a section which would tone down the optimism of those documents.
(145) Secondly, he noted the wish of the Commission that experts should concentrate on training activities.
(146) He assured the delegate of Thailand that his Government's request for further technical assistance had been accepted by the Director-General.
(147) He would take note of the remarks made by delegates concerning flexibility in the field of technical assistance.
(148) He concluded by saying that in 1955 there would be 200 experts and 800 counterpart staff in the field. It had been said two weeks ago of the pilot projects in Bolivia: "our children are being trained to know what Bolivia wants and what the world wants". That was a good omen for Unesco. A further quotation might reflect the aims of technical assistance: "We look to the programme for telescoping into a decade what other countries have had centuries to do".

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

# NINTH MEETING

*24 November 1954 at 3 p. m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.3 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: REPORT TO THE GENERAL CONFERENCE ON THE MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT LEVEL AND ON THE PROVISIONAL BUDGET FIGURE FOR 1955 AND 1956 (Documents 8C/5 Corr., 8C/BUD/1, 8C/DR/71, 8C/DR/91 and 8C/DR/92, 8C/DIV/105 Corr., 8C/ADM/31 and 32 Add., and 8C/ADM/33)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN called on the representative of the Executive Board to give the Board's recommendation on the budget proposed by the Director-General in 8C/5 Corrigendum.

(2) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) informed the Commission that the Executive Board strongly supported the higher budgetary level.

(3) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to the Draft Appropriation Resolution in document 8C/5 Corr. page 3. Certain changes, he pointed out, would be made if the recommendations of the Administrative Commission, which were to be dealt with next in the order of business, were accepted.

(4) Mr. ERIKSSON (Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission) presented document 8C/ADM/32, the first interim report of the Administrative Commission on matters relating to the ceiling of the budget for 1955-56. Points 1 and 3 had been adopted by the Plenary Conference that morning. It remained for the Commission to fill in the figures of point 2, Methods of financing the budget.

(5) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that the General Conference, in plenary meeting, had approved paragraphs 1 and 2 of document 8C/ADM/33, dealing respectively with the scale of contributions and the methods of financing the budget. The Programme and Budget Commission, therefore, had only to fill in the blanks in paragraph 2 of the document, and first of all to fix a provisional figure for the maximum assessment level for the two-year period 1955-56. A draft resolution on that subject had been prepared by the delegations of Brazil, Egypt, France and Japan. The Chairman therefore requested the delegate of Brazil to comment on the proposals contained therein.

(6) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) explained that the draft resolution in question was to be found in document 8C/DR/91 with an amendment in document 8C/DR/92. Its aim was to fix a provisional figure of $20,000,000 as the maximum total assessment on Member States for the financial years 1955 and 1956. With the adjustments that would have to be made to allow for other possible sources of income (miscellaneous revenue and assessments on new Member States), the gross budget level would reach $21,617,830; then, after subtraction of the sum of $1,012,000, corresponding to contributions unlikely to be received, the final figure would be $20,605,830.

(7) Mr. Berredo Carneiro emphasized the fact that, if the proposal were adopted, the contributions of Member States would, in most cases, be lower than those which they had paid in 1953-54. For instance, the United Kingdom's contribution would be reduced by $395,000. On the other hand, it was true that the United States' contribution would rise from $5,999,400 to $6,000,000, and that there would be an increase of some $600 each in the contributions of the following States, as compared with the 1953-54 figures: Cambodia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Monaco and Nicaragua.

(8) Although Mr. Berredo Carneiro disliked the idea of asking any more of the ten small countries he had just mentioned, he pointed out that the proposal in document 8C/DR/92 was already the result of a compromise, and strongly urged the Commission not to fix at less than $20,000,000 the figure which the Conference would be invited to consider as the total assessment level for the financial period 1955-56.

(9) In reply to a question from Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN explained that the draft resolution submitted jointly by Brazil, Egypt, France and Japan (document 8C/DR/92) should be regarded as an amendment to the proposals submitted by the Director-General, with the approval of the Executive Board.

(10) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) introduced an amendment to document 8C/DR/71, submitted by the United Kingdom, as follows:

"The General Conference,

Recognizing the need for the most effective and economic use of Unesco's resources;

Recognizing that accession of new Member States does not of itself justify an expansion of Unesco's activities;

Taking note of the statement of the seventh session of the General Conference working party on future programme and development that 'Unesco's growth does not depend entirely on increasing the budget';

Instructs the Programme and Budget Commission

(a) To examine the whole programme presented

to the Conference by the Director-General on the assumption of a budget for 1955-56 equivalent to the 'present budgetary spending level' as proposed by the Director-General in document 8C/5 Corrigendum; to which may be added

(b) The additional cost of holding the ninth session of the General Conference at New Delhi; and

(c) The cost of the use of Russian as a working language at the ninth session of the General Conference; and

(d) To report accordingly.

| Explanatory Note | |
|---|---|
| Present Budgetary Spending Level | $17,575,854 |
| Cost of New Delhi & Russian Language | 500,000 |
| Total Spending Level | 18,075,854 |
| Assessment Level | 17,324,236 |
| Total Appropriation | 18,942,066" |

(11) The United Kingdom, Sir Ben Bowen Thomas explained, had been confirmed, by all the discussions that had taken place on the budget, in its view that Unesco had a prescribed but essential function, the counterpart of which lay in the activities of Member States, acting officially and through voluntary organizations, both nationally and internationally. To base policy upon an increasing number of international bodies growing in size and power showed a wrong diagnosis of the needs of Member States, from which direct action was required. The accession of new Member States, and the effective return of old ones, did not justify an immoderate expansion in the work of the Organization. A level of expenditure could not be based upon a windfall.

(12) Sir Ben Bowen Thomas pointed out that the amendment he was proposing authorized the Director-General to spend, in 1955-56, $18,075,854, which was about a million dollars more than he had been allowed in 1953-54. As a result of the acceptance by the Plenary Conference of the recommendations of the Administrative Commission on how to finance the budget, the provision of that sum meant a total appropriation of $18,942,066, but, thanks to the availability of the surpluses contained in the recommendations of the Administrative Commission, the call on Member States for the next two years would only be $17,324,236.

(13) The well being of the world, Sir Ben Bowen Thomas concluded, ought not to be identified with the continuing expansion of an international organization. More money should be spent directly by Member States on an education system and cultural activities tending to attune their peoples to international understanding, and Unesco should be helped to grow in strength within its limited expert field, by concentration on tasks proper to it. The United Kingdom resolution provided the funds necessary for its efficiency during the next two years.

(14) The delegates of Canada and Austria seconded the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(15) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) firmly supported the United Kingdom proposal. The arguments presented in its favour were sound, and in conformity with the Organization's best interests. His Government went further, believing that it should even be possible to reduce the present budgetary spending level, and still have adequate resources. He suggested economies that would not impair the efficiency of the programme: (1) with regard to the travel allocation, in many cases observers could be replaced by the despatch of conference records. (2) It should be possible to reduce expenditure on contracts, and avoid duplication with other organizations.

(16) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the question of staff travel was to be discussed in detail at a later stage. But, he pointed out, if more response were to be given to the needs of Member States, more travel for consultation would obviously be necessary. Staff travel was less costly than the setting up of regional offices. With regard to contracts, the main increase in those was at the higher budgetary level, for the purpose of increasing technical aid to Member States by sending out experts to help them in technical aid projects.

(17) Mr. ARSENAULT (Canada) considered that, in the present state of affairs, any increase in Unesco's budget might be prejudicial. Unesco was going through a phase of reorganization. Not only was it giving its activities a new slant, but it had decided to change the structure of its Executive Board and to provide its Secretariat with a new building. It would therefore have to go through a transitional stage, during which any further extension of its activities - and the resultant untimely swelling of the budget - might be perilous. Although the speaker was well aware of the urgency of the problems Unesco was asked to help solve, he believed that it should concentrate on following up the decisions it had already taken with a view to remodelling the programme, before thinking of extending the scope of its activities by means of a larger budget.

(18) Mr. Arsenault also pointed out that many Member States were carrying on activities at home which, being as generous in their aims as Unesco's own activities, cost them a considerable amount of money.

(19) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) had found two trends in all the meetings on budget ceilings he had attended: one based on the belief that Unesco must expand and therefore obtain larger contributions from Member States; the other on the conviction that contributions should be adjusted to the internal economy, resources and obligations of Member States. Mr. Sharif believed there was a third way, which could reconcile the demands of the programme with the limitations of Member States. He was greatly impressed by the arguments of the Head of the United Kingdom delegation, particularly his emphasis on the need for national economy and national obligations, although he did not agree with the specific resolution moved by him. He pointed out that in view of the accession of new Member States it would be possible to develop the programme without straining the resources of Member States. His Government was opposed to any ceiling which might increase the existing contributions of Member States, and would strongly favour relief in the existing scale of contributions. The delegate of

Pakistan therefore suggested a compromise over the ceiling suggested by the delegate of the United Kingdom and by the delegates of Brazil, France and Japan and expressed the hope that the Conference would adopt a suitable compromise.

(20) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) was happy to take part in submitting the resolution presented by the delegate of Brazil on behalf of that country, France, Japan and Egypt (documents 8C/DR/91 and 92). It was the result of the deliberation of a number of States and it presented a very reasonable compromise with the proposal of the Director-General and the Executive Board. The honour of putting it forward had been distributed geographically to extend over the whole world.

(21) He mentioned the following points in support of the motion. Firstly, since the number of Member States of Unesco had increased over the past few years, it was only reasonable that the budget should increase. Secondly, no Member State would suffer any considerable increase in its contribution; some, like the United Kingdom, were offered a reduction. A small increase in a budget devoted to peace would be a very encouraging sign in the present state of world affairs. He appealed to the meeting to take a broad view of the issue and reaffirmed that the amendment proposed by the four States was a very reasonable one.

(22) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) was in favour of the United Kingdom proposal. He believed that both the budgets and activities of the Specialized Agencies should be closely co-ordinated with those of the United Nations. It would therefore appear inopportune to make plans for a substantial increase in Unesco's budget, just at a time when the General Assembly of the United Nations had cut that Organization's budget by more than a million dollars.

(23) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) had listened attentively to the remarks of the delegate of the Union of South Africa concerning the need to cut down certain administrative costs which were too high. However, he disagreed with the South African representative in thinking that such cuts should provide an opportunity to reduce Unesco's income. Income should not be reduced; on the contrary, additional funds should be made available for the implementation of the basic projects in Unesco's programme.

(24) The Mexican delegation was against the United Kingdom amendment and would vote for the amendment proposed by Brazil and other delegations. It would also oppose any suggestion to reduce estimated income; thus it would also vote against any proposal to cut down Unesco's activities.

(25) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) had advocated concentration and economy at all past Conferences, but the situation had changed. New members had entered Unesco. It was possible to enlarge the former budget, but not to the extent proposed in the four-State amendment. The delegate of Norway accordingly moved the following amendment (document 8C/DR/101) to the United Kingdom proposal:

(26) "Proposal submitted by the delegation of Norway to amend draft resolution 71.

Replace paragraphs (a) and (b) of the draft resolution by the following text:

(a) To examine the whole programme presented to the Conference by the Director-General on the assumption of a budget for 1955-56 equivalent to the 'present budgetary spending level' as proposed by the Director-General in document 8C/5 Corrigendum; to which may be added subject to a maximum appropriation of $20,000,000:

(1) The additional cost of holding the ninth session of the General Conference at New Delhi;

(2) The cost of the use of Russian as a working language at the ninth session of the General Conference;

(3) The cost of such additional items as may be agreed by the General Conference to merit priority; and

(b) To report accordingly.

Explanatory Note:

On the basis approved by the Administrative Commission:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Appropriation | $ 20,000,000 |
| Assessment Level | 18,382,170 |
| Spending Level | 19,080,891 |

(1953-54 Spending Level: $17,056,964)

(27) The proposal was supported by the delegates of Thailand, the United States of America and Greece.

(28) Mr. LAUGIER (France) felt bound to defend energetically the joint proposal submitted by his delegation and those of Brazil, Egypt and Japan. It seemed impossible to him that fortunate, strong and wealthy States should want to take advantage of the admission of new Member States to have their own contributions reduced. As stated in document 8C/DR/91, the admission of those new States would mean additional expenditure for Unesco. Every country could certainly develop those national services whose aim it was to promote education, science and culture; but the most important thing, in the fields of education, science and culture, was to awaken a true spirit of international brotherhood, and that task no country could accomplish alone. It therefore fell to Unesco to undertake it. The Organization's principal aim should be to enable the large countries to give the less privileged nations the help they so badly needed. The defence budgets of the different Member States of Unesco together totalled $100,000,000,000. The proposal under consideration aimed at obtaining from Member States the $20,000,000 that several delegations deemed necessary in order to carry out a programme worthy of Unesco and of the generous minds in which it had been conceived some years ago. It would be discouraging indeed if that proposal were rejected.

(29) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) assured the delegate of Brazil, who had referred to the increased contributions of some small countries, that they would be welcomed by his own, not as a sacrifice, but as a token of its appreciation of the Organization's aims and objectives. He added that on pages 246-8 of the draft programme and budget it was seen that 40% of the total budget was

spent on establishment posts and administration, whereas only 15% of the increase in the higher level budget would be spent in that way. Therefore the services Unesco would render Member States amounted to 85% of the $2,000,000 increase envisaged.

(30) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) explained his country's position, which had been the same as that taken by the Norwegian delegation. The Netherlands had approached Unesco with some reserve at first, but after study of Unesco's work it considered that the Organization was developing normally and that new contributions should be used to finance that natural growth. He therefore supported the four-State amendment.

(31) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) welcomed the opposite points of view that had been expressed, and felt that countries like his own appreciated the point of view of the Director-General better than those like the United Kingdom, who were not in such great need of help from the Organization.
(32) The United Kingdom delegate had suggested that the well being of the world should not be identified with the expansion of an international organization. But Unesco was a catalytic agent. The Ministers of Finance in Member States had been influenced by the ideals presented by Unesco. Not much more was being asked of Member States now. The delegate of India was very happy to hear the assurance of the delegate of Jordan in that respect.
(33) Reference had also been made to the changed rôle of the Executive Board, but the speaker was convinced that the new Board would continue to take the same view of its responsibility to the General Conference as in the past, even if it varied in its responsibility to Member States.
(34) The delegate of India thought that the Conference should not be too precise in fixing the items to be reduced and increased, but, referring to the remarks made by the delegate of the Union of South Africa on staff travel, he said the recent trip of the Director-General with the Chairman of the Executive Board had been of great assistance to Member States in getting to know the Organization. Replying to a remark of the French delegate, he thought reference to military budgets should be avoided.
(35) He concluded by saying that, in relation to the total population of the world, the proposed budget at the higher level would cost 1.05 cents per head.
(36) The Indian delegation supported the four-State amendment to the Director-General's original proposal without hesitation.

(37) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) announced that, although he had at first been inclined to support the proposal of the Director-General and the Executive Board, he was thenceforth prepared to accept the proposal in document 8C/DR/92, fixing the maximum assessment level at $20,000,000.

(38) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) repeated the general position of his delegation. It had first proposed that the budget should be kept at the 1953-54 level, around $18,000,000. It did not consider the accession of new members a reason for a higher budget, but, since the remodelling of the programme for the 1955-56 period was now envisaged, it had changed its view, and would support an increase, but only a moderate one, since any increase would be an imposition on the smaller countries and would have repercussions on the other United Nations Agencies.
(39) The United States of America took a middle of the road position. It would vote against any budget below $18,000,000 and therefore against the United Kingdom proposal. It would abstain on $18,000,000, it would support any increase up to and including $20,000,000 and therefore supported the proposal of the delegation of Norway and, failing that, the four-State proposal. And it would oppose any proposal of over $20,000,000.

(40) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) said that, in 1952, governments in favour of the lower budget ceiling had informed the Conference that their instructions were due to financial stringency in their countries. Sir Ben Bowen Thomas had announced the willingness of his government, when the world situation improved, to increase its contribution. The situation had improved, the contribution of those countries had decreased, some smaller countries were required - and were ready - to pay more, a remodelled programme had been worked out, and still the Conference was faced by those unwilling countries. The delegate of Liberia was flabbergasted. His Government, he concluded, fully supported the four-State proposal.

(41) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) could not understand the proposal, which had been made at the time when the present session of the General Conference was being prepared, that the contributions of new Member States should be used to reduce the contributions of other Member States. He thought it logical that advantage should be taken of the new contributions to improve certain of Unesco's activities, such as technical aid, scientific co-operation, etc.
(42) At a previous meeting, the Colombian delegation had disagreed with a proposal of the Director-General that he be given authority to invest those new contributions until the beginning of the two-year period 1957-58. The speaker would not maintain his opposition, because the proposal at present under discussion, presented by Brazil and other delegations, was a proposal likely to give fresh impulse to Unesco's activities.
(43) Mr. Bernal Jimenez pointed out to the United States delegation that the fixing of the amount of contributions was closely connected with the change in the structure of the Executive Board; therefore, those who seconded the United States proposal would wish the United States delegation to follow their lead in dealing with the problem of the use to be made of the contributions of new Member States.
(44) The Colombian delegate would vote against any proposal to stabilize the budget at its present level, for he believed it essential for Unesco to grow if it were not to become paralysed; in other words, it should be a dynamic, and not a static, organization.

(45) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece), like the United States delegate, was ready to accept any figure not less than $18,000,000 and not more than $20,000,000. In that connexion, he remarked that it should be possible for Unesco to cut down its expenditure to some extent by further improving its administrative methods and delegating certain tasks to the international non-governmental organizations best able to carry them out successfully.

(46) Although Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) was ready to vote for the proposal in document 8C/DR/92, it was not because his country would be one of the first to benefit from an increase in Unesco's budget. In his opinion, however, the generosity displayed by certain Member States towards the people in their charge should continue to be shown by Unesco itself. Only an international organization like Unesco could ensure that all the poorer countries benefited from the aid of the more privileged. The sum mentioned in document 8C/DR/92 was certainly not too large, if Unesco were to accomplish that task successfully.

(47) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) announced that she would vote for the Brazilian proposal. A small country like Uruguay had faith in Unesco and placed hope in its activities. The worst thing that could happen would be for Unesco to be left without sufficient money to carry out its task. Member States should not apply the brakes to Unesco's work for economic reasons. If such countries were obliged to go to war because they had stopped Unesco's cultural and pacific activities, it would cost them far more, especially in human lives, which were a country's most valuable possession.

(48) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq) said that, as long as there were underdeveloped countries, the views expressed by the meeting would continue, as at previous Conferences, to diverge. He supported the amendment submitted by the four States in favour of the higher budget ceiling.

(49) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) wished to reply to some of the remarks made during the debate. If, as the Canadian delegate had said, the programme for 1955-56 was a transitional one, only partly reflecting the recommendations made by the Executive Board with a view to a complete remodelling of Unesco's programme, the corresponding budget ought to be relatively large. Before venturing in new directions, Unesco would have to start by completing projects which it intended eventually to abandon, and that would entail heavy expenditure.
(50) In reply to the delegate of Belgium, Mr. Haguiwara pointed out that Unesco's budgetary situation was somewhat different from that of the United Nations, which did not have to supply direct technical aid out of its own budget, since the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance did not come under the United Nations budget.
(51) In conclusion, Mr. Haguiwara drew the Commission's attention to the last paragraph of document 8C/PRG/13 (Remodelling of the future programme of Unesco), which read:

"Now that, after early trials and experiments, the direction of Unesco's future activities can be more clearly discerned, the attention of governments should be drawn to the desirability of increasing the budget of the Organization so that it can carry out more effectively, more rapidly and on a wider scale the task which the peoples of the world have the right to expect of it."

(52) After a brief discussion on the procedure to be followed in voting on the various proposals that had just been discussed, the Commission authorized the Chairman to put the proposals to the vote in the following order:

United Kingdom proposal (document 8C/DR/71 amended);

Norwegian proposal (document 8C/DR/101);

Joint proposal of Brazil, Egypt, France and Japan (documents 8C/DR/91 and 8C/DR/92);

Proposal of the Director-General, approved by the Executive Board.

(53) Put to the vote, the United Kingdom proposal was rejected by 36 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.

(54) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) then asked if he might warn the Commission of the dangers of the Norwegian proposal. He urged the Commission once again not to approve any figure lower than the $20,000,000 advocated in document 8C/DR/92, and he paid tribute to the small countries, which had refrained from opposing the Brazilian proposal, despite the additional burden its adoption would impose upon them.

(55) The Norwegian proposal was next put to the vote and rejected by 36 votes to 24, with 1 abstention.

(56) The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the joint proposal submitted by Brazil, Egypt, France and Japan.

(57) That proposal was adopted by 41 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions.

(58) The CHAIRMAN stated that the figures resulting from the adoption of the joint proposal would be inserted in document 8C/ADM/33, where blank spaces had been left. He then invited the Commission to approve document 8C/ADM/33.

(59) Document 8C/ADM/33 was approved.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

# TENTH MEETING

*25 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET, CHAPTER BY CHAPTER, AND EXAMINATION OF SPECIAL REPORTS**

(1) The CHAIRMAN indicated the method he intended to follow in examining the programme: the document would be studied section by section, project by project, and resolution by resolution; whenever a new item came up for discussion, he would invite the representatives of the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget to speak, and would then call upon the delegates who had put down their names to speak on the subject. Finally, he would give the Director-General's representative an opportunity of replying to the observations made.

**ITEM 8.4:1: EDUCATION**

(2) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had strongly recommended approval of the programme and budget as drafted. It had given considerable thought to the section under discussion and had agreed to recommend its adoption to the General Conference. She would give the comments of the Executive Board on the individual application of the principles of co-operation, collaboration or consultation at the relevant stages of the discussion.

(3) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) paid tribute to the effort of concentration referred to in paragraph 55 of the Introduction which seemed to have influenced the text, the organization of services in the Secretariat and the programme of work, alike.
(4) He considered, however, that something still remained to be done and that some of the proposed activities were still unco-ordinated and inadequate. In his view, the International Bureau of Education might give the Secretariat useful help, especially if it were granted financial aid.
(5) With regard to the extension of education, Mgr Maroun advocated work in two directions: (1) development of the system of regional conferences; (2) increased aid to countries requesting Unesco's help in planning their educational systems.

(6) Mrs. HALINA (Poland) explained the views of her delegation with regard to certain educational problems which it considered to be particularly important: fundamental education, adult education, women's education, free and compulsory education.
(7) As Poland had instituted compulsory education and had established many schools for adults, it had scarcely any experience of fundamental education. She believed, however, that the funds allocated to that type of activity should be increased, particularly for the training of qualified staff. She hoped that the new Members admitted would bring the Organization not only increased resources, but the benefit of their experience in that field.
(8) The resolutions dealing with adult education would receive the support of the Polish delegation, which hoped that particular attention would be given to raising the standard of education among women, and that the press, films and other mass communication media would be used in education.
(9) The Polish delegation shared the views of the Uruguayan delegation on the need for making primary education compulsory, and education at all levels free (document 8C/DR/40). She considered that, if her country had been able to bear the cost of such a reform, despite the burdens imposed on it by reconstruction, countries under a less severe handicap should be able to solve the problem considerably more easily.
(10) Another resolution presented by the Uruguayan delegation (document 8C/DR/53), dealing with the payment of adolescents during apprenticeship, also seemed to her to be reasonable.
(11) In the view of the Polish delegation, the training of teachers was a major problem. The new feature to be introduced into the annual education conferences at Geneva, i.e. the exchange of views between educationists of all countries, seemed likely to help in improving the teaching profession. But she considered that the efforts of teachers would be successful only if the whole of society helped to build up a spirit of peace and international understanding.
(12) The Polish delegate hoped that Unesco would not be content to include substantial appropriations for education in its own budget but would endeavour to induce Member States to devote a steadily increasing proportion of their own funds to education, science and culture. Lastly, it seemed to her that the Organization's mission in the educational field was to promote contacts between educationists in all countries and to make education serve the cause of peace and understanding among the peoples.

(13) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that he had been unable to study the document under consideration in sufficient detail.
(14) He thought it would have been well for the Commission to set up a working party to present a

brief study of the various chapters, so that in considering the document, which was the most important item on the Conference agenda, reference could have been made to a systematic and detailed evaluation of the subjects, ideas and measures proposed. He understood, however, that there were certain technical difficulties which had prevented the adoption of that procedure. Although he considered that the Commission should not become involved in academic discussion, he thought it important to mention certain ideas which had a bearing on education.

(15) He agreed that priority should be given to the extension of primary education and to the development of fundamental education. But he thought that pre-school education had not received sufficient attention. There seemed to be some reluctance to give pre-school education a place in the initial stage of the ordinary educational system. He considered that pre-school education should also be included in the free education system which all Unesco's Member States were advised to adopt.

(16) Many of the difficulties encountered in the discussion of educational problems arose, he thought, from the use of terms which made the normal exchange of ideas difficult. Although that did not happen in the case of primary, pre-school and technical and vocational education, it did occur in connexion with secondary education. It was of very great importance that in future Unesco programmes, and at the regional Conferences mentioned by the Lebanese delegate, some standardized terminology should be worked out, and at least a rought definition evolved of certain ambiguous concepts which had given rise to concern and usually fruitless argument in educational matters. With regard to secondary education, for example, the terms "middle" or "intermediate" education were used, without any real emphasis on the specific differences between secondary and primary education. He thought that attention should later be turned to a special study of secondary education, regarded as a nodal point in the educational system as a whole, connecting up with all its different branches: marking the end of primary education, leading on to university education, dovetailing in with technical and vocational education.

(17) The delegate of Chile considered that education for all should be the first principle of primary education so that it should remain democratic. He felt that, while European countries had already instituted general compulsory education, for the great bulk of the population in the Latin American countries, for example, and in other continents, the problem of primary education should be considered in conjunction with that of providing education for all, designed to train good citizens and skilled workers.

(18) His purpose in making such general observations was to help in clarifying those problems for future Unesco programmes and any regional conferences that might be held.

(19) In reply to the remarks of the delegate of Chile, Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) stated that, in accordance with Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure, document 8C/5 had been sent to Member States by air on 28 June. As the Conference had started work on 12 November, the time limits had been observed.

(20) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) mentioned that the French National Commission had always taken a very lively interest in the work of the Education Department, and paid tribute to the efforts of Mr. Beeby and Mr. Elvin, who had, in turn, been the Head of the Department.

(21) He regretted that he was unable, on behalf of his delegation, to approve the proposed programme for the Department of Education.

(22) The disappearance of the Division of Education for International Understanding had surprised the French delegation most. The activities of that division were supposed to be taken over by other services in the same department, which, in carrying out their work, were to bear in mind the need for international understanding. Mr. François thought that, if it were split up in that way, the section of the programme would lose its point and cease to have any force. He drew the Commission's attention to various questions.

(23) Paragraph 163 ended with the sentence: "Finally, a special responsibility falls on Unesco and on Member States with regard to the orientation of school curricula towards the objective of international co-operation". In the French text, the term "en outre" seemed unfortunate, as one of Unesco's prime obligations was involved. He thought the English text better drafted.

(24) Consideration of heading 1.2 showed that the proposed appropriations for education for international understanding under the heading: "Pre-School and School Education" had been substantially reduced in comparison with earlier years. For 1955, they represented 30% of the total; for 1956 they had been reduced to 24%.

(25) Under the higher budgetary level, education for international understanding accounted for 7% for 1955 and 7% for 1956.

(26) The total appropriations proposed for international understanding under the heading of pre-school and school education amounted to 17% for 1955 and 12% for 1956.

(27) The delegate of France, however, considered that the new budget ceiling should make it possible to consider further projects.

(28) Mention was also made of international understanding in the paragraphs dealing with co-operation with youth organizations (page 45). But the appropriations for that division had been reduced by 20%.

(29) Certain practical activities had been stopped short. Studies had been undertaken with the object of discovering means of promoting international understanding in the different branches of teaching: history, geography, literature, science; French teachers had taken a great interest in the question and had attempted to act on the suggestions emerging from the study. If it were interrupted, Unesco might lose invaluable help.

(30) The delegate of France considered that the programme of the Department of Education was in conflict, on several points, with decisions taken

by the General Conference in 1952. It had then been decided to delete from the Education Department's programme certain projects which had not seemed vital, involving a total expenditure of $37,000. Several of those projects, however, were back in the programme for 1955-56. Without denying that they might be useful, Mr. François considered it unnecessary to take them up again. If Unesco wished to solve all the problems arising in the educational field, the whole of its budget would be insufficient.

(31) When considering the staffing pattern of the Department of Education (page 49), the French delegation had felt that the department was tending increasingly to become a supra-national Ministry of Education. His delegation considered that such a task was beyond Unesco's powers, and would urge the Organization to concentrate: (1) exchange of information and documentation; (2) extension of fundamental education, and of compulsory primary education; and (3) education for international understanding.

(32) For the reasons he had given, the French delegation would oppose certain projects and would ask for cuts and transfers of appropriations.

(33) Mr. CALO (Italy) paid tribute to the work done by Mr. Elvin and his colleagues.

(34) However, he was in almost complete agreement with the observations of the French delegate, and stressed the need for the Organization to concentrate its efforts. He too considered that the problems affecting yount people were extremely important and that some of the projects in the Department of Education's programme did not appear vital.

(35) The Italian delegation had prepared draft resolutions on various points. Those draft resolutions had nearly been rejected because of their budgetary implications. Mr. Calo pointed out that they were calculated to simplify the programme and to result in savings.

(36) The delegate of Italy had a proposal on the question of concentration. The Secretariat should invite Member States to make suggestions to the next General Conference on how the programme should be concentrated. The Secretariat would draw up a scheme, based on those suggestions, and would submit it to Member States for their views. The scheme would provide a basis for the Conference's work, so that wise decisions could be taken.

(37) Mr. ZIMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that one of Unesco's principal tasks was to develop education.

(38) Al children, of all races and religions, and whether rich or poor, should be able to enjoy the benefits of primary education at least. In the years to come, Unesco should seek to introduce free and compulsory education in all countries where it did not already exist.

(39) The needs of the underdeveloped countries should be considered with all possible care and efforts should be made to meet them. But their problems could not be solved simply by giving them international aid. They should be helped to develop their domestic resources by making use of the experience of countries having different social systems. That question should be thoroughly studied at the 1955 International Conference on Education.

(40) The delegate of the USSR considered that special attention should be devoted to teaching methods; there was still much to be done in that field.

(41) The needs of economic development raised the problem of broadening technical training not only in the countries mentioned in the programme but also in other large areas where there were underdeveloped countries.

(42) Those same needs also brought the problems of higher education to the fore, since the object of higher education was to train qualified national leaders in various fields. In the Soviet delegation's view, the omission of that problem from the programme was a serious defect.

(43) The delegation of the USSR hoped that the Director-General and the Executive Board would take the observations just made into account in carrying out the programme for 1955-56 and in preparing the programme for the following two years.

(44) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) considered that the chapter on education was the most important that the General Conference had to consider at its current session.

(45) She was surprised that a Uruguayan draft resolution, dealing with free education, had not been submitted to the General Conference. In that connexion, she mentioned that she had already stated several times that, in her country, education was secular, free at all levels, and compulsory at the primary level, and that Uruguay hoped also to be able to make secondary education compulsory. She wondered whether Unesco, with its great programme for international understanding, was not under an obligation to launch the idea of free education as a major theme. It was intolerable that there should be children in the world who were able to learn simply because their economic circumstances were easy while others were obliged to forgo the benefits of education.

(46) She thought it would be interesting to draw up statistics on armaments production in all countries to see what financial contribution each individual in a particular country had to make to give his country arms enough to put it on a war footing. It would then be seen whether a reduction in that contribution would make it possible for all the citizens of a country to help to provide free education for the nation's children. All countries should do everything in their power to institute compulsory education.

(47) Another subject on which she had already touched, and to which she wished to return, was the problem of literacy. She thought that literacy work would be useless without fundamental education. Besides knowing how to read and write, people needed to know about everything connected with their health, housing and clothing. That was one of the problems that Unesco had to solve and any money spent on it was well spent.

(48) She also wished to speak on the question of rural teachers. Rural teachers should not only instruct the children but should guide and counsel the whole neighbourhood, so that the peasants would acquire ideas that would otherwise never reach them.
(49) With regard to the programme for international understanding, she regretted that Mr. Düring's report made no mention of the greatest word in man's language - "mother". The first requisite for international understanding was that mothers should be capable of imbuing their children with love of the family and of their neighbour, so that they should never go to war to kill the children of other mothers.
(50) She thought that the pre-school education to which the Chilean delegate had referred should also be made free.
(51) Mrs. Pinto de Vidal repeated what she had already said on other occasions with regard to the education of women. Women, as wives and mothers, were bound to be interested in subjects other than those which were taught to men: domestic economy, motherhood, hygiene and child-care.
(52) With regard to the social and legal status of women - a question which had already been raised at the United Nations - the delegate of Uruguay said that neither in South nor in North America did all women yet enjoy civil and political rights. In Uruguay, however, women had full rights and her delegation hoped that women throughout the world would eventually possess the same privileges.
(53) Lastly she felt that little had so far been done to spread information about the United Nations. Everyone had seen pamphlets explaining what Unesco, WHO, FAO and UNICEF were, but children in primary and secondary schools had only hazy ideas about those organizations. She thought that Unesco should bring out primers explaining why the United Nations came into existence and what Specialized Agencies were associated with the organization.

(54) Mrs. ARUNDALE (India) was of the opinion that the programme of the Department of Education was in line with Unesco's educational ideals, although more emphasis should be put on fundamental education, the basis of all education.
(55) Too much discussion had taken place on the topic of international understanding and co-operation and too little had been achieved in their attainment. The problem was how to achieve international understanding. War had taught humanity the desirability of peace and the problem was now how to eradicate ideas of war and promote ideas of peace in the hearts of children throughout the world. The programme dealt with problems connected with education but in her opinion did not go to the heart of the matter.
(56) She pointed out that education and understanding were based on love. That love included not only humanity, but a love of nature in all forms. Advantage should be taken of the natural love in every child and every opportunity taken of promoting it. Children should be taught from the earliest age to understand the feelings of all living things. For that purpose pre-school education was of tremendous importance as was also the education of mothers. Education was a matter not only of techniques but of the heart.
(57) With regard to youth, it was necessary to help, through culture, in the teaching of an understanding of natural love. Youth should be taught the noble ideals of citizenship, of spiritual life and of the philosophy of life, and given a desire for knowledge. The fundamental principle to be followed was simplification of ideals. After the ideals had been accepted techniques would follow.
(58) She concluded by stressing the importance of seeing that the right means were used to achieve Unesco's objectives and of ensuring that spiritual as well as other values were absorbed in the process.

(59) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that it was considering the programme for 1955-56 alone, and that observations about future programmes could be put forward at a later stage.

(60) Mr. GARBARINI ISLAS (International Labour Organization) was very pleased with the arrangements for collaboration between the Organization he represented and Unesco, a signal instance of which was the signing of the memorandum, dated 14 October 1954, on vocational and technical training and allied subjects.
(61) The comments of the Director-General of the International Labour Office on Unesco's programme for 1955-56 appeared in document 8C/PRG/20, Annex II, page 8. Paragraphs 77 and 79 in the Exchange of Persons chapter dealt with the exchange of workers, an activity in which the two organizations could usefully co-operate. Paragraph 85 of the same chapter dealt with longer-term exchanges, which was another matter in which the two organizations might collaborate. In the paragraph dealing with workers abroad and employment exchange, however, no mention was made of collaboration with ILO, though that was, no doubt, an oversight.
(62) The need for collaboration between the two organizations was recognized in connexion with the survey of psychological factors affecting productivity, i.e. the social impact of industrialization. In that connexion, ILO had made a study of the human factors affecting productivity, labour management relations, etc.... He was therefore pleased at the suggestion that the survey of the psychological, cultural and sociological factors affecting productivity, mentioned on page 98 of the programme, should be carried out in close collaboration with ILO.

(63) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) remarked that it would be difficult to be brief if he was to answer all the points which had been raised during the discussion.
(64) In the first place, the Commission was considering a draft programme, to which, without doubt, improvements could be made. In the second place, most of the points raised by delegations had been thought of by the Secretariat, had been given its consideration and had either been

rejected or dealt with in a spirit of compromise in the interests of a balanced programme.
(65) Delegations had thought that the programme should be more concentrated but, on the other hand, had suggested that more emphasis should be given to fundamental education, to the extension of schooling, to women's education, to adult education and to work on child development. If the programme was to be more concentrated, it would not be possible to emphasize all these various branches of education. It was difficult to obtain a balance between the various wishes of Member States on the budget at the Department's disposal. In preparing the programme, the Department had observed the request of the Economic and Social Council, namely, that priority should be given to fundamental education and that work on other branches should be kept at a stable level.
(66) Referring to the remarks of the delegate of France, he explained that the Secretariat, backed by the Expert Committee, had felt that it was confusing to have a section in the programme devoted to education for international understanding, as much of the work undertaken in that field came under other sections. Further, the Department thought that, in the field of education, it was wrong to suppose that it was necessary to have special instruction in that matter; the idea should be part of every good education.
(67) He questioned the points made by the delegate of France in connexion with the budget, pointing out that formerly the section had contained four parts, two of which had been transferred to other parts of the programme. If those two parts were removed from the sections in which they now were and put in a separate section, there would be an increase in budget requirements of $9,000. He reassured the Commission that the Department would not diminish its efforts with regard to education for international understanding but would concentrate on the idea that such education was part of any good education.
(68) In answer to the remarks made by the delegate of Chile concerning confusion of terms used in documents, he said that the Department was trying through its clearing house to establish a glossary of terms used in the field of education.
(69) Concentration was not always synonymous with elimination of small expenditures. In some cases a small subvention was all that was needed to set in motion a project which would be of great value. He quoted as an example the benefits which would accrue from spending a small sum of money on a study of the causes of failure in school. Such a study would not only result in financial gain but would be of great use in dealing with the retarded child.
(70) He concluded by repeating that the Department had tried to attain a reasonable balance in the programme in the light of the budget at its disposal.

(71) The CHAIRMAN stated that the Commission did not have to vote on the preamble to the education chapter.

Project 1.11: Co-operation with International Organizations and Institutions

(72) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) mentioned that the Advisory Committee had made no observations on project 1.11.

(73) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) considered that the problem of co-operation with international non-governmental organizations and agencies was closely bound up with what the delegates of Lebanon, France and Italy had said during the general discussion and with what the Director of the Department of Education had just stated.
(74) He laid great stress on the concentration of projects - a principle that he supported - but there was a preliminary question to be considered. The delegate of Spain, like Mr. Elvin, felt that concentration was not an end in itself, but rather denoted a system of concentrated projects, linked up with the whole problem of education. Agreement should be reached on what Unesco was to do in that important field. It would also be well to apportion responsibilities, with regard to the general problem of education, between Member States, Unesco itself, national organizations and institutions, and international governmental and non-governmental organizations.
(75) In document 8C/PRG/21, which contained the observations of international non-governmental organizations, the following statement regarding education appeared (page 3): "It is noted with concern that both the proportions and the actual sums of money spent by the Department of Education through non-governmental organizations, in the form of subventions or contracts, are noticeably smaller than is the case for other departments... This is all the more regrettable in view of the undoubted competence of a number of non-governmental organizations which have long and valuable experience in the field of education". If the nature of subventions granted to non-governmental organizations were considered, however, it might be said that Unesco, far from lagging behind, was doing too much. Definite criteria should therefore be laid down concerning economic aid to international educational organizations.
(76) To sum up, the Spanish delegation hoped, firstly, that fuller information than that appearing in the programme would be provided about the practical activities in connexion with the provision of technical advice or other matters, that Unesco contemplated handing over to the organizations; secondly, that, once such a study had been carried out, the subventions to bodies that were doing educational work for their own purposes would be placed in category 3, as recommended in the Advisory Committee's Report; thirdly, that the Secretariat would consider the possibility of granting such aid in future by means of contracts for the execution of specific activities.
(77) The delegate of Spain stated that his proposal was not to abolish any of the proposed subventions, nor to belittle the work that many organizations could do. The reason for the criterion he suggested was the inevitable paucity of Unesco's resources,

which made it essential to establish strict priorities for expenditure.

(78) Mr. PRASAD (India) supported the proposal to adopt project 1.11. With regard to paragraph 20 concerning the International Bureau of Education, he suggested that the Director-General should be asked to come to an agreement with IBE to make all its working documents available to Member States on request.
(79) Secondly, with regard to paragraph 45 concerning the International Association of Universities, he asked whether membership of the Association was confined to individual universities or was open to national bureaux of universities. In his opinion, membership should be open to national bureaux, because, if confined to single universities, membership, in many cases, would be only nominal.

(80) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark), answering the question of the delegate of India, said that membership of the Association was open either to individual universities as members or to existing associations of universities as associate members.

(81) Mr. AL-KOUSSY (Egypt) said that he would comment on paragraphs 20, 23, 41 and 49.
(82) He agreed with the remarks made by the delegate of Uruguay, in his opening speech at the plenary meeting, that subventions should be granted to organizations only if they fulfilled the criteria of universality and efficiency based on cheapness. He also supported the view expressed by the delegate of India that, to make the work of the organizations effective, it was necessary that all Member States knew about them and their work.
(83) With regard to the Unesco Institutes in Germany, his delegation would like to have further information in order that it could judge their value.
(84) Some organizations were important from a local and international point of view because their work enhanced that of Unesco. He expressed surprise that in many cases only nominal subventions were being granted to such organizations
(85) In his opinion, Unesco should give its strongest support to the International Bureau of Education, the World Federation for Mental Health, the New Education Fellowship and the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, because such organizations were very important to Unesco's work. He was not against support for other organizations but felt that those four should be given priority as they were widely international and were capable of arousing awareness of Unesco's work.
(86) He proposed that the subventions to those four organizations should be increased and that the Commission should not agree to make a subvention which would merely justify their continued existence. If the subventions were not increased, he would abstain from voting.

(87) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) endorsed the comments of the delegate of Egypt. She thought that Unesco should not curtail its aid to any bodies co-operating with it in the educational field. That did not mean that aid should be given to all institutions; a study would have to be made of the activities which those associations carried on in the various countries.

(88) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that subventions were not necessarily proportional to the importance of the organizations which received them; the needs of organizations were also taken into account.
(89) He would, however, ask the representative of the Director-General to give all the necessary details on that point.

(90) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) indicated that he had the same comment to make on paragraphs 25, 30, 34, 37, 40, 44, 51 and 54, which was to the effect that, although he was in favour of subventions being granted for specific purposes, he thought that the method used for their distribution was unfair. In his opinion, it was a waste of time for the General Conference to grant subventions and he suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to consider making a large subvention to a really international organization for global distribution to smaller organizations doing work of interest to Unesco.

(91) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) felt convinced that the best way of disseminating the work of Unesco for international understanding was through co-operation with other organizations and institutions. In his opinion, subventions were only warranted if organizations had an expanding influence and if their work did not overlap or duplicate that of other organizations or if their contribution to the work of Unesco was unique.
He thought that organizations should be encouraged to be self-supporting but that adequate warning should be given if Unesco intended to decrease its subvention.
(92) With regard to paragraphs 38-40 concerning the subvention to the Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations, he said that, if he had been correctly informed, contributions of members to the organization amounted to $438. He opposed the granting of a subvention four times the amount of members' contributions to an organization which apparently competed with existing organizations, without evidence that it would have an expanding influence.
(93) He found it difficult to understand why the subvention to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession had been reduced. That organization showed ample evidence of increased growth. It should continue to receive a bigger subvention.
(94) He concluded by suggesting that the subvention proposed for the Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations should be deleted and that the subvention to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession should be restored to its previous figure.

(95) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) strongly supported

the remarks and proposals of the United States delegate. While not wishing to repeat the remarks of the delegates of Egypt and the United States of America, he stressed the importance of the teaching profession. In his opinion, money was being spent on how international understanding was to be taught when it should be spent on discussing who was to teach it. The World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession was a virile organization, which could provide Unesco with a medium for teaching international understanding. He thought that it would be sensible and appropriate to grant a larger subvention to that organization and to ask it to teach about the ideals and aims of Unesco.

(96) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) thought the programme of the Department of Education excellent, and congratulated the Secretariat on it.
(97) With reference to paragraphs 55 to 62, and 385, he stressed the need for co-ordinating the activities of the three Unesco Institutes in Germany. The Institute at Gauting did not seem to him to have produced the results expected of it. Unesco should endeavour to turn it into an international centre for German youth and, if possible, for young people of other countries too.

(98) Mrs. BURCHULADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the three Institutes set up by Unesco in the German Federal Republic in 1951 were not very international in character.
(99) She suggested that they should be financed, not out of Unesco funds, but by special contributions from governments. The sums allocated to maintaining the Institutes would be better employed if spent on financial aid to underdeveloped countries or on other tasks connected with international co-operation and mutual understanding.
(100) She emphasized that the Advisory Committee had also expressed doubts about the usefulness of the financial aid given to the Institutes at a time when the Organization's resources were needed for more important tasks.

(101) Mr. ROBERTSON (United Kingdom), referring to the Unesco institutes in Germany, said that his delegation would support the proposed subvention but not without hesitation, and only because it was suggested in the programme and budget document that Unesco's financial help should taper off and cease. It would perhaps be unfair to say that there were grave doubts about the work of the Institutes, but it was a temperate claim that they had failed to establish widespread confidence.
(102) He suggested that, owing to the size of the proposed subvention and the perplexity which surrounded the work of the institutes, it would be preferable that the critical study should be entrusted to a small number of independent experts, as being the best method of obtaining an unbiased opinion.

(103) Mr. CALO (Italy) drew the attention of delegates to the situation of some of the international organizations to which it was proposed to grant subventions. Generally speaking, he would have liked the reports submitted by the organizations to be communicated to Member States.
(104) The New Education Fellowship did not seem to have maintained its previous level of activity.
(105) The World Organization for Early Childhood Education, which could undoubtedly give Unesco useful help, was going through a serious crisis. Its national committees were divided. As things stood, it was difficult to foresee what contribution it would be able to make. The proposed subvention should therefore be approved subject to the proviso that the World Organization should surmount its crisis and provide certain guarantees.
(106) The delegate of Italy had no criticism to make of the International Federation of Children's Communities. He wondered, however, whether children's communities, which had been set up to deal with the special conditions of the post-war period, were still serving a useful purpose.
(107) Mr. Calo wanted further details about the International Association of Universities, and asked what was its relation to the Association of University Professors and Lecturers. He thought that one or other of the associations, or both, might be commissioned to solve the problems of the equivalence of university degrees, and might be asked to consider how universities could help in adult education.

(108) Mr. LAUGIER (France) proposed that the question of the amounts of subventions be referred to the Executive Board. He did not consider that the Commission should study it in detail.

(109) Mr. LOEFLER (German Federal Republic) said that he had already tried to clarify German feeling on the three Unesco institutes in Germany and referred to the Director-General's remarks about encouraging their work. There were several educators at the General Conference who had attended the Conference of the Institute for Education in Hamburg and who knew what the position was. He was grateful to the delegates of Belgium and the United Kingdom for their remarks. He supported the suggestion made by the delegate of the United Kingdom that any study should be entrusted to independent experts.
(110) He asked the Commission to support the institutes for a further two years in order that it might be seen whether their work for Unesco should continue.

(111) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) shared the Belgian delegate's opinion with regard to the Unesco Institutes in Germany, particularly the Institute at Gauting, which seemed to him to be the only body of its kind capable of studying technical problems.
(112) He considered the suggestion by the delegate of the USSR concerning the financing of the institutes to be dangerous. Their international character could be maintained only if they received funds from an international organization. If they were financed by governments, they might become platforms for the various doctrines in conflict in the world.

(113) In reply to the remark by the delegate of Italy, Mr. François thought that the World Organization for Early Childhood Education would emerge safely from the crisis through which it was passing.
(114) He did not think that Unesco could cast off the International Federation of Children's Communities. Unesco itself had set it up, and most of the needs which children's communities met still existed. A very large number of children were still suffering from the condition of society and were obliged to leave their families temporarily for health or other reasons. In children's communities they found a new family life. The French delegation therefore strongly supported the grant of a subvention to the Federation.

(115) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) considered that the Commission had too few data about the problem of subventions to be able to take decisions on any amendments suggested. He believed that the best course was to leave the solution of the problem to the Executive Board to be appointed at the current session of the General Conference. The new Executive Board and Unesco's technical services would be able to reach the right decisions on international organizations, about which information was rather vague.

(116) The CHAIRMAN pointed out to the delegate of Chile that the subventions had already been approved by the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(117) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) explained that he was referring to the subventions to be granted to the international organizations in the future.

(118) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) said, in connexion with the remarks made by the delegate of Italy about the World Organization for Early Childhood Education (paragraphs 28 and 29), that he was glad that that work was to continue. The differences of opinion were domestic matters within the purview of the Organization and, according to his information, were near settlement. He was in favour of granting that Organization a subvention.
(119) With regard to Unesco institutes in Germany, when those institutes were founded it was intended that they should be self-supporting through voluntary contributions from Member States but those contributions had not proved sufficient. The Danish Government was still willing to make a contribution to the institutes. He did not object to the United Kingdom proposal if it would help a decision to be arrived at on the usefulness of the work being done. It would be harmful to the reputation of Unesco if they were dropped at the present stage. He judged from previous discussions that most countries were interested in the experiment of uniting the educational and social aspects of the youth problem. If the experiment were successful, similar institutes could be set up in other parts of the world.

(120) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq) thought that subventions in the bracket from $2,000-6,500 should be allocated in accordance with services rendered. In order to do that, reports of the activities of organizations should be studied.
(121) He proposed that Unesco should grant subventions to organizations and authorize the Director-General to request them to carry out specific work. The amount of the subvention should be decided by the Director-General and the organization concerned.

(122) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) reminded the Commission that it was discussing subventions. Contracts brought no financial benefit to organizations.
(123) Replying for the Secretariat to the remark that delegations had not received enough information about organizations, he pointed out that document 8C/ADM/20 contained very adequate information. If delegations were not satisfied with the information in that document, the Secretariat would be more than willing to supply further details.
(124) In connexion with the criteria by which subventions should be granted, the Secretariat considered not only services rendered but also the usefulness to Unesco of the continuance of any organization. It was sometimes more valuable to keep an organization in existence than for Unesco to undertake the work itself.
(125) In answer to the references of the delegate of Italy to the World Organization for Early Childhood Education, he said that the view of the Secretariat was that the internal differences were being resolved. The Secretariat was watching the situation carefully.
(126) The United States proposal concerning the subvention to the Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations would, if adopted, suppress an organization which was "a child of Unesco". It was true that its work overlapped that of another organization, but he strongly advised the Commission to recognize both. The Joint Committee was preparing a Teachers' Charter, which would be of the utmost value to teachers throughout the world.
(127) The Secretariat could give more information to delegations about the Unesco institutes in Germany if required.
(128) Concerning the question of procedure, the question of each subvention was carefully examined by the Executive Board and by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget and approved by them before being sent to the Commission and the General Conference. In principle a decision on subventions had to be taken by the Commission and the General Conference.

(129) The CHAIRMAN asked delegates to take a decision on the proposed amendments to resolution 1.11.
(130) He called for a vote on the French delegation's proposal, which was to refer the subventions to international educational organizations to the Executive Board for consideration.

(131) Mr. LAUGIER (France) wished to make it clear that his delegation was in favour of granting subventions to many organizations, provided that they were thoroughly studied beforehand. It had suggested referring the details of subventions to

the Board, in order to avoid protracted discussions in the Commission. He therefore proposed that a vote be taken on resolution 1.11, on the understanding that the Executive Board would reconsider the proposed figures, which would then be studied in the light of further information obtained about all the organizations.

(132) The proposal was seconded by the delegates of Lebanon and Liberia.

(133) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the French proposal, which was rejected by 18 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.
(134) He asked the Commission to take a decision on the amendment, proposed by the delegation of Egypt, to raise the subvention to the New Education Fellowship.

(135) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) observed that the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had already carefully examined the proposed figures for the subventions. He wished to know the Executive Board's opinion.

(136) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) informed the Commission that those items were studied singly by the Executive Board in the light of information received from the Secretariat. A special committee had been created by the Executive Board to study the whole question of subventions.
(137) The Executive Board, after very lengthy consideration, had agreed to recommend to the General Conference approval of the subventions to the Unesco institutes in Germany in order that they could carry on.

(138) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), raising a question of procedure, asked whether, as the Commission had not received comments from the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget on the question of subventions, the Commission should proceed to a decision. As he did not believe that the Commission was in a position to take action in that respect, he supported the proposal by the delegate of France that the subventions should be forwarded to the Executive Board for decision.

(139) The CHAIRMAN mentioned that the report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (document 8C/BUD/1) had been communicated to all delegates, and that the document contained no observations on draft resolution 1.11.
(140) He stated that the proposed amendments would involve an increase of $14,000 in the appropriations.

(141) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the responsibility would rest with the Commission. If the Commission decided to increase a subvention, it would also have to decide where a corresponding reduction was to be made.

(142) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) urged that the balance between the different parts of the programme be maintained.
(143) As the amendment proposed by the Egyptian delegation was not seconded, no vote was taken on it.
(144) Another amendment, also proposed by the Egyptian delegation, to raise the subvention to the World Federation for Mental Health was not seconded, and no vote was taken on it.

(145) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on a third amendment, proposed by the delegation of Egypt, to raise the subvention to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession to $6,000 for each of the two years.

(146) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of the United States of America.

(147) Approved by 17 votes to 11, with 15 abstentions.

(148) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on an amendment, proposed by the delegate of the United States of America, to delete the proposed subvention to the Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations.

(149) The proposal was seconded by the delegates of Egypt and Costa Rica.

(150) Rejected by 17 votes to 14, with 11 abstentions.

(151) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the proposal by the delegate of the USSR with regard to the financing of the Unesco institutes in Germany.

(152) Mrs. BURCHULADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that she had not intended to make a formal proposal for deleting the subvention to the Unesco institutes in Germany, but had simply wished to indicate why she would abstain from voting on resolution 1.11.

(153) A vote was taken on resolution 1.11, with the approved amendment.

(154) Adopted by 40 votes, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

# ELEVENTH MEETING

*25 November 1954 at 3.30 p. m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

ITEM 8.4.1 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: EDUCATION (continued)

Project 1.12: Clearing House and Advisory Services

(1) The CHAIRMAN called on the Commission to comment on resolutions 1.121 and 1.122 and the relevant work plans (paragraphs 64 to 111).
(2) A number of draft amendments submitted by Member States would have to be studied in conjunction with the resolutions.

(3) Mr. PRATT (Australia) asked permission of the meeting to deal with resolution 1.121 (paragraph 64) in combination with resolution 1.122 (paragraph 68) as the two were closely connected.
(4) The Australian delegation regarded the Clearing House activities as of the greatest importance. They certainly fulfilled the catalytic function of Unesco as described by the delegate of India. The great value of that work implied a danger lest the volume of requests (150 had been received in one week) immobilize the Department. A high level of discernment was needed in dealing with those requests in the appropriate manner. On that ground, the delegate of Australia questioned the proposal outlined in paragraph 77 to call in six documentalists for consultation. He urged that not too much should be expected in that direction, and made the same remark in connexion with the proposals in paragraph 99. He stressed the importance of National Commissions in connexion with Clearing House activities.
(5) Mr. Pratt supported resolution 1.121, but felt that, with regard to resolution 1.122, more emphasis should be laid on the second part, namely, "the educational programme of Unesco", than on "the needs of Member States", which, however important, made the field too wide.

(6) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) suggested that there was a relation between the stage of a country's development and its interest in a clearing house, which was wanted for purposes of research and exchange. It would be a good plan to make countries more clearing house conscious. Expert advice would be needed to co-ordinate the work done here and there by Ministry departments. The Egyptian Ministry of Education was interested in setting up a local clearing house, and intended to consult Unesco on the matter.

(7) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile), speaking of resolution 1.122, said that the Education Clearing House should be divided into sections, each of which would deal with a different part of the world, covering countries with similar features. Every Member State was interested in all kinds of educational experiments throughout the world, but interest was greater when the information supplied related to countries with which a State had closer affinities.
(8) Paragraph 77 spoke of calling in six documentalists "to discuss the results of the survey of documentation centres" and "to advise on common problems of educational bibliography". It would be very helpful if those specialists were chosen to represent different parts of the world, and one of them might well represent the Latin American countries.

(9) Referring to paragraph 99, which dealt with the ways in which Unesco proposed to collaborate with national bodies concerned with educational matters, Mr. CALO (Italy) pointed out that there were a number of such institutions in Western Europe, and particularly in France and Italy, which might be of great help. He therefore felt that sufficient sums should be provided in the budget to enable Unesco to make contracts not only with the American Education Research Association but also with similar organizations in Western Europe. Referring to the figures given in paragraph 100a, he accordingly suggested that the estimates for 1955-56 ($18,080 and $9,080) be increased respectively to $20,000 (or even $21,000) and $10,000 (or even $11,000). Should his proposal be considered unacceptable, the amounts provided for "staff travel" might perhaps be somewhat reduced in order to increase the amounts requested in the budget for "contracts".

(10) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) associated himself with the views expressed by the delegate of Egypt, and added that his country had many years since set up a national clearing house in imitation of Unesco's. But the work done in that respect by Unesco was not well known enough in the United Kingdom. He wondered if the Secretariat could provide an authoritative article (or material for one) for publication in the educational journals of his country and perhaps in others.

(11) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) said that his delegation considered the contents of the chapter under examination to be very important, and was in agreement with the Italian delegation. The sums shown in paragraph 81 for financing the documentation unit should be increased by $5,000

a year. If such an increase were not possible, his delegation would not withdraw its motion, as it was anxious that its desires in that respect should remain on record. It was very important that studies carried out in one country should be publicized in others and Unesco should be responsible for the supply and exchange of information.
(12) Mr. Cassani was in agreement with the Australian representative. The establishment of a large educational information centre would be one of the most useful contributions to progress in the world.

(13) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) had little to add to previous speakers' remarks about the work plans for resolution 1.122. With reference to paragraph 92, he wished to point out, however, that the Secretariat seemed to underrate the studies there mentioned. Such studies on Human Rights and, in particular, on the right to education laid down in Article 26 of the Universal Declaration, had, he reminded the Commission, been repeatedly requested. It was very much to be hoped, therefore, that the Secretariat would take more active measures to carry them out.

(14) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain), commenting on paragraph 101 of the proposed programme and budget, praised the work being carried out by the Department of Education. That work might be supplemented by the publication of an international educational review, which would supply information and, while avoiding controversial subjects, would give practical and theoretical advice. The review might suggest curricula and serve as a guide to teachers.
(15) The representative of Spain was sure that the Secretariat would have interesting suggestions to make concerning that project.

(16) Mr. STEINIG (United Nations) stressed the great importance of Unesco's contributions to the United Nations in many of its major activities. He made the following remarks on paragraphs 83-100. For the first time specific financial provision had been made for the reports and studies Unesco provided in the field of education. Referring to paragraphs 186-196 he appreciated the fact that teaching about the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had now been recognized as a specific responsibility. Suitable information was to be made available to teachers, and an effort to provide basic teaching materials and documents for the classroom. The operative provisions however remained unchanged. The Secretariat might consider extending the scope of its assistance to the United Nations in that field.
(17) The report referred to in paragraph 89, he informed the meeting, would be concluded during the year. That might affect the studies mentioned.
(18) On paragraph 93, the status of women, a further resolution affecting Unesco had been adopted by the Commission on the Status of Women at its eighth session, and, on its recommendation, approved by the Economic and Social Council. It called for studies in connexion with school attendance, the vocational education of girls, and the use of women as teachers. On paragraph 94, racial discrimination, the study was not to be limited to questions of race, and Mr. Steinig thought the word 'racial' might be eliminated from the paragraph.

(19) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied to the points that had been raised by members of the Commission.
(20) The correction called for by the delegate of the United Nations had already been made.
(21) He would be very happy to comply with the request of the delegate of the United Kingdom for an article on the clearing house activities of Unesco.
(22) Replying to the delegate of Australia on the volume of requests handled by the Unesco clearing house, he said the normal average was about 150 requests a month. They were of all conceivable kinds, and every effort was made to control the degree of attention granted to them. Mr. Elvin felt however that all requests should receive some answer. Decentralization was necessary, and he appreciated the remarks of the Egyptian delegate in that connexion. To be successful, Unesco's work depended on the creation of educational clearing houses in all the Member States. The visit of documentalists questioned by the Australian delegate had been planned with that aim in mind. To the delegate of Chile he replied that Unesco aimed at a broad coverage but the specialists of clearing houses could only be invited where such clearing houses were already in existence. The idea behind the project in paragraph 99 (referred to by the delegate of Australia) was to get research workers thinking along lines favourable to the work of Unesco, and to inform the Organization of their results.
(23) Answering the delegate of Italy, Mr. Elvin said that his department was aware of the existence in other parts of the world of organizations such as the delegate of Italy had mentioned. They could however only be assisted one at a time. The next Conference would be free to decide where the next effort was to be made. If the Commission did not vote an increase in the budget for that activity, Mr. Elvin thought it would be unwise to make a cut in the sums required for the first effort.
(24) To the Spanish delegate, Mr. Elvin replied that the Secretariat had considered an international educational review for the draft programme, but the Hamburg Institute had decided to start one itself, and it would probably be better that it should be run under strictly professional auspices.
(25) In conclusion, Mr. Elvin thanked the delegate of the United Nations for his remarks. The list of work on hand and the fact that the activities connected with the United Nations had been listed in a special section were evidence of the close co-operation between the two organizations. He begged the representative of the United Nations for as long a notice as possible of any new studies wanted, as they required considerable staff time.

(26) The CHAIRMAN then asked the Commission to vote on the amendment proposed by the Italian delegation with regard to the estimates given in paragraph 100a.

(27) Mr. CALO (Italy) said that the Italian delegation was prepared to lower the figures which it had originally mentioned in its draft amendment (document 8C/DR/28), since its main desire was to emphasize the question of principle. Its proposal accordingly was that the appropriations set out in paragraph 100a be increased from $18,080 to $20,000 and from $9,080 to $10,000.

(28) The Italian proposal was seconded by the delegates of France, Turkey and Spain.

(29) It was then put to the vote and rejected by 21 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions.

(30) The CHAIRMAN then called on the Commission to take a decision on the amendment proposed by the Argentine delegation, to increase the amounts provided in paragraph 81 by $5,000 for each year. The amounts as they stood were $12,330 for 1955 and $12,330 for 1956.

(31) As the proposal was not seconded, it was considered to be rejected.

(32) A vote was taken on resolution 1.121, which was unanimously adopted.

(33) A vote was then taken on resolution 1.122, which was also adopted, with no dissentient vote but one abstention.

Project 1.21: Development and improvement of school systems and school teaching (paragraphs 112 et seq.)

(34) The CHAIRMAN called upon the Commission to comment on the resolutions and work plans relative to this project.

(35) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) said that the time had come to discuss draft resolution 40 submitted by the Uruguayan delegation, inviting Member States to take the necessary measures to ensure that education was provided, free of charge, at all levels. He appreciated the idealism behind the proposal. The delegate of Uruguay had protested that morning against the Executive Board's failure to recommend it, and it had been supported by the delegate of Poland.
(36) Most countries, Mr. Nielsen thought, were aware of the difficulties inherent in a proposal of that kind, and tried to approach their common goal step by step. If any countries did not agree with the spirit of the resolution, it would hardly carry the weight required to change their attitude.
(37) If a proposal had no budgetary implication, that did not mean it was "harmless" and could therefore be adopted. If it had no effect, it would be detrimental to the impact of Unesco on the world. That remark had a bearing on a good many resolutions which had been put before the Conference by Member States.

(38) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) considered that the general remarks set forth in paragraphs 115-127 called for some comment. Referring to paragraph 117, he remarked that racial or religious discrimination, which in the past had prevented certain children from attending schools which were open to others, tended to disappear today. The inequalities found in educational opportunities were thus due, in the main, to economic or social factors. Mgr Maroun was most anxious that that fact should be stressed in paragraph 117.
(39) He also considered that, in a programme of action such as that before the Commission, there was no need constantly to reiterate principles already formulated repeatedly. What was needed was exact details about the means by which those principles were to be applied.
(40) Among the steps taken by Unesco for the development of education, Mgr Maroun was wholeheartedly in favour of all those on an international and regional scale. He considered that at the national level, however, Unesco had not so far been moving in the right direction, nor had it succeeded in giving its Member States the help they needed to improve their own education systems. He would therefore have a number of criticisms to make regarding the section on "Action on particular problems (paragraphs 153-175)". Many of the activities mentioned in that section lay outside Unesco's competence, since the Organization should act neither as a kind of international Ministry of Education, nor as an international institute of education, but should concentrate primarily on giving its Member States the help they needed to further the development of educational facilities on their own territory.

(41) Mrs. BOLLO (Uruguay) said that, in every Commission, the universal character of Unesco had been mentioned as being its most noteworthy and characteristic feature. Free and compulsory education in all countries and at all levels was one of the things that Unesco's universal activities were intended to achieve. Such education was available in some countries and not in others; but steps should be taken to establish it everywhere.
(42) The representative of Denmark had said that he would not oppose the Uruguayan proposal (document 8C/DR/40), but that the right to education was already set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The representative of Lebanon had said that nobody would dare to challenge that right, but that, once such a declaration was down on paper, it was best to wait until events brought it into effect. As the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had not thought fit to recommend the Uruguayan proposal for approval, it was necessary to lay particular stress on it.
(43) Uruguay wanted all education to be free. Such a system had been introduced in Uruguay itself with beneficial results and the Uruguayans wished all to enjoy the same facilities. The best way of bringing that about was a strong recommendation for immediate action. The right to culture as proclaimed in the Declaration of Human Rights could be effective only if secondary and higher, as well as primary education, were free and compulsory.
(44) Uruguay proposed that Unesco set aside a sum sufficient for carrying out an experiment in

the provision of such education in a country where it did not exist, so that action should not be confined to an abstract statement of aims. Free and compulsory education should be established in all the 72 Member States of Unesco. If education were not free, the cultural level of the peoples could never be raised, and Unesco's aims in that respect could never be achieved.

(45) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) reminded the Chairman of the need for the meeting to be informed of the decisions taken by the Advisory Committee on all the questions discussed by the Programme Commission.

(46) The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution No. 40 had not been recommended by the Advisory Committee.

(47) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said this had been a challenging resolution, but the Executive Board had been obliged to face the issue realistically. Many States could not afford to provide free education at all levels. It had been found impossible to recommend the project for a high priority.

(48) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) said that his delegation had noticed that in dealing with the development and improvement of school systems and school teaching (project 1.21), particular importance was attributed to primary education, some attention was devoted to secondary education, while higher education was completely overlooked. His delegation wished that shortcoming to be remedied and consideration to be given to the problems of teaching at all levels of education.
(49) The Argentine delegation considered that free education was an ideal which should be confidently and energetically pursued. Argentina had had considerable experience, for it had introduced free education at all levels, for all Argentine or foreign students and pupils, who attended Argentine educational establishments in their thousands. There were many ways of achieving that ideal; one of them was through proper guidance, and Unesco was always in a position to give such guidance.

(50) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) suggested that at future conferences there should not be such a flood of last-minute resolutions. Small delegations had no opportunity for studying them properly, and were sometimes obliged to vote against resolutions for that reason alone.

(51) Referring to resolution 1.211, Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) pointed out that education could not be made compulsory until it could be provided free. He therefore thought it would be well to include in the programme a more firmly worded resolution, calling on Member States to earmark part of their budget each year for the expenditure entailed in providing free education for their nationals.

(52) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) said that the two resolutions with which the meeting was now concerned were a case of the overlapping of activities he had referred to in general terms at an earlier meeting. The Council for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara had already convened a conference on primary education. With regard to the Unesco Conference proposed in paragraph 150, had the necessary preliminary studies laid down by the Economic and Social Council been made, and more important, had full account been taken of the work already carried out in that field by other organizations?

(53) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) protested against the objection raised by the delegate of the Union of South Africa. He had not objected to the many conferences continually held by Unesco in other parts of the world, but when one was proposed for his own region, which was the most backward economically, socially and educationally, he opposed it. The delegate of Liberia suggested that more money should be allocated to the proposal and more conferences held in Africa south of the Sahara.

(54) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) agreed with the delegate of Liberia on the need of educational activities in Africa, but insisted that, when they were already being tackled on a wide basis, there was no case for duplication on the part of Unesco.

(55) Mr. KABIR (India) agreed that duplication should be avoided in general, but thought that the case of Africa was exceptional. The more conferences held there, the better. There was an urgent need to train political leaders and arouse a social conscience.

(56) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) was in entire sympathy with the delegate of Liberia in his concern for educational progress in South Africa.

(57) Replying to the comments of the delegate of the Union of South Africa, the CHAIRMAN stated that, in his opinion, the best course would be to leave the Executive Board and the Secretariat to decide to what extent Unesco should take account of what had already been done by regional and local organizations for educational development in Africa.

(58) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) then read out the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget regarding paragraphs 137, 143, 147 and 163 (document 8C/BUD/1, pages 4 and 5).

(59) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) wished to make an important point, but without budgetary implications, concerning resolution 1.211 on extending free and compulsory schooling. Some countries were exposed to education in a way that did not fit in with their own culture, which had the effect of denationalizing them and leaving them in a state of unrest. The delegate of Egypt would like

the addition, at the end of the resolution, of the following sentence: "The development of primary education in the non-self-governing territories should take full consideration of its indigenous pattern of culture". Egypt was a member of the United Nations Committee on Information from non-self-governing territories, and was aware of the problems that arose when that aspect of the question was ignored.

(60) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) was surprised that, since the beginning of the General Conference, statements such as that just made by the representative of New Zealand had been heard. The condemnatory tone adopted should have been modified. Chile had put forward one or two amendments and had a right to the consideration always accorded to States which had recently been admitted to the Organization.
(61) He was, in principle, in favour of the Uruguayan proposal and wished to see free and compulsory education extended.

(62) Mr. KOVAL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) stressed the importance of resolutions 1.211 and 1.212. He reminded the meeting that there were 200 million children of school age in the world who had no means of education. One of Unesco's first duties should be to remedy the existing situation and to do away with illiteracy among children and adults alike. It should, in the opinion of the Ukrainian delegation, direct its efforts, in the main, to improving education in the underdeveloped countries. It should seek to remove all forms of discrimination, based on race, religion, language or social standing, which affected educational opportunities. Mr. Koval stressed the need for Unesco to give attention, particularly in the underdeveloped countries, to the training of well-qualified teachers, who should be recruited locally to staff primary and secondary schools. Unesco should also bear in mind the importance of building new schools and providing better equipment for existing schools.
(63) Mr. Koval hoped that his comments would be taken into consideration in working out Unesco's programme for 1955-56.

(64) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) was happy to agree with the delegate of Egypt on his proposed amendment to resolution 1.211. It was the policy of the United Kingdom Government to base education in its non-self-governing territories as far as possible on their indigenous culture. But the suggestion of the Egyptian delegate should be extended to all countries, for all of them had cultures which were only to a very small extent indigenous, and all of them faced the same double need: to develop citizens of their own countries who should at the same time be citizens of the world.

(65) Mr. KABIR (India) seconded the delegate of Egypt. All he had wanted to say had been said for him by the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(A) International Conference on Public Education (paragraphs 137-142)

(66) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) referred to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget concerning the International Conference on Public Education, which had been read out by the Secretariat. In it the Committee hoped "that meetings of this Conference.... will be increasingly devoted to the discussion of specific problems of concern to educators rather than to the presentation of the reports submitted by Member States".
(67) He said that, whenever he had taken part in the proceedings of the International Conference on Public Education, he had seen how efficiently, soundly and competently its work had been done. The recommendation was unnecessary because the Conference was already dealing with specific problems of great interest. At its 1952 meeting, it had studied the natural sciences and educational opportunities for women. At its 1953 meeting, it had dealt with the training of primary teachers, while in 1954 it had given its attention to the training of secondary school teachers; for 1955-56, it was preparing to discuss questions of outstanding interest, such as the financing of public education and school inspection.
(68) The International Bureau of Education carried out studies on educational developments, and in the establishment and building of educational institutions; in doing so, it had a clear picture of education in all countries, which thus made it possible to pool useful experience. Furthermore, it issued very full publications to make known the results of the work it was carrying out.
(69) The Commission should therefore not endorse the Advisory Committee's recommendation but, on the contrary, should make explicit mention of the zeal and ability with which the International Conference on Public Education was accomplishing its work.

(B) International Educational Development Fund (paragraphs 143-146)

(70) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) gave the opinion of his delegation on that section. He supported the idea of pre-school education, but not the Fund, about which his ideas were in line with those of the Advisory Committee.
(71) All countries were agreed that it was important to advance education as rapidly as possible, but it was hard to find the right balance between providing what was wanted and creating a state of dependence or of despair because too much was being done too soon. No Member State had an adequate answer to that problem in his own country, and Unesco's efforts were no more than a drop in the bucket. A thorough study of each other's mistakes ought to be made before any such fund was started. In the United States of America a conference of citizens and educators was to be called before November 1955 to discuss those problems. Similarly, he felt, all the knowledge of Member States could be pooled before the proposal was taken any further.

(72) The CHAIRMAN, after requesting speakers to keep closely to the document before them, and not to present their obser ations too haphazardly, called on the Swedish delegate.

(73) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) suggested that it would be wiser for Unesco to postpone its efforts to establish a separate fund for another two years, in view of the fact that the United Nations had recently taken some steps towards a similar one - SUNFED - and that the United States of America had contributed $35,000,000 for the purpose. The proposed Unesco fund was not supplied with sufficient resources to enable it to begin functioning. If it were put off until the results of the work of SUNFED could be evaluated, there would be time also to investigate the possibility of giving the financial assistance required in some other way, such as by an expansion of technical assistance. Mr. Duering asked for the deletion of Section B.

(74) Mr. STEINIG (United Nations) agreed that it would be advisable to await the results of the United Nations consultations and negotiations before creating a special fund which might not prove necessary. On 16 November the Second Committee of the General Assembly, now in session in New York, adopted unanimously a resolution on the special United Nations fund for economic development, which brought the realization of SUNFED one step nearer. It had resolved to urge all governments to review their positions in extending material support to that fund, "taking into consideration changes in the international situation and other relevant factors, both national and international". It further decided to request Mr. Raymond Scheyven, a distinguished Belgian stateman and former President of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to continue his exploratory consultations with governments with a view to obtaining their views on the support they would be prepared to extend to such a fund; and to prepare, in co-operation with the Secretary-General and an ad hoc group of experts and after having consulted the Technical Assistance Board and the Specialized Agencies, a further report containing a full and precise picture of the forms, functions and responsibilities which such a fund might have, and the methods by which its operations might be integrated with the development plans of the countries receiving assistance from it. Dates had been fixed for the final presentation of the report to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly in 1955 and hope was expressed that the fund would be established as soon as practicable.

(75) The CHAIRMAN declared the discussion on paragraphs 113 to 146 closed, and called on the French delegate to put forward comments he wished to make on Section C, dealing with regional conferences on free and compulsory education.

(C) Regional Conference on Free and Compulsory Education (paragraphs 147-152)

(76) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) feared that, by engaging in work in Africa in which local organizations had apparently already achieved a fair measure of success, Unesco could only harm its own prestige. He would therefore favour dropping the regional conference to be held in Africa in 1958, for which provision was made in paragraph 150.

(77) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) had wished to speak on paragraph 145, but, when the CHAIRMAN pointed out that to do so would mean reopening discussion on a section that the Commission had completed, he spoke on paragraph 148, which dealt with the calling of a regional conference on free and compulsory education.

(78) Mr. Estelrich asked whether sufficient data were available about education in Latin America, whether such data were accurate, and whether a study had been made of the complex factors affecting the problem. Moreover it seemed unlikely that anything would be gained by bringing together a large number of people to study the obstacles standing in the way of extending free education. It would be better to hold a small meeting of experts to achieve the desired results.

(79) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), on the question of abandoning the proposed regional conference in Africa (paragraph 150), said that that would be a repudiation by Unesco of its own principles. For the first time, Member States had protested against the holding of a conference in a region which statistics showed was at the foot of the ladder in education matters. How was it possible to claim that the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa south of the Sahara was doing all the educational work needed in that region?

(80) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) was also a member of the Council for Technical Co-operation in Africa south of the Sahara, but did not think it desirable or practicable to exclude the operation of international organizations from that part of the world. He hoped it could be taken for granted that whatever Unesco did would be done after consultation with the governments concerned. He did not want any duplication but no one could pretend that Africa south of the Sahara possessed all the education and wisdom on matters of education it needed. Mr. Ward was confident that Unesco would be able to co-operate with the Council for Technical Co-operation, and could not support the deletion of paragraph 150.

(81) Mr. ERZUAH (Gold Coast) supported the delegates of Liberia and the United Kingdom. The danger in Africa was always of doing too little.

(82) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) commented first on Section C. He referred to a similar problem in Latin America.

On hearing that the Organization of American States proposed to convene a Conference of Ministers of Education, which might serve the same purposes as the Conference on Free and Compulsory Education planned by Unesco for 1956, the Director-General had suggested that the project should be maintained on the understanding that, if the two conferences had the same purpose, they would co-operate rather than separate. Mr. Elvin suggested that, with the approval of the Executive Board, the same procedure could be followed over the African conference.
(83) Reverting to Section B, he said that the Commission and the Conference would have to decide, in view of the comments of the United Nations representative, which the Advisory Committee had waited for, whether it would now withdraw the proposal, on the understanding that, if SUNFED failed to come into existence, the Director-General could study a separate Education Fund, and report, before action was taken, to the next Conference.

(84) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) then withdrew his proposal concerning the deletion of paragraph 150.

(85) Mr. KABIR (India), on the proposal in Section B, wondered if, in view of the modest sum involved ($2,000 in the first year and $1,000 in the second), the project might not be retained, with the purpose of creating a public opinion in its favour, which might contribute towards the establishment of SUNFED.

(86) The CHAIRMAN then asked the Commission to vote on Section B (International Educational Development Fund).
(87) The Commission would vote on the proposal to recommend that the General Conference postpone consideration of the project until its ninth session.

(88) The proposal was adopted by 34 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

(89) Section C (Regional Conference on Free and Compulsory Education) was approved.

(D) Education and Child Development (paragraphs 153-159)

(90) The CHAIRMAN then called on the delegate of Italy.

(91) Mr. CALO (Italy), referring to paragraph 158, commented on the draft amendment set forth in document 8C/DR/79. He pointed out how useful it would be to arrange for studies, by the meetings of experts mentioned in the paragraph in question, of methods of securing closer co-operation between teachers and social workers. He thought, too, that still more emphasis should be placed on the study of the examination systems in force in the various types of schools.
(92) Lastly, Mr. Calo suggested that some of the subjects for study put forward in the original paragraph 158 were too vague, and unlikely to lead to good results in practice.

(93) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) disagreed with the Italian delegate's suggestion of deleting certain points in paragraph 158. Far from being over-emphasized, he thought the parts objected to had been under-emphasized. Indeed, he considered that not only the training of educational psychologists, parent education, etc., but the hygiene of marital life and its influence on children and the rising generation should be taken into serious consideration.

(94) Mr. FRANCOIS (France), without underestimating the usefulness of the activities proposed in paragraph 158, felt that they could produce worthwhile results only if considerably larger funds were available for carrying them out. He also considered that, since Unesco had to operate on a very limited budget, it would do better to concentrate on work which possibly had a closer bearing on its true mission. He accordingly proposed the deletion of the appropriations for the purposes referred to in paragraph 158.

(95) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) was astonished at the suggestion that certain subjects in paragraph 158 which had been essential elements in educational progress for the last fifty years, were not considered to be the concern of Unesco. Unesco had for the first time called in experts who had studied the ways of other countries. A lot could be done there at little cost.

(96) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) pointed out once again that, in tackling the question of educational development, Unesco should seek mainly to solve the administrative problems facing the various Member States, rather than to deal with technical questions or those of educational theory. He did not therefore greatly favour the activities mentioned in paragraph 158, and was prepared to second the French delegate's proposal that they be deleted.

(97) The CHAIRMAN then asked the Commission to vote on the French delegate's proposal that the suggested appropriations for the activities mentioned in paragraph 158 be deleted.

(98) The proposal was rejected by 30 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.

(99) Replying to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. CALO (Italy) stated that he did not wish for a vote on the proposal contained in document 8C/DR/79. All he hoped was that, when the time came, the suggestions made in that document would be taken into account.

(100) The Commission took note of Mr. Calo's desire.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/37: Promotion of Health Education

(101) The CHAIRMAN asked if the delegation of

Uruguay stood by its proposal; if so, a vote would be taken.

(102) Mr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) said that the proposal was on very broad lines and that it would be inappropriate to withdraw it, as it fitted in with proposals made by other delegations.

(103) Replying to Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon), Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) stated that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had recommended adoption of the proposal.

(104) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) drew attention to the recommendation by the Advisory Committee that the project which had no budgetary implications should be adopted.

(105) The proposal contained in document 8C/DR/37 was put to the vote and adopted by 34 in favour, none against and 8 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

# TWELFTH MEETING

*26 November 1951 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET, CHAPTER BY CHAPTER, AND SPECIAL REPORTS** (continued)

(1) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, in the General Committee that morning, the Secretariat had been asked to explain to the Administrative Commission, from time to time, what the financial situation was. Accordingly, as soon as the Programme and Budget Commission had finished its examination of each chapter, the Secretariat would report, at the next meeting, on the financial implications of the decisions taken, reserving the right to ask the Administrative Commission to approve such further cuts in expenditure as might be required to enable Unesco to work within the budget ceiling decided on in plenary session. In addition, the Secretariat might ask to be allowed to revert to any particular chapter after all the chapters had been considered by the Programme Commission.
(2) As regarded budget figures, $314,000 more would be required to hold the ninth session in New Delhi, $141,000 for the use of Russian at the Conference, $40,000 for the use of Spanish in the Executive Board, and $12,000 for the travel expenses of members of the Board. There would be a decrease in expenditure of $23,000 (established posts, Director-General's office, common service costs), so that, all in all, the Programme Commission would have to reduce expenditure, taking into account the Advisory Committee's recommendations and the draft resolutions submitted, by $222,937 - roughly, $223,000.
(3) So far, in the field of education, the additional expenditure decided on amounted to $8,000 and cuts to $2,900 - a net increase of $5,100.
(4) The Advisory Committee was recommending cuts to the extent of $218,946 and an increase in expenditure, on the basis of the resolutions submitted, of $86,367. Of those $218,946, roughly $18,000 were accounted for by the cuts made in the Director-General's office, the Bureau of the Comptroller, and in common service costs, so that the net decrease recommended was about $200,000. The net increase on the draft resolutions was $86,000.

(5) The CHAIRMAN considered that the procedure recommended was by far the best. The decisions to be made would be provisional only and the Commission would have a chance of going back to those questions after the budget had been examined as a whole.

**ITEM 8.4.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: EDUCATION** (continued)

(E) Rural training (paragraphs 160-162)

(6) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) asked the Secretariat to give some explanation of paragraph 161, for he did not see the point of the method proposed.
(7) Judging by experience at the Sirs-el-Layyan and Patzcuaro Centres, which had been established in rural districts to demonstrate modern methods in action and stimulate the local economy by a suitable programme of agricultural training, the new measures proposed did not seem really necessary.

(8) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) agreed with the views of the Lebanese delegate.
(9) With regard to rural teacher training, particularly in Latin America, she considered that preliminary studies of the areas in which they would work should be carried out, for conditions varied greatly. In certain areas of Latin America the Indian problem had to be considered; in others, farming was the main source of livelihood; in others cattle raising; and, in yet others, mining. The basis for the training of rural teachers should therefore be provided by studies of the various regions, carried out by the Latin American governments. Consideration should be given not only to those to be educated, but also to the influence the rural teachers might have in the communities where they worked.

(10) Mr. MARTI (El Salvador) considered that rural teacher training was Latin America's most urgent need in the field of education. He said that El Salvador could not at the moment make use of the fellowships granted to his country for study at Patzcuaro, because it had no posts to offer to those who had qualified in fundamental education.
(11) The delegate of El Salvador thought it undesirable to spend too much on experts and recommended making use of the services of the Pan American Union through its school, "Rubio", in Venezuela.

(12) Mr. BARDALES (Honduras) considered that the problem of the supply of rural teachers, 80% of whom held no diploma, had an effect on rural primary education in Latin America.
(13) In order to give rural primary schools in Latin America qualified teachers, it was urgently necessary for Unesco to take measures to encourage Member States to set up rural teacher training colleges, and, in the countries where there were already such colleges, to increase the number of teachers trained in them.

(14) He also considered that rural teachers, who had to work in a very difficult environment, should be better paid, and that they should receive more, or at least not less, in salary than teachers in towns. He believed that something had already been done in that respect in Panama and Uruguay.
(15) He thought it necessary for the improvement of rural teaching that measures be taken to provide professional training for unqualified primary teachers by means of correspondence courses run by the rural teacher training colleges; they could send out their teaching material in printed form every month and might also employ staff to visit rural areas from time to time and give the teachers direct practical tests which would make good any shortcomings in the correspondence courses. He said that Mexico already had an institution of that kind; that Honduras had had such a service for the past two years, and that Costa Rica was proposing to organize a similar one with Unesco's technical assistance.

(16) Mrs. REINOSO DE RODRIGUEZ (Philippines) said that paragraph 160 was extremely relevant to the needs of the underdeveloped countries. It was perhaps difficult for highly industrialized countries to understand the peculiar needs of the underdeveloped ones. The rural teacher in the latter was an exceedingly important person in the village community, he must be a community leader, general adviser, banker, agricultural expert and, on occasion, even entertainer.

(17) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) thought that the discussions would be shorter and would proceed more smoothly if the Secretariat were given an opportunity of answering questions as soon as they were raised.

(18) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, while the rural teacher in underdeveloped countries might not be quite the jack-of-all-trades suggested by the previous speaker, he nevertheless had to have a sympathetic understanding of the problems facing those who were trying to improve village life in general. Experience had shown that social workers in the village needed the confidence of the village teacher, who therefore needed some training in how to approach the more general problems of the community.
(19) The Secretariat had discussed the matter with the observer from the Organization of American States, who had agreed that the proposal implied no rivalry with the model rural college established by that Organization. In any case, there were other parts of the world which were less fortunate and needed Unesco's assistance.

(20) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) said that his country had had a rural teacher training centre for the past seven years, and would be pleased to put its services at the disposal of Unesco for the purpose of co-operating in the work.
(21) He reminded the meeting that Mexico had approved the agreement concluded between OAS and Unesco with regard to the Regional Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro.

(22) A proposal of the delegation of El Salvador to delete the appropriations for paragraph 162 was not supported. The whole of section E, "Rural Teacher Training", was unanimously approved.

(F) The school curriculum (paragraphs 163-167) and documents 8C/DR/82, 8C/DR/84 and 8C/DR/93

(23) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (document 8C/BUD/1) thought that, before an International Advisory Committee on the School Curriculum was set up, as proposed in paragraph 166, a careful study of the problems involved should be made in collaboration with the appropriate international bodies.
(24) The Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget therefore recommended that the international committee should not be set up until 1956 - thus freeing the funds set aside for that purpose for the year 1955.

(25) Mr. CALO (Italy) thought the idea of setting up an International Advisory Committee on the School Curriculum praiseworthy, although its aims seemed rather ambitious and complicated.
(26) While in some Member States nothing had yet been done on school curricula, in many others an established tradition had to be taken into account, and, there, the solving of the delicate problems raised would depend mainly on the countries concerned. Moreover, the problems themselves were not the same in different parts of the globe. It would therefore be preferable, instead of setting up one committee of ten, to set up several small committees of three or four, each responsible for a group of States with similar and comparable cultures. Naturally, those committees should provide help for Member States only at the latter's request, and should deal only with major questions that had a bearing on Unesco's basic concerns.
(27) Mr. Calo said that in recent years the tendency everywhere had been to cut down the number of subjects taught, and it was a matter of urgency for Unesco to consider how the great, underlying principles of its work could be introduced into the schools while the curricula were being lightened.
(28) If the Organization did not first make a careful study of the question, it might find the Member States unwilling to co-operate. The Italian delegation, therefore, wished to lay particular stress on the second paragraph of its resolution (document 8C/DR/82).

(29) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the idea of creating an advisory committee on the school curriculum had been his own.
(30) During his first few months with Unesco, he had been greatly struck by the multitude of unco-ordinated proposals submitted by the various departments for the inclusion of extra subjects in the school curriculum. It had seemed to him that the only way to harmonize such recommendations and to ensure that the curriculum was not grossly overloaded would be to set up an international committee of experts.
(31) Unesco sometimes sent experts to Member States, at their request, to advise on school curricula. In the past, those experts had tended to make recommendations on the basis of their own experience, with

the result that there had been a remarkable lack of uniformity. The need was clear for somebody to lay down general rules which might be adapted to local conditions and to the economic resources of governments. Such a body would in no way impose any rigidly uniform views.
(32) Such a committee could be consulted by Member States on their particular problems. It would consider the problem of school curricula not from a regional, but from a world-wide point of view. Its experience would benefit highly developed countries as much as underdeveloped ones.

(33) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), commenting on the Italian proposal, said that a committee of a regional character would not cost less than a committee of the type proposed, since, under the proposal, it would have more members than the ten proposed by the Secretariat.
(34) Nor was he sure that there was any point in approaching the problem from a regional point of view. There were neighbouring countries with very different educational requirements. He therefore preferred the original suggestion of a committee, universal in outlook, whose advice would be available to Member States if asked for.

(35) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that his country ventured to think its experience in connexion with school curricula was fairly reliable. He considered it useless to alter curricula without a careful revision of the objects which they were intended to serve and of the structure of the system within which they functioned. He therefore thought the move to be a trifle over-ambitious, and felt that Unesco was not yet in a position to undertake the work in the form proposed.
(36) He warmly supported the Executive Board's proposal, and considered it most important to have a programme in which Unesco's Department of Education and the National Commissions should take part. Once that work, which might take years, was achieved, the International Advisory Committee on the School Curriculum could take action; that body would naturally be intended solely to make general recommendations, and he therefore asked that the International Committee should deal mainly with the techniques for working out school curricula.
(37) He thought the Executive Board's proposal that the budget item be deleted for 1955 was well advised. However, it was proposed that the $26,530, set aside for 1955, be used, if not entirely, at least partly, as contributions to help Member States to carry out the preliminary work properly.
(38) He considered that paragraph 163 was not quite accurate, when it said: "Hardly less significant to the extension of school education than the problem of teacher training is the group of problems related to the curriculum". The truth was, not that problems related to the curriculum were as important as teacher training, but that reform of the curriculum necessitated reform of teacher training. The problems were allied and could not be separated.

(39) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) wondered whether the Secretariat had appreciated all the implications of the huge and most interesting project in question.
(40) School curricula and educational systems were closely linked and, while the problems of the different countries had much in common, their solutions depended entirely on the special social and economic conditions.
(41) It should therefore rest primarily with the country concerned to initiate such reforms, rendered necessary by the ever-increasing speed of social development.
(42) To do so, a country could obtain all the requisite information from the Education Clearing House or, at its own expense, send missions of experts to the country or countries whose school system and curricula interested it most.
(43) Again, if it asked for direct assistance from Unesco, the experts sent by the Organization would have to brief themselves very thoroughly before going out, and, in any case, should remain in the country longer than a few months if they wanted to achieve anything really worth while.
(44) For those reasons, the French delegation regarded an International Advisory Committee on the School Curriculum as unnecessary. Moreover, its functions were defined only in the vaguest way, and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget itself had been very cautious in its recommendation.
(45) Failing some reassurance from the Secretariat, the French delegation would suggest that the proposed appropriations for paragraph 167 be deleted.

(46) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) spoke with the authority of a practising primary teacher in moving adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendation. He was extremely sceptical of the ability of such an expert body to offer advice to national educational authorities. A long stay in a country was needed to grasp its educational problems.
(47) He would suggest that, if the Advisory Committee's recommendation were adopted, the Secretariat should go into the matter in greater detail, so that some more definite statement, accompanied by fuller plans, could be made to the next Conference.

(48) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Commission had three proposals before it:
(1) A proposal of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, seconded by the delegations of New Zealand and El Salvador, for deleting a part of the proposed appropriations;
(2) A proposal of the French delegate for deleting the whole appropriation,
(3) A proposal of the Italian delegate, seconded by the Chilean delegation, for changing the procedure for carrying out the suggested measures.
(49) The Chairman then asked the delegates who had applied to speak whether they had new proposals to put before the Commission, or whether they merely wished to speak on the proposals already submitted.

(50) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon), moving the amendment submitted by his delegation (document 8C/DR/93) to paragraph 166, said that his Government welcomed the idea of a study being made both of the primary and of the secondary school curriculum.
(51) In Ceylon, there had been a tendency, during the previous twenty or thirty years, to pile one subject on the other in the school curriculum. In addition,

practical subjects (weaving, woodwork, basket-making, etc.) had been included, to meet the charge that the education provided was of too academic a character. Difficulties had been encountered in co-ordinating those various subjects.
(52) There was, too, a language problem; there was a lack of textbooks in the national languages(Sinhalese and Tamil) in which instruction was given up to the ninth year of schooling.
(53) The whole question of the curriculum was being studied at the national level; a special committee had been appointed, and a thorough investigation would be made. To that end, the co-operation of other countries would be very valuable.
(54) He agreed with the view of the Advisory Committee that, before such an advisory committee on the school curriculum was set up, the matter should be taken up with the National Commissions. Nevertheless, he was against postponing the problem for another year, and a fortiori strongly opposed the French proposal to drop paragraphs 163-167.
(55) His delegation was proposing that five regional seminars be held, made up of representatives of National Commissions, and that they be called upon to submit their reports by March 1956, after which it would be possible to go ahead with setting up the advisory committee suggested.

(56) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) observed that, if the Commission endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendation to postpone the setting up of the International Advisory Committee until 1956, the Committee would need to meet only once, since the questions it was to deal with could not be expected to develop very rapidly.

(57) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) was in favour of the establishment of an International Advisory Committee on the School Curriculum as set forth in paragraph 166.

(58) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) said that, according to some speakers, the problem was so big as to need postponement. He, on the other hand, felt it was very urgent and required careful study. There was a need for further investigation by Unesco on new lines.
(59) The word "curriculum" was being taken in too narrow a sense. The problem was not just to fill a child's head with facts, but to allow him to grow up in the right sort of atmosphere.
(60) He was therefore in favour of taking up the problem, although he was prepared to admit that the project might be postponed for one year in order that it might be given further thought.

(61) Mr. CLEGG (United Kingdom) thought that the French proposal to jettison the work already done in favour of youth work was equivalent to sawing off the branch on which one was sitting.
(62) The success achieved by youth work was largely attributable to good teacher training and to good curricula. Youth work, too, if it was to be really successful, had to be voluntary. He would earnestly ask the delegate of France not to press his point.

(63) Mr. STANKOVIC (Yugoslavia) thought that, with the social and economic changes that had taken place, school curricula no longer met contemporary needs and should therefore be revised. Moreover, curricula needed to be given a new slant if they were to serve the noble aims of international understanding and co-operation. A difficult and complicated study was necessary, which Unesco could carry out only with the collaboration of experts from other agencies and the National Commissions.
(64) The Yugoslav delegation could support neither the French nor the Italian proposal, but would vote for the setting up of the committee in 1956, or preferably in 1957.

(65) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), explaining the budgetary implications of the various proposals made, said that the French proposal to drop the project would mean a saving of $53,000 over the following two years. Adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, to the effect that the 1955 meeting should be abandoned, would save $26,000 (cost of meeting and cost of studies). Adoption of the Italian proposal would mean increasing the number of members in the committee, or an extra expense of $37,000 over two years.
(66) The proposal by Ceylon for regional seminars during the first year would be very expensive if Unesco had to finance them. Some $80,000 would be required. It might be better if National Commissions convened meetings and appealed to Unesco for aid; the money saved by abandoning the 1955 meeting might in that case be used to assist them.
(67) The Belgian suggestion that the committee meet but once a year would save $18,530 over two years, which sum could either be considered a net saving or be used to help pay the cost of national seminars.

(68) In reply to a question raised by Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon), he pointed out that the International Conference on Public Education, mentioned in paragraph 166, was a joint IBE - Unesco Conference, the subject for which had been chosen by a joint committee. It had merely been suggested in the programme that one of the subjects for that conference in 1957-58 might be primary and secondary school curricula. It did not follow that the conference would not meet if the paragraph were dropped.

(69) The CHAIRMAN observed that the French proposal for deletion of paragraphs 163-167 had not been seconded.

(70) The Advisory Committee's recommendation, in favour of deferring the establishment of the committee for one year, was adopted by 41 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

(71) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) asked for a vote on his amendment.

(72) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) seconded the proposal by Ceylon, on the grounds that it encouraged activity by National Commissions, of which there had recently been criticism.

(73) The proposal by Ceylon (document 8C/DR/93) was put to the vote and adopted by 26 votes to 19, with 7 abstentions.

(74) The CHAIRMAN said that the Italian delegation would like a vote to be taken on the draft resolution it had submitted (document 8C/DR/82).

(75) Mr. CALO (Italy) reminded the Commission that his delegation attached great importance to reconciling the introduction of new subjects with the general lightening of the school curriculum. He therefore asked the Commission to take a decision on the second paragraph of the draft resolution.
(76) As the Italian delegate's proposal was not seconded, it was not put to the vote.

(77) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, in accordance with the amendment by Ceylon just adopted, it seemed probable that the report from the five regions would reach Unesco in March 1956 and, since the report by the Advisory Committee on Curricula had to be ready for the Conference in November 1956, it was pointless (and might well be impossible) to have two meetings of the Advisory Committee in 1956. The ideal time for the Committee to meet would be in May or June, so that its report could be prepared and distributed well in advance of the Conference. The cost would be $9,200.

(78) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was doubtful about the powers of such a committee and the vague way in which the use to be made of the funds released under paragraph 167 had been defined.
(79) The French delegation proposed to revert to the item at a plenary meeting.

(80) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) said that, in accordance with what had just been said by the Director-General, he would move that the Committee hold only one meeting in 1956.

(81) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) seconded.

(82) The United States proposal to the effect that the Advisory Committee on Curricula meet only once in 1956 was adopted by 54 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

(G) Improvement of school education in certain fields (paragraphs 168-173)

(83) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) was glad to be able to report that, just before the Conference, the Director-General had signed an agreement with ILO delimiting the respective spheres of the two organizations as regards vocational education and training. There had been discussions within the Secretariat (although no proposals had yet been submitted to the Governing Body of ILO or to the Executive Board) on the possibility of making the conference referred to in paragraph 169 a joint one. The ILO Secretariat had informed Unesco that the cost of so doing had been underestimated. For that reason it would be well to keep the original budget estimate.

(84) Mr. GARBARINO ISLAS (International Labour Organization) recalled that Unesco's Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 made provision for the holding of a conference, in collaboration with ILO, on vocational and technical education in schools, for the Arab States of the Middle East. He thought such a meeting would be well-timed because those countries were going through the transition from an agricultural to an industrial social structure. He pointed out that, in an exchange of letters between the Directors-General of Unesco and ILO, both had agreed upon the importance of holding such a conference jointly.
(85) He added that a meeting of representatives of the Secretariats of Unesco, ILO and FAO had been held, at which a preliminary draft agenda for the conference had been drawn up.
(86) He believed that the proposed conference would be an excellent instance of the collaboration which should exist between the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations.
(87) Lastly, he was pleased to report that the Governing Body of ILO, at its meeting in Rome, had approved the proposal presented by the Director-General concerning the Conference of Arab States in the Middle East.

(88) Section G was put to the vote and unanimously approved.

(H) Evaluation of national pilot projects in pre-school education (paragraphs 174 and 175)

(89) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) reminded the meeting that Unesco had made clear its intention of promoting the development of pre-school, primary, secondary and vocational education, by technical co-operation to enable Member States to solve their most urgent problems in those fields of education. In addition to setting up educational establishments of a new kind, it was urgently necessary to provide means of reforming the traditional educational establishments in Member States. Experience had shown that, to achieve such aims, schools or experimental centres should be set up to deal with both regular and out-of-school education
(90) He suggested that Unesco include experiments in teaching in its education programme in order to achieve the following aims: (a) the improvement of experimental teaching bodies in Member States; (b) the establishment of new experimental teaching centres in countries which desired them; and (c) the concentration of efforts for setting up regional experimental teaching centres in important areas of the world.
(91) A permanent service dealing with that kind of problem should be maintained in order to fulfil those requirements. It would have to give information on the following: the position of experimental teaching; aspects of teaching which, in every country, were suitable for pilot projects; plans for the creation of regional centres. He furthermore proposed that the Director-General be authorized to study the possibility of giving such a service a permanent place in the budget for coming years.

(92) Mr. CLEGG (United Kingdom) said that the success of an evaluation scheme (referred to in

paragraph 174) depended on who carried it out. Would the Secretariat be the sole judge of the success or failure of the pilot project?

(93) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that two outside persons, possibly an educational expert and a social scientist from different countries, would be asked to undertake the task.

(94) Section (H) was unanimously adopted.

(I) Developing the teaching of languages of wide communication (paragraphs 176-178) and document 8C/DR/39

(95) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) mentioned that the Advisory Committee had suggested (document 8C/BUD/1, page 6) that the proposal submitted by the Uruguayan delegation be given further consideration by the States concerned.

(96) Mrs. BOLLO (Uruguay) said that her country had proposed a study of the use of Spanish and English in the Americas because it thought a knowledge of those two languages to be necessary for better international understanding among the countries of the American continent.
(97) She recalled that in North America, and particularly in the United States, Spanish departments had been set up in almost every university, under the control of eminent men from Spain and South America.
(98) A knowledge of both languages would confer considerable benefits in both North and South America. For example, if the peoples of Latin America had a better knowledge of English, they could improve their mastery of the sciences. On the other hand, a knowledge of Spanish would help to give the English-speaking countries of North America a fuller understanding of the countries of Latin America.

(99) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that, while the Board recognized the value of the proposal, it had decided, as it would involve large-scale outside consultations, not to recommend adoption of the proposal for the next two years at least.

(100) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) and Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) supported the Uruguayan proposal.

(101) The Uruguayan proposal (document 8C/DR/39) was put to the vote and rejected by 11 votes to 9, with 23 abstentions.

(102) Section (I) was thereupon unanimously adopted.

(J) Textbooks and teaching materials (paragraphs 179-185) and document 8C/DR/75

(103) The CHAIRMAN, noting that the Advisory Committee had not yet communicated its findings on draft resolution DR/68 submitted by the delegation of Honduras, suggested that the Commission postpone consideration of that question and asked the delegate of Honduras to get into touch with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

(104) Approved.

(105) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission), after reading out the draft resolution submitted by the Italian delegation, said that the Advisory Committee had not had time to study that question, nor, generally speaking, the drafts contained in document 8C/DR/64 and later documents.

(106) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) confessed that the Secretariat had been a little puzzled by the Italian resolution. It was suggested that the Secretariat should print two pamphlets. That would cost some $2,700. The proposal also suggested a small meeting of experts. Would the Secretariat have to send representatives? The point was not clear.
(107) It was suggested that the same work could be done at less cost. For the reasons given above, he was inclined to doubt that.

(108) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) moved adoption of the text appearing in the Director-General's programme.

(109) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to postpone consideration of the question until it had received the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

(110) Approved.

(K) Teaching about the United Nations and human rights (paragraphs 186-192) and documents 8C/DR/28, 8C/DR/55 and 8C/DR/80

(111) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee had recommended that the proposal submitted by the Uruguayan delegation be rejected.

(112) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) recalled that Uruguay had presented a proposal in the form of a draft resolution relating to teaching about the United Nations and human rights.
(113) She considered that, since 1945, the Charter of the United Nations had represented the best hope of the human race and that thenceforward its provisions were the best guide for the preservation of peace. She therefore considered it essential that all peoples should be acquainted with it if better international understanding was to be achieved.
(114) She also thought it necessary to spread knowledge about human rights. She reminded the meeting that all human rights entailed duties, and said that, if those rights were maintained and suitably publicized, there would be no room for the appearance of men who, knowing nothing about them, might impose a tyrannical rule upon many peoples.

(115) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that, since the proposal had no budgetary implications, the Executive Board recommended its adoption.

(116) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) and Mr. FRANCOIS (France) supported the proposal.

(117) The Uruguayan resolution (document 8C/DR/38) was adopted by 24 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

(118) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out draft resolution DR/55 submitted by the Uruguayan delegation and said that the Advisory Committee recommended that the first paragraph be adopted. In its remarks on the Social Sciences chapter, the Committee had added that it also recommended adoption of sub-paragraph (a), but classed the study only in category 3. There were no budgetary implications.

(119) The CHAIRMAN proposed taking a vote on the first paragraph and postponing consideration of the rest until the Social Sciences chapter was discussed.

(120) Approved.

(121) With reference to DR/80, the CHAIRMAN, in the absence of comments from the Advisory Committee, suggested that the Italian draft resolution be referred back to the Committee.

(122) Mr. CALO (Italy) said that, as the project had no budgetary implications, it could be discussed straight away.

(123) The CHAIRMAN observed that the resolution began with the words: "Contracts will be concluded .....".

(124) Mr. VITO (Italy) then explained that the Italian delegation suggested deleting the international seminars, which seemed unlikely to make any constructive contribution.

(125) The main thing was to interest the teaching profession in the problem. Unesco had already approved substantial subventions to a great many international organizations in the field of education, which could be commissioned to carry out the work.

(126) The Italian delegation thought one of the best methods would be to organize competitions in the different countries, with prizes which would enable the winners to write and publish works that would be of great use to their colleagues. The necessary funds for the prizes could be taken out of the subventions already granted.

(127) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) failed to see what the Italian delegation expected to achieve with its proposal. It seemed to him that the original plan prepared by the Secretariat would achieve the very aims that Italy desired to attain, for a modest outlay. He had not grasped the reference to competitions, for it was impossible for the Secretariat to organize competitions or to award prizes without budgetary implications.

(128) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) considered that the Italian delegation's proposal was most interesting and worthy of closer study, and accordingly asked for it to be referred back to the Advisory Committee.

(129) Agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p. m.

# THIRTEENTH MEETING

*26 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: EDUCATION (continued)**

Teaching of the Charter of the United Nations and the Constitutions of the Specialized Agencies (document 8C/DR/38)

(1) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) wished to submit an amendment to the resolution adopted at the previous meeting, which he had discussed with the delegate of Uruguay and which would enable his delegation to support the resolution. He proposed that the word "encourage" should be substituted for the word "cause"; the Federal Government of the United States of America had no control over the school curriculum.

(2) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) was very pleased at the support that the United States of America was giving her country in its great scheme.

(3) Mr. ARSENAULT (Canada) supported the amendment proposed by the United States delegate. In his country too the Federal Government had no control of education, and he had been obliged to abstain from voting on the resolution, in spite of the importance which his Government attached to teaching about the United Nations.

(4) The CHAIRMAN noted the Canadian and United States delegations' approval of the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/38, adopted at the previous meeting, subject to that slight change in wording.

(5) He recalled that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had been asked to consider certain draft

resolutions which that Committee had been unable to study, its report having been drawn up before they were received.

(6) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Chairman's request concerning additional draft resolutions would place the Advisory Committee in an awkward situation. The only item remaining on the Committee's agenda was the remodelled programme, and it would be extremely difficult to reopen discussion of the 1955-56 programme. He proposed that any draft resolutions presented too late to be discussed by the Advisory Committee should be handled by the Commission.

(7) The CHAIRMAN saw no alternative to adopting the suggestion just put forward by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, leaving it to delegations to submit draft resolutions not included in the Committee's report during the meeting; he added, however, that, where there were budgetary implications, such proposals could not be admitted; where there were none they could be introduced orally in the course of the discussion.

(8) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) reminded the meeting that the Conference had originally had two separate Commissions, a Programme Commission and a Budget Commission; they had been amalgamated into a single Commission, the Programme and Budget Commission, which, in his view, was competent to deal with all such questions; it would be a pity to deprive the central Commission of the Conference of the right to take up any questions on which it had not been possible to obtain the opinion of the Advisory Committee.

(9) Mr. CALO (Italy) had genuinely believed that it was in order for him to propose amendments which, taken as a whole, far from entailing additional expenditure, would result in savings on certain items. The Italian delegation was ready to withdraw any draft amendment or even to remain silent throughout the discussion. Mr. Calo mentioned, in particular, one amendment submitted by the Italian delegation at the previous meeting which had recommended the cancellation of two meetings planned by the Secretariat. He ended by asking the Commission to note that the Italian delegation was abandoning its draft amendments, and that it was unnecessary to take a vote.

(10) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) was extremely grateful to the delegate of Italy: it was not easy to renounce projects on which much thought and effort had been expended.

(11) The Commission was making rather slow progress in its work and much time had been given to the discussion of matters not directly related to the programme. Unesco existed solely to execute its programme, and that was the subject the Commission should discuss. He pledged his full co-operation, no matter how many extra or late meetings might prove necessary.

(12) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) hoped that a more satisfactory method of dealing with draft resolution could be found before the next General Conference. With regard to the problem of proposals submitted after the prescribed date, a distinction had to be made between those suggesting changes in the proposed programme and budget and those introducing new items. It would be correct for the Commission to discuss the former, since all delegations had the right to submit modifications: and it would be helpful if they could be given to the Secretariat in writing. The latter proposals must be ruled out of order.

(13) The CHAIRMAN felt that the best method the Commission could adopt would be to consider only those draft resolutions already examined by the Advisory Committee, leaving delegations to submit further proposals in the way suggested by the delegate of Denmark. To allay the anxieties voiced by the Egyptian delegate, he made it clear that the Commission was still entirely free to discuss, accept or reject proposals of any kind.

(14) The Egyptian delegate agreed to the proposed procedure.

**REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (PART IV): EXAMINATION OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE EXPERT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND CO-OPERATION**
(documents 8C/BUD/3 and 8C/DIV/80)

(15) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Advisory Committee had examined the proposals of the Expert Committee in the light of their possible effect on Unesco's programme and budget. As a result, the Advisory Committee had, in document 8C/DIV/80, suggested modifications to certain of its original recommendations to the Programme and Budget Commission. He proposed that discussion should, for the time being, be limited to that part of the report.

(J) Textbooks and teaching materials (paragraphs 179-185)

(16) Section (J) was approved.

(K) Teaching about the United Nations and human rights (paragraphs 186-192)

(17) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina), referring to paragraph 190, said that it would seem advisable that the documents which were to be published in French and English to provide teachers with systematic information about the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies, should also be published in Spanish, which was an official language of the General Conference. In that way the work of translation would be shortened and teachers would receive the documents with less delay.

(18) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), in reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, said that it would be a comparatively simple matter to

add Spanish to the two languages concerned. The proposal, however, was not to print the documents, but to supply them in stencilled form, leaving Member States to publish and print in quantity.

(19) Section K was adopted.

(L) Scheme of Co-ordinated experimental activities in education for international understanding and co-operation (paragraphs 193-196)

(20) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) reminded the Commission that, according to the report of the Advisory Committee (document 8C/BUD/3), the report of the experts (document 8C/DIV/80) appeared to place the work in the priority category, whereas the Advisory Committee maintained its previous decision, placing it in category 2.

(21) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Expert Committee had requested high priority for the activity. The Advisory Committee, on the other hand, had approved the activity but made no recommendation on priority.

(22) The CHAIRMAN remarked that it was permissible for the Commission to reconsider the proposal, which was not one of those to be considered only if funds were available in the budget.

(23) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) supported the views that had been expressed by the Director-General and the Director of the Department of Education at the previous meeting concerning the school curriculum. Unesco must respect national sovereignty on that question, and the Secretariat should guard against appearing to impose a Unesco doctrine. Unesco's ideas should be advocated because they were sound, constructive and acceptable but not imposed as a Unesco or government directive.

(24) Mr. ROBERTSON (United Kingdom) found the paragraphs in question acceptable and referred to experiments being conducted in English and Welsh schools. Unfortunately, work was hampered by lack of films and illustrative material on other countries. He urged delegates, instead of making speeches on the importance of international understanding, to direct their attention to the production of material in their countries which would promote knowledge and understanding in other nations.

(25) Mr. MORITO (Japan), who had been a Japanese member of the Expert Committee, strongly supported the project. Peaceful aims of mankind could not be fostered by emancipation from illiteracy and diffusion of technical knowledge and skills alone; nor did fundamental education as such lay the foundations of peace. It was essential to develop international understanding and international co-operation in the younger generation.
(26) In the case of Japan, for example, education had been compulsory for half a century; but although long before the war the rate of school attendance had reached nearly one hundred per cent and illiteracy had almost disappeared, the love of peace had not increased proportionately. Education in international understanding was therefore necessary as much in countries with free compulsory education as in underdeveloped countries.
(27) Educators were still seeking effective methods, and the pilot project outlined in the paragraphs under discussion was precisely the kind of action required. Moreover it was an excellent example of the co-operation between Unesco and Member States which was to be promoted in Unesco's future programmes. Japan was participating in the scheme; four schools had already been selected and the Government had allocated $5,000 for the current year. The people concerned with the scheme, of whom he himself was one, were looking for help and guidance from Unesco.
(28) He re-emphasized the importance of the project and asked that it should be given the highest possible priority in Unesco's programme.

(29) Section (L) was approved.

(30) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on resolution 1.211, subject to the amendments already made, and in particular, to the addition of the following phrase:
"... due regard being had to the cultural individuality of each country or territory".

(31) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) mentioned that he had the previous day submitted a proposal for an addition to resolution 1.211, asking the Director-General to urge Member States to devote at least one-twentieth of their annual budget to the promotion of free and compulsory education.

(32) The delegate of Uruguay seconded that proposal.

(33) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the original proposal mentioned no specific proportion. Whether or not the Haitian delegate's amendment were included, the resolution would have no budgetary implications for Unesco.

(34) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) had a comment to make on the wording of the resolution. He did not think it fitting that Unesco should make recommendations of that sort to Member States; the recommendation in question seemed to imply that they did not set aside such a proportion of their budget for education, whereas in fact most of them devoted a very much higher percentage of their resources to it.

(35) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) did not agree with the Lebanese delegate. Unesco had thought it right to put forward suggestions about free education to its Member States because it knew that such facilities were not provided by them all; such general suggestions might remain a dead letter, but, if States were asked to devote not less than one-twentieth of their resources to free education, Unesco would more easily make an impression on them and help to solve the important problem of free schooling.

(36) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the amendment proposed by the delegate of Haiti, seconded by the delegate of Uruguay.

(37) The proposal was rejected by 30 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions.

(38) The amended text of resolution 1.211 was then put to the vote, and it was adopted unanimously.

(39) Resolution 1.212 was also adopted unanimously.

(M) Technical aid to Member States for the development of school education (paragraphs 197-213)

(40) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) pointed out that Unesco's work in that field was conducted at three levels: the international level (annual IBE-Unesco Conference); the regional level (regional conferences) and the national level, when Member States asked Unesco for help. The emphasis in the programme for 1955-56 was on the needs of Member States, and Mgr Maroun was sorry that a practical form of action which was certain to produce good results had been placed under the "higher budgetary level", that meant that the Organization would be unable to help Member States unless, by an unexpected stroke of luck, its budget was increased; Mgr Maroun did not think such a policy was altogether worthy of Unesco. Seeing that for once - with the agreement of the United Kingdom delegation - a higher budget had been approved, Mgr Maroun urged that the activity in question, which was so important to Unesco, be transferred to the "present budgetary level".

(41) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) said that the project was one of the more important parts of Unesco's programme, and one on which any additional funds might usefully be spent.

(42) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed deletion of the word "technical" in all paragraphs where it appeared, not only in the interests of brevity and economy, but because aid from Unesco should be many-sided and not merely technical.

(43) The Director-General accepted the proposal.

(44) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) proposed deletion of the words "higher level", in accordance with the views expressed by many delegates and the Director-General's statement that there was no difference between projects at the higher and lower levels.

(45) The Director-General agreed to delete the words wherever they appeared.

(46) Mr. HOUGHTON (Observer for the British Caribbean Group) said that the wording of paragraph 209 implied that conferences had only been held in the areas listed, which was not the case.

(47) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) proposed deletion of the words "that is" in the second line of the paragraph and substitution of the words "for example".

(48) Agreed.

(49) Section (M) was approved.

(N) Assistance to national regional seminars on school education for international understanding and co-operation (paragraphs 214-216)

(50) Approved.

(51) Resolution 1.213 was adopted subject to deletion of the word "technical".

Project 1.22: Emergency educational assistance

(A) Assistance to Palestine refugees (paragraphs 223-237)

(52) Replying to a question from Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon), who had asked at what stage in its work the Commission could expect to do away with the distinction between the higher budgetary level and the normal budget, the CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been agreed that there was no real differentiation between the two budgetary levels.

(53) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) recalled that the Director-General had informed the Committee of a request he had received from the Director-General of UNRWA for three additional staff members. The Committee had expressed interest in the request and left the initiative to the Director-General.

(54) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) said that his country was extremely grateful to the General Conference for the assistance it had voted in the past for the Palestine refugees, who were still suffering from poverty and disease. He also thanked UNRWA and the members of the Unesco Secretariat who had helped in the work. He regretted, however, that Unesco's contribution to that project for the next two years was to be reduced; the increase in Unesco's budget and in the Organization's responsibilities in the project, and the rising number of children of school age, merited an increase rather than a reduction.

(55) Had the report of the working party set up in Jerusalem been distributed to Member States, they would, he felt sure, have realized the urgent needs and shortcomings of the programme. It was stated in paragraph 226 that free education was now available for all; in fact, Unesco and UNRWA schools housed only eight per cent of the refugee population. Moreover, the UNRWA report showed that education was often given in poor accommodation, with inadequate equipment and by untrained teachers. In addition, the five per cent of primary school enrolment which it was proposed under paragraph 230 to admit to secondary schools was too low. He also disagreed with the statement in paragraph 231 that it was easier for skilled or semi-skilled workers to become economically independent than for holders of secondary school diplomas. In Jordan no holder of a secondary school diploma was unemployed.

(56) Any programme with which Unesco was associated must be exemplary in practice and must be carried out in accordance with Unesco's recommendations and resolutions. He moved that the budgetary allocation for 1953-54 be maintained and

that the increase of $45,000 over the allocation proposed for 1955-56 be used partly to cover the $25,000 for the three additional posts already referred to and partly to provide programme specialists with the necessary materials and equipment.

(57) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) pointed out that the Advisory Committee's approval of the proposed three additional posts had been conditional on the submission of a formal proposal by the Director-General and on funds made available by reductions in other parts of the programme.

(58) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) considered that the part of the programme in question was, for many reasons, a true Unesco activity rather than one carried out by Member States with Unesco's assistance. Unesco had in fact taken the lead in 1948 in helping the Palestine refugees and had renewed its assistance in each succeeding year. After adding his thanks to those of the delegate of Jordan, Mgr Maroun pointed out to the Director-General that he was the first to cut out of the programme an activity designed to help refugees - a form of work to which his predecessors had attributed great importance. He urged the Director-General to reconsider once more the request made by UNRWA and supported by the delegate of Jordan.

(59) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that facilities for schools had increased remarkably during the past two years and aid was now being provided at the rate of some millions of dollars annually. Because financial grants were being made by UNRWA and because Unesco needed funds for other important work, it had seemed wiser for Unesco to limit its assistance to the most important posts. It had been understood that UNRWA was agreeable to the arrangement proposed in 8C/5, but now it appears that UNRWA believes the implementation of the principle will require Unesco to pay the salaries of additional personnel. He had accordingly agreed to ask the Conference whether it wished to vote additional funds for that purpose.
(60) He was willing to support the delegate of Jordan's proposal if the General Conference would decide where the funds could be found; but he wished to point out that one of the most likely places would be under paragraph 230.

(61) Mr. KHADRA (Saudi-Arabia) wished to pay tribute to Unesco, UNRWA and the people in the field for the work being done to combat ignorance and illiteracy among the refugees. He deeply regretted that, in spite of the progress that was being made, it had been decided to reduce the budgetary allocation. For the following reasons, he proposed that it should be increased.
(62) First, a great number of people formerly possessing liquid assets had now come to the end of their resources and were eligible for assistance.
(63) Secondly, the birth rate was high, and school facilities should be expanded to meet it.
(64) Thirdly, Unesco's budget for 1955-56 was larger than for 1953-54.
(65) He had been told that the Director-General's original proposal had been to reduce the budgetary allocation by one-half and that he had only modified it as a result of strong representations from the Director of UNRWA. He could not understand the reasons for any reduction, and warmly supported the delegate of Jordan's proposal for an increase.
(66) He asked whether the statement in paragraph 226 implied that every child of school age was now receiving education. With regard to paragraph 230, the opportunities provided by the admission of 5 per cent of primary school enrolment to secondary schools, and the offer of university grants to 5 per cent of refugees enrolled in secondary schools were quite inadequate. He also questioned the trend indicated in paragraph 231 and hoped that the importance of a balanced education would be borne in mind.
(67) In conclusion, he drew attention to the recent changes in the technical assistance policy of the Foreign Operation Administration, which was now giving financial assistance to universities and educational centres in underdeveloped areas, five million dollars being allocated to the American University in Beirut. He proposed that the Director-General should endeavour to negotiate agreements with the Foreign Operation Administration or the American University in Beirut for the provision of fellowships for the refugees.

(68) Following a question by the CHAIRMAN and an explanation by the delegate of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, it was agreed that the Director, Department of Education should work out the financial details and submit them to the Commission.

(69) Mr. PRATT (Australia) supported the project and sympathized with the proposal of the delegate of Jordan, but asked whether a refusal by Unesco to provide the funds would mean the suppression of the activities, or whether the funds might be provided by UNRWA.

(70) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the request from UNRWA would mean the addition of three posts to the four referred to in paragraph 233 and the cessation of any cash contributions. The cost of the three additional posts would amount to about $27,000 in 1955 and about $27,500 in 1956. With regard to the delegate of Australia's question, the problem was one of principle rather than finance, since, if UNRWA had to provide the money, it could only do so by the curtailment of other educational activities.

(71) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the delegate of Jordan's proposal to restore the allocation to the 1953-54 level would involve additional sums of $44,060 in 1955 and $43,095 in 1956, or a total amount of approximately $87,000 (including the three additional posts) over and above the budgetary amount proposed for the 1955-56 period.

(72) Mr. SIDDIQI (Pakistan) supported the proposal.

(73) The CHAIRMAN asked for vote on the proposal of the delegate of Jordan, seconded by the delegate of Saudi-Arabia.

(74) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) recalled that the Director-General had stated that Unesco and UNRWA had agreed on the principle that UNRWA should furnish all the necessary teaching materials, and Unesco all the necessary staff.

(75) The proposal of the delegate of Jordan was adopted by 29 votes to 7, with 17 abstentions.

(76) The CHAIRMAN explained that the figures being fixed by the Commission were provisional, and that they would need to be reconsidered, firstly at the end of the examination of the chapter on Education, and, secondly, when all the chapters of the programme had been reviewed; a balance would have to be established between them before the Commission drew up its report.

(B) Emergency educational assistance to Korea (paragraphs 238-244)

(77) Mr. PAIK (Korea) was grateful for the work being done by UNKRA, welcomed the resolution authorizing Unesco's collaboration, and noted that Unesco was proposing to provide two field experts in 1955 and 1956. He wished, however, to see Unesco taking a more active part in the emergency assistance programme, and saw no reason why specific projects should not be included in Unesco's regular programme, provided there were no duplication of work being done by other bodies in the same field. The work was too extensive to be handled by a single organization.
(78) He accordingly proposed that the Commission should adopt a resolution authorizing the Director-General to work out a Unesco programme for educational assistance to Korea which would not duplicate the work of other organizations active in Korea.

(79) Mr. U TSUIN-CHEN (China) supported the proposal.

(80) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, since Unesco was already co-operating with the agency set up by the United Nations, the Korean delegate's resolution appeared superfluous.

(81) Mr. PAIK (Korea) agreed to withdraw his proposal.

(82) The Secretary of the Commission read resolutions 1.221 and 1.222, which were adopted.

(83) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wished a vote to be taken on resolution 1.222 because they intended to abstain as a means of making their views known.

(84) The CHAIRMAN remarked that a fresh vote would therefore have to be taken on resolution 1.222.

(85) The result of the voting was 46 in favour, none against with 6 abstentions.

Project 1.31: Fundamental education

(Paragraphs 247-267)

(86) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Advisory Committee had, at the suggestion of the Director-General, reviewed Unesco's activities in fundamental education as a whole. The method had proved highly successful and had given the Committee a clear idea of the main projects and their connexion with the work of the various departments. The Committee had noted with satisfaction that fundamental education accounted for about $2,000,000 or 13% of the programme activities, half under the Department of Education and the remainder under the Departments of Social Science, Cultural Activities, Mass Communication and Exchange of Persons.

(87) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that the system of Associated Projects was one of the most important parts of Unesco's work. He had, however, two comments to make on the paragraphs under discussion. First, paragraph 256 contained no reference to the great variety of languages. Secondly, with regard to the recruitment of experts under paragraph 259, it was difficult to find experts capable of dealing with many different kinds of project, and Unesco must resist the temptation to employ an expert for several projects merely because they were located in the same region.

(88) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) recalled that, at the seventh session of the General Conference, the Belgian delegation had drawn attention to the heavy expenditure on the two regional centres at Patzcuaro and Sirs-el-Layyan, and had expressed doubts about the possibility of setting up other centres of the same kind; he thought that the Belgian view had been justified and considered that it would be reasonable for Unesco in due course to cease financing the centres, the cost of which should gradually be assumed by the countries benefiting from their work. The Executive Board had suggested setting up a world centre, but the Director-General had said he preferred national centres. The Belgian delegation upheld the latter viewpoint, as it felt that there would be insuperable psychological, linguistic and financial obstacles to setting up a world centre. The policy of encouraging countries which wished to create centres to do so seemed, on the other hand, calculated to spare offence to national feelings.

(89) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) said that, though he might later return to the question of the centres, he would confine himself for the time being to the wording of resolution 1.311 (paragraph 246); his comments would also have a bearing on the following paragraphs, down to paragraph 289. Fundamental education covered an enormous field and he paid tribute to the project which Unesco had so bravely undertaken. While it was clearly Unesco's duty to take action in that field, it should not be forgotten that fundamental education had not been invented by Unesco, but had been conducted and was still being conducted by an army of men and women who were

quietly devoting themselves to the service of their fellows. Missionaries of every faith, from every country in Europe, had for long years been bringing knowledge and education to the less civilized peoples; Mgr Maroun noted with regret that the part they had played was not even mentioned. Unesco could not leave their work out of account, either in the Secretariat or in the field and in the very wording of its programme. Resolution 1.311, which, as it stood, said nothing of such private work, would be improved by the addition, (after "international organizations" - second line) of the words "... and appropriate private bodies in this field....".

(90) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa), referring to paragraphs 258 to 260 (Servicing Associated Projects), stressed the importance of preliminary consultation with the responsible authorities in areas where Associated Projects were to be established, before any budgetary provisions were made.

(91) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that it was axiomatic that the Director-General did not invite an expert to make a study in any Member State without prior consultation with the competent authorities. In connexion with the teaching of reading, for example, a conference had been held in Nigeria, the participants coming from many African territories and including Dr. Cook of the Union of South Africa.
(92) In reply to a further question from the delegate of the Union of South Africa, Mr. Elvin said that consultation had not yet taken place in the unspecified areas mentioned in paragraphs 258-260, but when the draft programme had been approved, it would be initiated only after consultation with the Member States concerned.

(93) Mr. KADYROV (Union of Soviet Socialst Republics) said that his country's delegation had put forward a resolution, on which he wished to make a few comments.
(94) A study of cultural conditions in the twentieth century showed that half the population of the world was still shrouded in ignorance - a state of affairs which was neither just nor humane
(95) The closest attention should be paid to work connected with education; illiteracy should be wiped out without creating social differences or introducing discrimination with regard to religion or sex, and that should be one of Unesco's fundamental tasks.
(96) The delegation of the Soviet Union held teaching and education to be impossible unless based on a knowledge of the national languages of the country concerned and the provision of proper training for the teaching staff.
(97) In Russia, there had been a great deal of illiteracy until, with the triumph of the Revolution, many peoples had had the opportunity of studying in their own languages. In the USSR, teaching was carried on in at least 60 different languages, through a network of schools, institutes and academies for the spread of knowledge.
(98) Unesco should develop its work along those lines in all countries and publish textbooks on fundamental education in order to wipe out illiteracy.

(99) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) supported the remarks of the United Kingdom delegate on Associated Projects. Egypt was planning a number of projects, including the training of rural teachers and establishment of social centres, and looked forward to receiving assistance from fundamental education leaders. He therefore welcomed the inclusion of paragraphs 258-260 in Unesco's programme, but care should be taken that the projects to which Unesco proposed giving assistance were true fundamental education centres.

(100) Mr. ERZUAH (Gold Coast) said that fundamental education was the only Unesco activity which reached the masses. As stated in paragraph 253, it was still in an experimental stage, and the experience in his own country might be of value to the Commission.
(101) The three main features of the system adopted in his country were these: the campaign was conducted on a nation-wide basis; it was directed towards a general improvement in the life of the community, and it included voluntary effort.
(102) A preliminary step had been the setting up of temporary rural training centres in the main regions to provide the necessary staff. Mass literacy was an important element since it was realized that through literacy people became aware of the need for social and economic improvement. Literacy was thus not an end in itself but a means to achieving the full benefits of living. It had also been realized that the logical sequence was literacy in the vernacular, followed by literacy in English as a gateway to the knowledge and culture of the outside world.
(103) To achieve nationwide impact, the campaign had been organized on a regional basis under community development officers, a method which had been of great assistance in dealing with the diversity of vernaculars and the particular local problems. Bearing in mind the objective of improving standards of living, attention was directed to providing not only reading primers but also reading material on such subjects as village sanitation, farming, child care and nutrition. Vernacular newspapers were published to keep people informed on matters outside their own community, and it was hoped later to provide leisure-time reading material. Activities included training courses for local authority officials, and plans were being made for a local government publicity campaign by mass education teams to encourage acceptance of the responsibilities attached to rights in local self-government.
(104) An important feature was the voluntary worker, coming from many walks in life and trained at the rural training centre.
(105) Recalling the Director-General's reference to the empirical nature of work in fundamental education, the speaker would welcome information on the experience of others.

(106) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) sympathized with the views put forward by the delegate of Lebanon and warmly supported his proposal. He also wished to emphasize that in Latin America 12,000 missionaries were engaged on fundamental education work.

(107) The CHAIRMAN proposed the closure of the discussion. The proposal of the delegate

of Lebanon, seconded by the delegate of Spain, was before the Commission.

(108) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), replying to the delegate of the United Kingdom, said that Unesco considered that an expert might be useful in a number of associated projects, but did not expect one person to be capable of handling all the projects in a given region.
(109) In answer to the question by the delegate of Belgium, while it was an accepted doctrine that Member States should ultimately take over responsibility for fundamental education centres, it was not yet appropriate to do so in the two cases mentioned.
(110) With regard to the question raised by the delegate of the Soviet Union, it was Unesco's policy to see that the results of experiments in any country were supplied to other Member States. Information on the work of the cultural missions in Mexico had been published by Unesco. He agreed with the Soviet delegate's emphasis on the educational value of teaching reading and writing initially in the spoken languages. The idea conformed with Unesco's educational doctrine, although there might be administrative limitations in small areas with large varieties of languages.
(111) In reply to the delegate of Lebanon, Unesco was already in consultation with a number of private organizations, whose experience in fundamental education was valuable to the Organization. He asked if the following amendment to the resolution would meet the case: the insertion of the words "and in consultation with competent private organizations" after "appropriate international organizations". It was essential to distinguish between association with the United Nations and the Agencies and consultation with private organizations, since association implied joint responsibility.

(112) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) emphasized, however, that not only consultation but co-operation was needed between Unesco and organizations which had been dealing for many years with fundamental education. He therefore wished the words "in association with" to apply to the appropriate private organizations as well.

(113) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) supported the proposal of the Director of the Department of Education; he considered consultation with private organizations interested in fundamental education to be important, but it was better to do the actual work of education through the competent government departments.

(114) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) supported the Lebanese delegate's proposal. In his own country private missionary organizations had been working on fundamental education long before any governmental action was initiated, and their collaboration was necessary to the work.

(115) The CHAIRMAN wondered whether a compromise was possible between the proposals of the Lebanese delegate and of the Secretariat. He suggested the following wording: "... and in conjunction with private organizations....".

(116) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) confessed that the shade of meaning introduced by the new form of words eluded him.

(117) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the correct term in respect of private organizations was "consultation". Use of the word "collaboration", which implied participation in the management of a project, could lead to serious legal difficulties with other collaborating agencies.

(118) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) referring to what the Director-General had said, observed that this country would oppose any form of collaboration in the Patzcuaro Centre, not already covered by the existing contracts.

(119) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) supported the statements of the Director-General and the delegate of Lebanon. In United Kingdom territories a great debt was owed to educators whose main driving force was religion, whether Christian, Muslim, Hindu or other denominations. With regard to the drafting difficulty, since the voluntary organizations were all working in collaboration with their respective governments, Unesco could collaborate with them through the Member Governments concerned. The wording "in relation with voluntary organizations" should therefore be satisfactory.

(120) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that relationship with private organizations was automatic and use of the word in the resolution would only cause confusion.

(121) The CHAIRMAN said that the wording might be: ".... in consultation with the appropriate private organizations....".

(122) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) recalled the work done by non-governmental organizations in addition to that of governmental organizations, adding that Unesco was in a good position to appreciate it. To collaborate with governments did not automatically mean collaborating with all the existing organizations in a country

(123) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed the wording "and in consultation with competent international non-governmental organizations and appropriate private organizations".

(124) The delegate of Lebanon signified his approval.

(125) Before the vote was taken, Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) stated that he was not in favour of formally adopting a proposal which was to be referred back to the Secretariat for final drafting.

(126) The CHAIRMAN thought that a vote might be taken, since the Lebanese delegate had indicated his agreement with the Director-General.

(127) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed a further slight modification, and the delegate of Lebanon said that he would be satisfied to leave the final drafting to the Secretariat.

(128) The amended resolution was put to the vote

and adopted by 41 votes to nil with 9 abstentions.

(A) Methods of teaching how to read and write (paragraphs 268-270)

(129) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) approved the project, but considered it illogical to define a region in terms of its political status. The wording of paragraph 269 would exclude Liberia and possibly other sovereign territories in Africa. He proposed that the words "non-self-governing territories" should be replaced by "Africa South of the Sahara".

(130) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) seconded the proposal, adding that he would not have taken exception to the existing wording, because Liberia was already receiving great benefits from Unesco's technical assistance programme.

(131) Section (A) as amended, was approved.

(B) Evaluation of literacy campaigns (paragraphs 271-273)

(132) Approved.

(C) The use of a language of wide communication in relation to the use of vernacular languages in fundamental education (paragraphs 274-279)

(133) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that he had heard with great interest the statement of the Soviet delegate and was struck by the similarity of the Soviet and United Kingdom policies on vernacular languages. The number of languages in which the Soviet Government was providing education was impressive and exceeded the number in United Kingdom territories. He had much to learn from the Soviet methods and looked forward to hearing of developments in the future.

(134) Section (C) was approved.

(D) Joint field experiments (paragraphs 280 and 281)

(135) Approved.

(E) Field consultation (paragraphs 282-289)

(136) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that, while he found nothing objectionable in the aims of the project, he saw a danger in the use of the word "urged" in paragraph 285. He had every sympathy with the policy of paying more attention to the interests of women but Unesco's rôle in Associated Projects was to advise and not to control.

(137) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that he had already explained his own doubts over the wording to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. He would see that a suitable alteration was made in the drafting of the paragraph.

(138) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to point out, with regard to the teaching of vernacular languages in the USSR, that he had said that 60 languages were taught, and not so many as the delegate of the United Kingdom seemed to have understood.

(139) Mr. PRATT (Australia) proposed deletion of the word "compulsory" at the end of paragraph 283.

(140) Agreed.

(141) Section (E) was approved.

(F) International fundamental education centres (paragraphs 290-304)

(142) Mr. ORTIZ (Director, Regional Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America) said that at Patzcuaro teachers from all the Latin American countries except Argentina and the Dominican Republic had been undergoing training. He invited those two countries, through their delegations at the Conference, to take part in the work of the Centre.

(143) Since the Centre had been set up, some 180 students had been trained. Careful attention had been given to the methods and procedures of training and constant progress had been made until the existing form of organization was established.

(144) Training at the Centre lasted 18 months, with one month's vacation. The training was divided into three semesters, at the end of which students submitted their theses and sat examinations.

(145) Certain fellowship holders who had taken courses at Patzcuaro had already returned to their countries (Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Honduras), and were working in their respective communities, while fellowship holders from other countries were still undergoing training.

(146) Mr. SEDES (France) stated that the French delegation had studied the section on Fundamental Education Centres with special care and was of the opinion that the logical course was to continue what had been begun, even though the financial burden imposed by the two Centres unfortunately prevented Unesco from pursuing action elsewhere. With the need for continuity of effort in mind the French delegation supported the section, together with its budgetary implications.

(147) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) said that his delegation supported all types of fundamental education, but added that the problem did not arise in his country. Nevertheless, if it were thought desirable, Argentina would send students to the Patzcuaro Centre.

(148) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) wished to put on record that the Patzcuaro Centre was jointly maintained, being supported by Unesco, the Organization of American States and the Government of Mexico, the latter contributed more than $50,000 a year.

(149) His delegation believed that technical assistance should be combined with fundamental education, in order to improve living standards.

(150) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) speaking on behalf of his Government, expressed his gratitude for the invitation for students from his country to attend the Patzcuaro Centre; he believed that such activities as had resulted in the establishment of the Centre should be undertaken more often, for they were conducive to international understanding.

(151) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) said that the Patzcuaro Centre was one of Unesco's most useful projects in Latin America. A generation of teachers from Ecuador had been trained there and were already teaching in their country.
(152) The delegation of Ecuador suggested that a project for the establishment of a fundamental education centre in the Andes region should be submitted to the General Conference at its ninth session.

(153) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that it was desirable to have as much information as possible on the Sirs-el-Layyan and Patzcuaro Centres, to which such importance had been attached and to which so much effort had been devoted. He asked if the Secretariat could prepare information on the activities of graduate students who had returned to their own countries.

(154) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that in the case of the Sirs-el-Layyan Centre it was too early to furnish such information. With regard to Patzcuaro, details were already available and a statement would shortly be published showing the influence of graduates in their respective countries.

(155) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had approved paragraph 285 on the understanding that it was concerned not with furthering women's interests generally, but with giving women a greater part in the promotion of fundamental education. The Board had recognized that women had more free time than men - who had to earn their living; that there were now more women than men in the world; and that women suitably trained could start educating children in their homes.
(156) The Executive Board looked upon fundamental education centres as one of the foundations of Unesco's work. It had devoted a considerable amount of time to studying the Sirs-el-Layyan and Patzcuaro Centres and, in view of the fact that students would ultimately work for the benefit of their own countries, had decided to recommend that in future efforts should be made by the Member States concerned to support their own students out of technical assistance grants.
(157) With regard to the establishment of other regional centres, experiment had shown that it was impracticable in other areas of the world, owing to cultural, linguistic and geographical barriers. The Board had therefore agreed to recommend that only national centres should be encouraged.

(158) Section (F) was approved.

(G) Aid to national fundamental education centres (paragraphs 305-307)

(159) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) appreciated the difficulties referred to by the representative of the Executive Board and, in the circumstances, approved the idea of national centres, which would be less costly to Unesco. He urged, however, that national centres should have the main features of, and be given the same assistance as, the existing international centres.

(160) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured the delegate of India that his remarks would be borne in mind.

(161) Section (G) was approved.

(H) Further contributions to the international fundamental education centres (paragraphs 308 and 309)

(162) Mr. PRATT (Australia) asked whether the contracts in paragraph 309 involved a large increase in student maintenance costs. He felt that the time had come for some of that expense to be met by the countries from which students were drawn. The contracts for the two years 1955 and 1956 amounted to over $150,000 and he would suggest that part of that expenditure might be diverted from that item and used elsewhere in the education programme.

(163) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he had submitted the item at the higher budgetary level because he wished the present session of the Conference to decide whether it was the appropriate time to ask Member States to bear the cost of maintaining their own students. The proposal under the lower budgetary level was that, starting in 1955, the maintenance of all new students should be paid by Member States. The decision now before the Commission was whether Member States should assume the burden or whether it should continue to be Unesco's responsibility.
(164) The reason for the larger amount in 1956 was that that year would include the students already there since 1955 and the newcomers in 1956.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

# FOURTEENTH MEETING

*27 November 1954 at 9 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.1 OF REVISED AGENDA, EDUCATION (continued)**

(H) Further contribution to the international fundamental education centres (paragraphs 308 and 309) (continued)

(1) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), developing remarks previously made by the Director-General, said that, when the budget was originally drafted, provision had been made for financial support of the Patzcuaro Centre for two years, while support for the other centres had been put on the higher budgetary level. The aim had been to draw attention to the point made at the previous meeting by the delegate of Australia, namely, that the time must inevitably come when Member States might reasonably be expected to bear the costs themselves. The Director-General hoped the Commission would not think he was advocating cuts in order to force through what at the present time must necessarily be a difficult decision, i. e., whether Unesco should continue its financial support or not.

(2) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) said he had been instructed to raise the same point as the delegate of Australia. His attitude towards such centres was by no means unsympathetic. But he felt that the time must come when such projects must stand on their own feet, otherwise there would be no possibility of creating new ones. He understood that the Patzcuaro project was already costing the Mexican Government a good deal of money. Surely those other countries taking advantage of the facilities there offered ought at least to pay for the maintenance of their students?

(3) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) said that direct contact with the centres and with the States sending students there would convince Unesco of the value of continuing its assistance, which in any case would taper off in future years. Its premature cancellation would be most damaging to the centres. He trusted that the amounts provided for in the programme and budget would be approved.

(4) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) was in favour of assisting the centres, which were doing most important work. But he recognized the force of the arguments adduced by the Australian and New Zealand delegations.
(5) An essential condition, if the centres were to see their influence strengthened, was that the support of governments be enlisted to a much greater extent, and that governments should be anxious to see the training acquired by students they had sent there used to the best advantage. One of the best ways of achieving that aim was to call on governments to contribute to the cost.
(6) However, it was perhaps premature to expect the governments to take over full financial responsibility right away. He would propose that Unesco make its full contribution for 1955, but that in 1956 governments be expected to pay half the cost of the centres, Unesco paying the other half.
(7) In submitting his proposal, he had been more anxious to strengthen the influence of the centres than to save money for Unesco.

(8) Mr. ATADEMIR (Turkey) seconded the proposal.

(9) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) stated that his Government had given him instructions to support any recommendation the Director-General might make concerning the Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro.

(10) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) said that his Government would keep strictly to the terms of the contract it had signed with Unesco with regard to the Regional Centre at Patzcuaro. In addition, his Government would welcome adoption of the recommendations which had been made under paragraph 308 of the programme by the representative of the Executive Board and by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(11) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) sympathized with the views expressed by the delegates of Australia and New Zealand. Sooner or later the question would have to be faced whether Member States should pay a proportion of the cost of maintaining their students at the centres, pending the time when they would take over full financial responsibility.
(12) Nevertheless, the point should not be pressed at the moment. Let the Secretariat decide, in consultation with the directors of the two centres and the governments concerned, how arrangements might be made for Unesco's financial aid to taper off.

(13) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) considered that the question under examination had three aspects, which led to confusion. Firstly, it was not a question of touching on the problem of what Unesco should consider permanent and what it should consider temporary. If Patzcuaro or any similar project were to be permanent, they should not be dealt with at that meeting. Secondly, what steps Member States should take in developing those projects had not been submitted for examination either. Thirdly, there was the concrete problem of subventions to those regional centres. In

that respect the speaker believed that what the Secretariat had proposed should be approved.

(14) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) pointed out that, if those Arab States that were interested in the functioning of the Centre at Sirs-el-Layyan could not at present give it sufficient financial aid, it was because they had to face a concrete problem: the training given was of an extremely high standard and the countries from which trainees came were not yet equipped for putting the necessary resources at their disposal for the rational and fruitful use of the knowledge they had acquired at the Centre.
(15) The Secretariat had fixed the credits indicated in paragraph 309 with a full knowledge of the facts.

(16) Mr. SEDES (France) supported the United Kingdom delegate's statement. It was without doubt desirable to find a way in which the States concerned could participate financially, but any premature decision might compromise the existence of the two centres, which, as had been said and emphasized, was a necessity.

(17) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) said that, in view of the good results so far obtained by the Regional Centre at Patzcuaro, she considered that its present organization should not be changed for another two years. She also believed that the governments of countries whose students enjoyed the benefits of the Centre, should contribute to its maintenance and should for example bear travel expenses. Mexico for its part could help by providing cheaper accommodation.
(18) She supported the project in the form in which it had been presented.

(19) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq) said the Centre at Sirs-el-Layyan was in its early stages, and after two years of existence had turned out only five Iraqi students, who were being used by the Iraqi Government to start two new centres, the cost of which it was bearing itself.
(20) The Egyptian Government, he had been told, was making a substantial financial contribution. In fact, he believed it was paying more than Unesco.
(21) He agreed that governments should be expected to contribute, but not in the early stages. A cut in the Unesco contribution would gravely endanger the centres.

(22) Mr. PRATT (Australia) wished to make it clear that his delegation was strongly in favour of the centres. There had been substantial agreement among previous speakers as to their value. The only question was how their influence and value could best be ensured.
(23) He would be the first to acknowledge that the Egyptian and Mexican Governments had given the centres magnificent support. But in general he would be inclined to associate himself with the United States proposal, for the reasons given by the delegate of the United States of America.

(24) Mr. C.W. CARTER (Canada) thought that the United States proposal would go far to meet the fears entertained by the delegates of Australia and New Zealand. A rather similar situation had arisen in Canada in the past, and had been settled along the lines indicated in the United States proposal.
(25) Even if the Commission supported the United States proposal, it should, he considered, support the estimates given in the document for 1955. The activities were central to the programme of Unesco.

(26) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) repeated that his proposal had been submitted merely in order to reinforce the position and influence of the centres and, since it seemed to be meeting with a cold reception, he would be perfectly willing to withdraw it.

(27) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that one important point had not been made. Every Member State sending students to the centres paid in some way or other. For example, since most of the students were married men with commitments, the States concerned undertook to continue paying their salaries. In addition, they paid students' travel expenses.
(28) A distinction should be made between the two centres. That at Sirs-el-Layyan was much the younger, and it was felt that at least five years would be required to estimate the extent to which it had succeeded in making its influence felt in the Arab world.
(29) Then there was the question of timing. The Latin American States had been asked for their views whether Unesco assistance should not be tapered off. Most of the replies received had been sympathetic, but the view had been expressed that, if such steps were taken too early, the future of the centres would be jeopardized. The Director-General might be asked to investigate the attitude of States towards the question whether they should take over maintenance costs and to report thereon to the General Conference at a later session.

(30) Paragraphs 308 and 309 were unanimously adopted.

(I) National experiments on the production of reading material for new literates (paragraphs 310-312)

(31) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), commenting on a suggestion by the delegate of the United Kingdom that discussion of the two paragraphs should be postponed until the Commission came to discuss cultural activities, said that such a course was possible, but that the two activities were complementary rather than identical.

(32) Paragraphs 310-312 were unanimously adopted.

(33) Resolution 1.311 (pages 33 and 34) was unanimously adopted.

Project 1.32: Adult Education (paragraphs 313-333)

(34) Mr. WEILENMANN (Switzerland) said that his country approved resolution 1.322, and was appreciative of what the Director-General had done in that field during the preceding year.
(35) He stressed the great importance of adult education,

to which, indeed, almost every chapter in the programme made reference in some way or other.
(36) The world was rapidly shrinking and adult education was of vital importance in training people to live peaceably side by side. The experience of Switzerland showed that a modus vivendi between various linguistic and cultural groups could be found, provided education emphasized the principles of freedom, equality and voluntary association.
(37) Education in those three principles was equivalent to education for democracy, and democratic principles had to be instilled not only into children, but also into adults.
(38) Adult education was being largely carried on by independent voluntary associations, some of which had grown up in the nineteenth century, such as workers' educational movements. In addition, he would mention the Universidad de Trabajo in Uruguay, and the extension lecture system operated in British universities. Such bodies and such schemes were working in the same direction as Unesco.
(39) Thence Unesco should make better use of them. To that end he proposed that the Director-General be authorized to have recourse to adult education institutes for advice and to foster regional and world-wide associations of such institutes. He understood that such an association was being formed in Europe and another in the United States of America.

(40) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) seconded the proposal.

(41) Mr. SEDES (France) said that the French delegation attached great importance to that chapter and approved the long-term programme which would make it possible for all departments to take a greater part in the various tasks connected with adult education.
(42) Referring to paragraph 327, the French delegate proposed that the sentence "in consultation with the staff specially concerned with adult education" should be completed by the addition of the words "and with the practice of the social sciences", and suggested to the Drafting Committee that they find an expression more satisfactory than "the common people"

(43) This proposal was seconded by the delegations of Haiti, Lebanon, and Switzerland.

(44) Mrs. DOUGLAS (Canada), referring to paragraphs 314 and 315, in which the words "adult education, including workers' and women's education" were used, said that a simple change in wording would remove the impression that women's education was somehow not the same as education for adults. Perhaps the words "also special projects for women's education" might be inserted.

(45) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) wished to make it clear that his delegation fully supported the project as a whole.
(46) As regarded the expression "workers' education", used in paragraph 319, it would be better to say "adult education". In New Zealand the word "former term" had certain ideological implications and it should not be suggested that distinctions should be made in educational needs along class lines.

(47) In connexion with paragraph 322, he would suggest that the Consultative Committee on Adult Education, therein mentioned, should be made more representative of the world as a whole.
(48) In paragraph 332, mention was made of a permanent International Centre. Was the Secretariat satisfied that with its existing resources and staff it could organize and direct the activities of such a centre.

(49) Mrs. JOBORU (Hungary) said that her country, since the war, had acquired much valuable experience in adult education. It would be very willing to offer other Member States the benefit of that experience.

(50) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) was in agreement with the part of the programme under examination and with the suggestions presented by New Zealand and Canada for altering the wording of paragraph 314. He considered that the words "workers" and "women" should be deleted, as it was absurd to talk of adult education that excluded workers and women. He thought the most suitable wording would be: "Member States are invited to encourage the development of adult education, of both men and women without exception". In that form he unreservedly supported the paragraph in question.

(51) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) welcomed the two resolutions 1.321 and 1.322 as also the statement by the delegate of Switzerland on the principles involved.
(52) As regarded the wording of paragraphs 314, 315 and 319, the distinction made between workers' and women's education, as branches of adult education, was, he felt, a valid one. In the United States of America there were no less than thirty million men and women belonging to labour unions of one kind or another which actively promoted adult education for better international understanding - the United States National Commission would be very ready to supply information about programmes, if requested. He was therefore in favour of keeping the existing wording.

(53) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) enquired how the Consultative Committee was constituted. Was the advice of the National Commissions taken in regard to the choice of members?
(54) He was a little surprised that the delegate of the United States of America was in favour of keeping the expression "workers' education".

(55) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) stated that, when the time came, her delegation would vote in favour of the resolution in the form in which it had been presented. However, the fact that the Swiss delegate had alluded to the Universidad del Trabajo (Workers' University) in Uruguay led her to declare that from the age of twelve upwards everyone could be admitted to that university; it taught all the working techniques in use not only in Montevideo, but throughout the country.
(56) She pointed out that in Uruguay there were primary courses for adults, which both men and women could attend. As a rule, they were evening courses arranged for those who worked during the day.

(57) For secondary education, a secondary school with evening classes had been organized on the same lines.
(58) Higher education was open to all those who had completed primary and secondary education.
(59) With regard to the expression "workers and women", appearing in resolution 1.321 (paragraph 314), she considered that the word "adults" would be sufficient.

(60) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) was surprised that the chapter nowhere mentioned the trade union movement. Did Unesco not collaborate with the different bodies representing that movement?

(61) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), commenting on the expression "workers' education" used by the Secretariat, said that the word "worker" obviously had different connotations in different countries; there were historical reasons for that.
(62) The Secretariat was in frequent consultation with workers' organizations of various kinds, and often helped international non-governmental organizations and international trade unions to organize summer schools in adult education. There was therefore some reason for making a special reference to workers' education.
(63) As regarded women's education, there was, in the United Nations, a special commission on the status of women, which was continually asking Unesco what it was doing for women. For that reason the Secretariat had made specific reference to women's education more to protect itself against criticism from that quarter than for any logical reason.
(64) It had been suggested that the text might be expanded to show that the Department of Education worked in co-operation with the Department of Social Sciences and other departments. The Secretariat was quite prepared to make such an addition, but he could assure the Commission that such collaboration already existed.
(65) With regard to the question raised by the delegate of New Zealand about the permanent International Centre mentioned in paragraph 332, the field was one in which expansion had been impossible because of pressure to give priority to school education and fundamental education. But it was planned to go ahead as soon as the budget permitted.

(66) Mr. HORNE (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) stated that workers did not think that educational, cultural and scientific activities could achieve their real objectives if workers, who were an important and large body of the population, were excluded from them.
(67) Two recommendations in the education programme deserved the firmest support from ICFTU: the transformation of the International Workers' Educational Centre through the decentralization of its activities, and the transference of international summer schools run by international non-governmental organizations to underdeveloped areas.
(68) ICFTU had been pleased with the proposals contained in the draft resolution concerning the organization of national or regional adult education seminars. He stressed the need for full co-operation between the competent national or regional organizations, including trade union organizations, in the running of such seminars.
(69) He praised Unesco activities in underdeveloped areas.
(70) He also expressed his satisfaction at the increased possibilities offered by Unesco to non-governmental organizations in the last two years, and hoped that that interest would grow.
(71) Although, at the international level, relations between ICFTU and Unesco had certainly been generally satisfactory, collaboration between free trade union organizations and a large number of Unesco National Commissions left much to be desired. It was only exceptionally that representatives of workers' organizations were members of National Commissions, or were consulted by National Commissions on problems of particular concern to workers. The work that Unesco was doing in Member States through its National Commissions would be seriously compromised if trade union organizations were not represented on them as they should be. Consequently, ICFTU asked Unesco once more to request Member States to appoint representatives of workers' organizations to sit on National Commissions as well as to select them as members of delegations to Unesco General Conferences.

(72) Mr. VIEBRA FERNANDEZ (International Federation of Christian Trade Unions) supported what the previous delegate had said.
(73) Although the work that Unesco was doing was effective, he believed that it had not been understood by the general public; most of the inhabitants of Montevideo were still wondering what Unesco was and what purpose it served. For that reason he considered that, when the general public started to understand and take interest in Unesco, it would be very near to achieving the result that it was seeking: to achieve peace through culture.
(74) He was in agreement with all that had been done and was to be done for the education of children, who formed the essence of tomorrow's community, but he considered that the workers were the reality of today and that, for that reason, their education should not be neglected.
(75) He thought that, if the workers took a more active part in Unesco activities, it would dispel the idea that Unesco was no more than a gathering of intellectuals who talked a great deal but did little or nothing.

(76) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) recalled that the distinguished Italian delegate had stated at the last meeting that he no longer wished to take part in the debates of the Commission. Although she did not know the reason for that drastic decision, she would ask the Italian delegate to reverse it and continue to assist with his wide knowledge and experience in solving the problems facing Unesco.

(77) The CHAIRMAN said that, under the procedure, it was not possible to reverse a decision taken on the previous day.
(78) He recalled that all delegations none the less had the right to present in the form of oral proposals

draft resolutions on which the Advisory Committee had not been able to give its opinion.

(79) Mr. CALO (Italy), after thanking the delegate of Uruguay for the friendly words addressed to his country, stated that he had made reservations about the usefulness of taking part in the discussion and above all had declared that he would avoid making suggestions which constantly came up against budgetary obstacles.
(80) Mr. Calo considered that the problem in adult education which required urgent solution before all others was that of training teaching staff.
(81) The establishment of permanent courses, in which workers could take a personal part to explain their desires and impart their experiences and concerns, would be a first step in that direction.
(82) The teaching profession and university circles could also give a great impulse to adult education. Universities should therefore be encouraged to intensify their university extension courses as practised so successfully in English-speaking countries.
(83) Mr. Calo then referred to the highly desirable creation of a permanent international adult education centre and assumed that the present Consultative Committee on Adult Education would be merged in the new body, since it would be doing the same work.

(84) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) stated that Brazilian experts on their return from a seminar at the International Workers' Centre (La Brévière) had launched an active movement for fundamental education; they hoped to get wider support in the national field.
(85) On the basis of that example, the delegate of Brazil drew the Commission's attention to the text of a draft recommendation which had no budgetary implications but which would be of great help to Member States who had to face those problems.

(86) The CHAIRMAN then reminded the meeting that the Commission had to take a decision on several proposals, notably on the amendment to resolution 1.322 presented by the delegation of Switzerland (seconded by Belgium).

(87) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that an expert committee convened by Unesco had considered the possibility of forming an association of adult education movements. That committee had given most sympathetic consideration to the problem, but had reluctantly concluded that, in view of the diversity of such movements, the time did not seem ripe to carry the matter further. Did the Commission think that the problem should be given further consideration?

(88) Mr. WEILENMANN (Switzerland) felt, nevertheless, that it would be good if Unesco were to help in the formation of regional associations.

(89) The Swiss proposal that Unesco should foster collaboration between the various adult education movements was put to the vote and adopted by 24 votes to 0, with 19 abstentions.

(90) The French proposal (seconded by the Netherlands), to amend the last line of paragraph 327 to read: "adult education and, in co-operation with social science experts, to adapt their programmes to the needs of the common people" was unanimously adopted.

(91) The Brazilian resolution (seconded by Argentina) was amended so that the words "fundamental education" read "fundamental and adult education".

(92) It was subsequently put to the vote and adopted by 34 votes to 0 with 5 abstentions.

(A) Consultation at the international level (paragraphs 334-336)

(93) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), answering a question raised earlier by the delegate of the United Kingdom, said that thitherto the Committee mentioned in paragraph 334 had been small (10 or 12 members). Its members were not nominated by National Commissions, since that would have involved asking no less than seventy-two such commissions to put forward candidates. Also there were the interests of the non-governmental organizations to be considered.
(94) The Committee was made up of individuals drawn from countries with much experience of adult education, or from suitable non-governmental bodies. When a member of the Committee did not come from some clearly international organization, informal contact was kept with the National Commission of his home country.
(95) A suggestion had recently been made, and had been approved by the Director-General, that a list of thirty associate members should be drawn up. Persons unable to attend meetings of the Committee at frequent intervals would be included in that list. It was proposed to ask some of those associate members to take part, in turn, in the meetings held by the Committee.
(96) The membership of the Committee changed from time to time, and was not exclusively European.

(97) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) said that paragraphs 328, 329 and 330 laid stress on the need for regional meetings and called for special efforts to be made in the underdeveloped countries.
(98) Accordingly, he felt that the Committee in question should be such as to permit the active participation of the various parts of the world. A fundamentally European body inviting persons from elsewhere from time to time was not enough, since most of the peoples of the world lived in the underdeveloped areas.

(99) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that a distinction had to be made between fundamental education (normally understood to mean basic education for those who had not enjoyed a normal schooling) and adult education (i.e., further education for those who had had a normal education).
(100) Adult education movements were most strongly developed in the countries where literacy was most widespread, and thence, in setting up the Consultative Committee, it was inevitable that recourse should be had, first and foremost, to such countries. The Committee itself was anxious to be broader, but it was

difficult to give exactly equal representation to the various parts of the world without interfering with the basic purposes of the Committee.

(101) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) said that, if what the previous speaker had said was true, paragraphs 328, 329 and 330 were largely meaningless. The point was that the countries with large illiterate populations were trying to industrialize and wished to benefit from the experience acquired, and the mistakes made, in the more highly developed countries.

(102) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, in setting up a committee to conduct a literacy campaign, it would surely be only logical to have recourse to countries which were culturally more highly developed. It was natural that the countries with highly developed adult education movements should be called on to provide most of the members of the Committee.
(103) Paragraphs 328-330 were not meaningless. In fact, that very year, there had been two seminars in adult education, one in India, the other in Latin America.

(104) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) said that the Social Science Department was holding a meeting in the Ivory Coast on problems of industrialization and urbanization, which surely proved that such problems were not peculiar to European countries. Africa was rapidly evolving, particularly in areas like the Congo and South Africa, and should not be used by the rest of the world for experimental purposes only. The machinery already existed for making use of African experience and should be used.

(105) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq) enquired whether the Committee included any member from the Arab countries.

(106) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said it did not. No adult education movement of any strength existed in the Arab countries, but representatives of the Arab States would attend seminars on adult education.

(107) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq) said that, in his country, there were evening classes on a wide scale. No fewer than 3,000 lawyers had graduated from such classes alone, and similar figures could be given for other Arab countries. It was important, therefore, that there should be an Arab member of the Committee

(108) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) had much sympathy with the views expressed as regarded the terms "fundamental education" and "adult education", having asked the same question himself on first entering Unesco. He had often suggested that work should be divided under headings, according to the type of person to whom those activities were directed. But in the circumstances the best course was probably to keep the two terms "fundamental education" and "adult education" as ordinarily used, i.e., understanding, under "adult education", the further education of those who had already enjoyed an ordinary schooling.

(109) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) supported what had been said by the delegate of Liberia. He had lived in Africa and he was in a position to affirm that there did exist, in Africa South of the Sahara, a growing movement for adult education as that term was normally understood in Europe.
(110) In the Gold Coast, for example, an organization known as the People's Education Association was doing work very similar to that performed by the Workers' Educational Association in Great Britain, and the University College of the Gold Coast was also active. Other examples could doubtless be given for Sierra Leone and elsewhere. It was certain therefore that there did exist, in Africa, people well qualified to advise the Committee, or at least to serve on the consultative panel.

(111) Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua) thought that fundamental education embraced rural and adult education; beyond being a method of teaching, it was a philosophy of education, the purpose of which was to co-operate with those two branches of teaching (rural and adult).

(112) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) proposed, in accordance with Rule 76 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, that the debate be closed and that a vote be taken on paragraphs 334 to 336.

(113) Mr. BARDALES (Honduras) stated that the general lines of the fundamental education school were laid down at the seminar in Rio de Janeiro in 1949. It was said on that occasion that there was a serious shortage of primary schools in Latin America and in other countries and that the population of school age had no chance to attend school, while even those who could do so, remained only one or two years. It was for that reason that the name of "fundamental education" had been given to a minimum teaching period of three years with the object of extending it to the whole population, including adults and children.
(114) He thought that adult education should be for those who already had some fundamental education and wished to widen their knowledge; that included those who had studied in schools of all types. Adult education also aimed at improving the condition of the workers (manual and professional).

(115) Section (A) was unanimously approved.

(B) Summer schools and training courses for members of approved international organizations (paragraphs 337-339)

(116) Unanimously approved.

(C) Technical aid to Member States (paragraphs 340-350)

(117) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Commission at the previous day's meeting had decided to delete the word "technical".

(118) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) pointed out (with reference only to the French text) that the wording "en vue de l'organisation de cours" in resolution 1.323 was too restrictive, as the organization of seminars was also proposed.

(119) Mr. MARTI (El Salvador) asked that the part of the paragraph which read: "including workers' and women's education" should be deleted. He thought it was clear that workers' and women's education was included in adult education.

(120) The CHAIRMAN said that that point had already been discussed and that it had been decided to keep the present wording.

(121) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) said that, at a meeting held by his National Commission, there had been a person who had attended two seminars on adult education. That person had made two suggestions, first, that there should be a broader geographical representation at such seminars and, second, that, before the seminar met, its aims should be clearly defined by the Secretariat. Much time had been lost in deciding whether the seminar was merely a group of individuals or a group called upon to submit a report.

(122) Resolution 1.323 was unanimously adopted.

Project 1.33. Work with youth

Paragraphs 351-371

(123) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) regretted, in view of the importance and of the occasional difficulty of relations with youth movements, that the post of a qualified staff member had been suppressed. He urged that that post be maintained.

(124) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) considered that the reduction of credits for that chapter by 12% was not compensated in its effects, as the Director of the Department of Education had given to understand, by the subventions granted to the Youth Institute, which was not a recent creation; furthermore, it served an informative purpose and stood aside from the active rôle which that branch of the Department of Education had to play.
(125) Mr. François stigmatized the complete failure of the present programme to fulfil the promises contained in the Florence programme. Most young people escaped early from the school atmosphere, and youth movements could alone take them in hand. The Council of Europe, with its fourteen Member States, supported those movements with sums ten times those provided by Unesco.
(126) For that reason the French delegation proposed that the credits for contracts and the purchase of publications should be increased by $5,000 and $1,500 per annum respectively.

(127) The proposal was seconded by Belgium, Brazil, Italy and the Lebanon.

(128) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) recalled that Unesco's first efforts in the field had met with a cool reception and that young people themselves had been sceptical about the results to be obtained from them; he was disappointed to see the credits cut in that particular chapter.
(129) He considered that a larger place should be given to contracts drawn up with youth organizations if real encouragement was to be given to ideas of co-operation and citizenship in the international field.

(130) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that the figures in paragraph 351 showed the scale of expenditure for 1953 and 1954, as well as the proposed expenditure for 1955 and 1956.
(131) The total expenditure for the first period had been estimated at $143,000. Proposed expenditure had been cut to $136,000 - a reduction of only $7,000.
(132) It had to be remembered that the normal budget of Unesco was expected to find $64,000 for the Youth Institute at Gauting.
(133) As regarded staffing, it was not often that the Secretariat could give light-hearted approval to staff reductions, but it was a fact that the work in question could be performed with the staff proposed, i.e., with one established post less.

(134) Paragraphs 351-371 (Work with youth) were unanimously adopted.

(A) Associated youth enterprises (paragraphs 372-384)

(135) The proposal of the French delegation (DR/100), seconded by the delegations of Belgium, Brazil, Italy and the Lebanon was approved by 14 votes to 10 with 17 abstentions.

(136) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) proposed that "access of women to education" should be added as a theme to the subjects of study enumerated in paragraph 376.
(137) Referring to paragraph 380, he furthermore suggested that Unesco should encourage the International Federation of Organizations for School Correspondence and Travel to extend its aid to youth movements.
(138) With regard to paragraph 381, which proposed the creation of a Consultative Committee on Youth Work, Mr. Hacquaert thought that experts should be chosen in collaboration with the large international youth associations, so that scout movements and workers and correspondence associations etc., should be represented on the Committee.
(139) In addition, he asked Unesco to consider paying not only travel expenses but also a per diem allowance.

(140) Mr. STEINIG (United Nations) said that the United Nations naturally took the keenest interest in Unesco's work with youth, in so far as youth work represented a contribution to international understanding, and also in so far as Unesco's work impinged on special United Nations projects, such as the prevention of juvenile delinquency, and youth welfare services.
(141) He would reiterate the assurances given by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Director-General of Unesco that the United Nations would co-operate to the full with Unesco in planning further projects and in preparing the agenda for seminars and conferences in that field.

(142) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) shared the Belgian delegate's point of view.
(143) He added, however, that the Consultative Committee proposed under paragraph 381 should be

formed on the basis of a wide geographical distribution. In Near and Middle Eastern countries, in particular, youth movements were very popular.

(144) Mr. CLEGG (United Kingdom) said that, in paragraph 374, the Director-General would "inform" Member States, National Commissions, etc., of the proposed scheme and of the conditions for association. Surely it would be better if he consulted National Commissions and youth organizations first? As a compromise, he would suggest that National Commissions and youth organizations be given time to make their comments.
(145) As regarded paragraph 381, how would the members of the Consultative Committee on Youth Work be chosen? Would the National Commissions be consulted?

(146) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the problem of contacts between Unesco and the National Commissions had already arisen several times. It seemed that they could not be as direct as would sometimes be desirable, because governments had to be informed of such steps being taken.

(147) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that the members of the Committee would largely be drawn from international youth organizations, and would be selected primarily for their international standing. Their nationality, therefore, would be more or less incidental, although he saw no objection to informing National Commissions of the choices made.
(148) As regarded paragraph 381, it had been suggested that Unesco pay travel costs plus per diem allowances. That was a suggestion the Secretariat could accept. If the Committee met once a year, for five days, the cost would be $1,000 a year.
(149) As to the point raised by the United Kingdom (paragraph 374), the Secretariat would most certainly send out proposals well in advance and leave time for comments to be received before any final decision was taken.

(150) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) said that, in dealing with the chapter regarding youth organizations likely to improve international understanding, mention should be made of one such organization which deserved Unesco's attention: the Junior Red Cross. It was a branch of the International Red Cross and was based on three principles: the health of young people, national solidarity and international solidarity. Unesco had taken an interest in the organization and had granted scholarships to some of its members. It would be a good thing to organize camps with government aid; the friendships between young people and adolescents which might be formed there would be a very valuable factor in understanding. She therefore hoped that Unesco would consider what she had said, with a view to aiding the Junior Red Cross throughout the world.

(151) Mrs. LEGARDA (Philippines) said that in her country there were plenty of youth movements - boy scouts, girl guides, Catholic youth, etc. The problem was rather how to cater for young people not yet organized in youth movements and for young people out of school hours. She would therefore urge the adoption of paragraph 381, with special reference to that problem, which was closely bound up with the problem of juvenile delinquency and the provision of suitable films and literature for young people.

(152) Paragraphs 372-384, as amended by France, were unanimously adopted, subject to the comments made.

(B) Collaboration with the Unesco Youth Institute, Gauting (paragraphs 385-395)

(153) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia), speaking as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, said that there had been doubts in the Committee as to financial support for the Institute. The Committee, after lengthy discussion, had been of opinion that the Institute had been in existence for too short a time for any final judgment on its usefulness to be passed, and so had recommended that the estimate of expenditure should be maintained, and that the Director-General should submit a critical study on the matter to the ninth session of the Conference.
(154) The Committee had drawn attention to the report by the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation. Both staff and studies should be made more international in character, and the results of the studies carried out should be disseminated.

(155) Paragraphs 385-395 were unanimously adopted.

(C) The rôle of sport in education (paragraphs 396-398)

(156) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the question was explained in detail in document 8C/PRG/12.

(157) Mr. CALO (Italy) was surprised that large international organizations like the World Health Organization and the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies had not been invited by Unesco to take part in the preliminary studies in a field in which their opinion might carry particular weight.
(158) Public health specialists, physiologists, pediatrists and moralists had constantly expressed doubts of the value of sport in character formation (when practised intensively and from an early age) unless it led gradually from simple games to competitions properly so called, passing through the stages of methodical exercise and moderate sporting activity.
(159) For that reason, the Italian delegation, which had always strongly favoured all exchanges of information between Member States, now thought it necessary to call an international conference or a meeting of experts to study, on the basis of questionnaires and other documentation, more particularly:

1. The influence of sports organizations and international sports meetings on the development of international co-operation and understanding;
2. The desirability of sport at different ages and scholastic levels.

(160) Those problems should also be studied by the

Youth Institute at Gauting; senior boys and girls obviously had something to say on the question of sport as a factor in education.
(161) It was only a suggestion, but the Italian delegation would be glad if it were taken into consideration.

(162) Mrs. JOBORU (Hungary) said that her Government gave every encouragement to sport both at school and outside, and much valuable experience had been acquired. Sport, if properly organized, helped to build character and contributed to international understanding among young people.
(163) Hungary, which had achieved great successes in the field of sport, would be very ready to take part in any scheme for the pooling of information and experience in connexion with the rôle of sport in education.

(164) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) said that, while the United States of America had been criticized for the almost excessive importance it attached to sport as a means of education, he questioned how far Unesco could go in the matter under discussion, in view of pressing educational needs in other fields.
(165) Two organizations in the United States of America had just made a careful study of the problem (the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and later the Educational Policy Commission of the United States). Their findings might usefully be consulted by the Conference.

(166) Mr. STEWART (Canada) said that, while the paragraphs in question had no budgetary implications, there might well be some in two years' time.
(167) In document 8C/PRG/12, Canada was quoted, but, while Unesco must have consulted various organs, it had not consulted the educational authorities. If the resolution 1.332 were adopted, confusion might well result, unless the points on which Member States were consulted were very clearly defined. Information might be submitted, for example, on semi-commercial or commercial sport. Hence he would support the United States proposal (document 8C/PRG/12) that none of the activities mentioned in resolution 1.353 of the seventh session be undertaken.

(168) Mr. CLEGG (United Kingdom) said that, if the value traditionally ascribed to organized games was taken for granted, and it was assumed that Unesco was not concerned with a favoured minority, the practical problem which arose was the following: did there exist, in the great cities and agglomerations, sufficient open ground available for games?
(169) The Advisory Council on Education in Scotland had decided that not enough ground was available in Scottish towns. It had, however, suggested that a careful enquiry ought to be carried out. As far as he knew, no such enquiry had been made.
(170) He would suggest two lines of enquiry. Firstly, was enough ground available? Secondly, if not, could games be encouraged involving less ground but inculcating the real or supposed virtues of organized games?

(171) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that the object of the consultations and studies proposed by the authors of paragraphs 396 and 397 was to throw light nationally and internationally on the great problem of the coexistence of amateur and professional sport; it was certainly within the scope of Unesco to ask Member States in which the problem existed to make a study of the repercussions of professional sport on education, and France would particularly need to know how those things were arranged in other countries.
(172) The French Government would even be prepared to devote large sums to a study of the kind and would probably be glad to know the results of the large-scale enquiry of which the delegate of the United States of America had spoken.

(173) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) thought that there were two distinct aspects of the rôle of sport in education: on the one hand, there was sport as seen in the framework of physical culture, on the other, the part it could play and the effects it could have in the field of international understanding.
(174) The delegate of Brazil considered that Unesco, through resolutions appearing in other parts of the programme, was already in a position to face the tasks that that implied, and he thought that too great an importance would be attached to sporting organizations, which anyway had more money than did cultural organizations, if the question were given special attention.

(175) The proposal submitted by the delegation of the United States of America was rejected by 16 votes to 8 with 15 abstentions.

(176) Resolutions 1.331 and 1.332 were unanimously adopted.

Creation by Unesco of an International School in Paris (document 8C/PRG/1)

(177) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia), speaking as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, said that his Committee, after considering the recommendation by the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation had decided to support the experts' view that, while there might be a call for such a school, Unesco should not take the initiative of founding it.

(178) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that clear advice had been given by the Expert Committee and by the Advisory Committee, so perhaps no comment was appropriate.

(179) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) said that his country was very pleased to welcome children of different nationalities in its schools, but was also anxious to educate them in such a way as to satisfy the very varying aspirations of parents.
(180) He therefore wondered whether that direct experiment in international understanding was not, first and foremost, part of the mission which Unesco had undertaken and whether that eminently varied sphere was not the best suited to the study of the possibilities for developing the idea of living in a world community.

(181) For that reason the French delegation would favour the Secretariat's continuing the study of that project while envisaging the formation of an expert committee, which would naturally be composed of educationalists, but also of legal experts, since one day the problem of the equivalence of degrees would arise.
(182) As regarded the financial aspect of the question, the French delegate recalled that the French Ministry of Education had promised to collaborate directly with Unesco by offering to put the necessary teaching and administrative staff at its disposal.

(183) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) was against the scheme. Such a school would be founded merely to render a service to international officials, and could never be considered a Unesco project in the field of work for international understanding. In addition, many parents would no doubt want their children to obtain higher education in their home countries. It would be a great blow to Unesco's prestige if the scheme were a failure. Hence he was strongly opposed to it.

(184) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) spoke of the existence of private international schools in Switzerland, which could achieve the same result without new schools' intervening. Furthermore, he considered that a problem might arise in that children, having studied in this school, could not be certain that their degrees and diplomas would be recognized by their own countries or by countries in which they had to take up their residence.

(185) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) accepted the creation of the proposed international school in principle. She particularly supported the experimental character of the school, having regard to the fact that what was most important would be to give the pupils basic training both in how to belong to a world community and in how to be potential citizens in a local community.
(186) She thought that the school could be set up by private contributions and would not need financial aid from Unesco.
(187) She remembered a visit she had paid to the school for the children of United Nations staff members in New York, and she considered that teaching in a school of that kind would be fraught with difficulties, particularly with regard to languages.

(188) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Board had discussed the scheme to determine whether it could constitute a pilot project or whether it was merely for the benefit of international officials. Reports on the international schools in New York and Geneva had been considered.
(189) The Board had come to no very clear decision for or against, and had merely referred the document to the Conference without comment.

(190) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) said that he would be surprised if Unesco were to ignore a problem to which many other international organizations, less directly interested, had already found a solution.
(191) The French delegation had, moreover, done no more than ask that a study of the kind should be pursued, so that it could be put before the General Conference at its next session.
(192) As for the argument of possible failure, put forward by the New Zealand delegate, its use, for that project or for others, could only foreshadow Unesco's own failure.

(193) Mr. SIDDIQI (Pakistan) said that, as a proposal to offer reasonable facilities to international officials in educating their children, the scheme had much to be said for it.
(194) Such a school, however, could never be considered a pilot project, as it would be operating under very special conditions.

(195) Mr. CALO (Italy) was in agreement with the continued study of a project of the kind and paid tribute to the generosity of the French offer.
(196) However, if he had to vote on a proposal for carrying out the project immediately, he would feel obliged to abstain, as he doubted the desirability of early bilingualism or multilingualism, as much from the educational point of view as in the formation of character.

(197) Mr. CLEGG (United Kingdom) thought that, with so untypical a group of pupils, such a scheme could never be a pilot project. In addition, how could Unesco with a good conscience set up a costly school when dedicated to the cause of free compulsory education for all? At a time when so much urgent work remained to be done elsewhere, the scheme was wholly unsatisfactory.

(198) Mr. SUNDARAM (India) could not support the scheme. How much support was there for such a school amongst the staff of Unesco? It would be by no means easy to find suitable staff. It would be better to leave the creation of such a school to voluntary enterprise.
(199) Then there was the grave problem of religious education, a question on which parents might have strong views. The difficulties were so great that there was no point in further study.

(200) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) thought that fear of the school being a failure was no argument against its establishment.
(201) The French offer was extraordinarily generous and offered a unique opportunity of assembling children of all nationalities and creeds for an experiment in peaceful coexistence.
(202) He himself had been against the scheme in the Advisory Committee, but had since changed his view and had become a firm supporter.

(203) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the school would certainly offer a most interesting opportunity for experiment. At the same time, conditions would be very far from typical. In addition, the school would be competing with other schools in Paris. There were, for example, an American school, an Anglo-French school, a Swedish school, and possibly other national schools, besides the French ones.
(204) Then, again, there might be financial difficulties. The financial calculations had been based on the

assumption that Member States would supply teachers without cost. Hitherto, only France had made such an offer.
(205) There would be the capital costs of some $550,000, which would have to be borrowed. If the scheme were adopted, the Conference would have to authorize a loan from the Working Capital Fund to borrow half of the money required; the rest would no doubt have to be raised from some French agency.
(206) The delegate of France had suggested that the principle involved should be further studied. But that had already been done at length in the document itself.
(207) Hence it would be well to take a decision forthwith on the principle involved. If the principle were rejected, there would be no call for further study. If it were adopted, there would be need of course for planning.

(208) By 25 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions, it was decided that Unesco should not create such a school.

(209) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Commission had recommended increases in the expenditure of the Education Department amounting to $96,990 net. Should the Director-General continue to submit proposals for reductions?

(210) The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in accordance with an earlier decision, the Commission was entirely free after it had finished its examination of the programme as a whole to return to each main chapter separately and to hear what the Director-General had to say about such detailed adjustments as he thought possible.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

# FIFTEENTH MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

(1) Before the debate on the programme of the Department of Natural Sciences began, Mr. SEVERI (Italy) wished to pay tribute to the memory of the physicist, Fermi, who had just died from cancer in Chicago. Fermi, who was born in Italy and had taught for several years at the University of Rome, had done remarkable work on nuclear physics and artificial radio-activity. Mr. Severi hoped that Fermi's discoveries would be used solely in the service of civilization and peace, and that the great scientist, whose death was so untimely, would be counted amongst the benefactors of mankind.

(2) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) wished, in the absence of the United States scientific representative, to express his delegation's deep regret at the untimely death of Professor Fermi, which had cut short a career with great potentialities for world peace and security. The United States of America, the home of much of Professor Fermi's work, could not but suffer from the loss.

(3) Mr. LEROY (France), on behalf of the French delegation, expressed sympathy with scientific circles in Italy and the United States of America in their loss.

(4) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), on behalf of his delegation, joined in the tribute paid to the memory of Enrico Fermi. He had personal reasons for doing so, as he had known him and been a friend of his, and national reasons, as the distinguished research worker had had scientific contacts with Mexico for more than 20 years.

(5) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to observe a few moments' silence in homage to the memory of Enrico Fermi.
(6) He reminded the Commission that the decisions it had taken when discussing the Education Department's programme had resulted in an increase of nearly $100,000 in the budget estimates. He suggested that the Commission consider the other chapters of the draft programme and budget and refer its recommendations to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, which would study them at the same time as the Director-General's proposals. The Commission could then consider the views expressed by the Committee and draw up its final report for the General Conference.
(7) The Chairman then drew his colleagues' attention to the need for expediting the discussions and limiting their remarks to the essential minimum. Even then, evening meetings would perhaps be required to get through the Commission's extremely heavy agenda.

## ITEM 8.4.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: NATURAL SCIENCES

Paragraphs 1-16

(8) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) first paid tribute to the scientific genius of Enrico Fermi, with whom he had on several occasions been able to collaborate.
(9) He then said that it would be difficult for him to give the Commission full details of his Department's programme in a few minutes. Much had been said

about concentration and the remodelling of the programme, but, in the scientific field, the most important thing to remember was that Unesco's main object was to place science at the service of man.
(10) The Department of Natural Sciences had but limited means for achieving that object: $800,000 a year and some 50 people for the period 1953-54. Fortunately, those modest resources were complemented by substantial contributions from outside - the support and co-operation of governments, National Commissions, the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations and all scientists of good will.
(11) Mr. Auger thought that science could be regarded from four main standpoints, corresponding to the principal parts of the programme of his Department: universality, utilization, dynamism and value.
(12) In the first place, science was universal and of interest to all the countries of the world. Unesco was accordingly fostering the development of international scientific co-operation, the improvement of understanding between research workers, and the improvement of the standard of scientific documentation.
(13) Science was not of purely theoretical interest; it could be harnessed in the service of mankind and used to improve the lot of the people as a whole. In that respect, the Department of Natural Sciences was making a technical contribution to the work of the Specialized Agencies.
(14) Science was also characterized by continual progress, to which it was impossible to see any end. For that reason, it was necessary to improve science teaching so that the young could play their part in the scientific work of the future, and to spread scientific knowledge amongst the adult population so that the man in the street might have his share in scientific developments throughout the world.
(15) Finally, science had what might be called a commercial value, for countries rich in scientific knowledge were able to exploit their capital better. But the highly developed countries could place their scientific knowledge at the disposal of less privileged countries without any loss to themselves. They might even benefit from such action in the long run. The programme of the Department of Natural Sciences therefore included projects for providing Member States with scientific assistance.

(16) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) wished to comment on chapter 2 of the proposed programme and budget as a whole. In its broad outline, he found it perfectly acceptable and very reasonable in its arrangement of activities. But he had the following observations to make: (1) however praiseworthy might be the activities shown under Section II, "Contribution to research, particularly for the improvement of the economic and social conditions of mankind", he thought that the first and third headings of Section I best reflected Unesco's particular responsibilities in the field covered by the Department; (2) consequently, the delegation of Spain supported resolutions 2.11 and 2.12 unreservedly, and particularly the latter. Owing to its special position in the Spanish-speaking world, Spain believed that it had a great part to play in three of the tasks mentioned in resolution 2.12, i.e.: the standardization of scientific terminology, the compilation of multilingual dictionaries and the improvement of scientific translations. The delegation also supported resolution 2.121 and asked that one of the terminological bureaux proposed under it, be set up in Madrid; (3) Mr. Estelrich therefore advocated the stabilization of the budget for Section II of chapter 2, until satisfactory results had been obtained in international scientific co-operation and in the teaching and dissemination of science.

(17) Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the three aspects of Unesco's scientific work set out in paragraph 2 of the Natural Sciences chapter, wished to add a fourth: the use of scientific achievement solely for peace and the benefit of mankind. He supported the resolution on the peaceful use of atomic energy submitted by the Indian delegation in document 8C/DR/9 (rev.) and hoped that it would be unanimously adopted by the Commission.
(18) The Soviet Union had long been interested in atomic energy and, not long after the discovery of a system of chemical elements by Mendeleiev in 1867, theoretical discoveries were made which foreshadowed the splitting of the atom. Soviet scientists had carried out important research work during the past decade; they had studied closely the achievements of scientists and physicists in other countries, especially those of Professor Fermi, whose death was deeply to be regretted. Great progress had been made in the use of radio-activity and radio-isotopes for studying the exchange of elements in living organisms, in the study and treatment of disease in human beings and animals, in biology and genetics and in general as a means of investigating the secrets of nature for the good of humanity.
(19) The Soviet delegation was also in favour of the French delegate's proposal for an expert discussion on radio-isotopes in Europe, but urged that more governments should be invited to participate.
(20) In conclusion, he urged that Unesco should adopt a strong policy on the peaceful use of atomic energy. The Soviet Government would support any action in the direction of prohibiting the use of atomic weapons and encouraging the use of atomic energy for the benefit of humanity.

(21) Mr. SAMBURSKY (Israel) considered the chapter on Natural Sciences one of the best in Unesco's programme. A study of the budgetary distribution between items, however, showed a slightly lower proportion for research than for the dissemination of science, and he felt that the reverse should be the case.
(22) A great deal had been said on the need for concentration, and the Natural Sciences programme was well concentrated; but there was a danger that, if the policy were pursued too rigidly, no room would be left for new activities. In his opinion the programme should be divided into three parts: contributions to scientific organizations; specific activities, such as arid zone research, the geophysical year and travelling exhibitions; and exploratory studies for the selection of future programmes, and ten per cent of the reserve budget should be used for exploration in new fields. There were numerous possibilities for research: for example, the creation of more food, the use of photo-synthesis, radio biology; and Unesco

could co-ordinate and give a stimulus to work already being done in the various fields.
(23) With regard to the teaching of science, he had been unable to find any reference to the teaching of the history of science. He strongly advocated its inclusion in an appropriate part of the programme.
(24) Finally, comparing the budgetary distribution between Natural Sciences and the other chapters, he noted that Education, Mass Communication and Cultural Activities accounted for 70.5% of the total, Natural Sciences for 17% and Social Sciences for 12.5%. If some of the scientific activities, such as dissemination of science, could be transferred to other departments, it would be possible to increase scientific research under chapter 2. He would like the proposal to be considered, if not for the 1955-56 programme, at any rate for the subsequent period.

(25) Mr. STANKOVIC (Yugoslavia) congratulated the Secretariat on having drawn up a well-balanced programme for the Natural Sciences. He considered that the European Organization for Nuclear Research and the programme of arid zone research could be held up as examples of well-conducted enterprises.
(26) In connexion with the International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences programme, Mr. Stankovic understood that the experts who had met in 1953 had been particularly interested in the development of national centres for scientific research. However, the draft programme provided only for a conference of directors of national scientific research centres and councils (paragraph 72).
(27) Mr. Stankovic said that the Yugoslav delegation attached great importance to the question. Two trends were to be observed: in some countries, government action in the field of scientific research was increasing, not only in the financing but also in the conduct of research; in other countries, scientific research was developing with greater flexibility.
(28) Mr. Stankovic thought it essential for the various national scientific research councils to be able to compare notes and make a critical evaluation of the results obtained.
(29) It would also be well for Unesco to collaborate more closely with non-governmental organizations and the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. The interest in oceanographic research, for example, was satisfactory, but Mr. Stankovic wished to know whether the Secretariat contemplated co-operating with the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. The activities undertaken in connexion with arid zone problems had shown that it was impossible to tackle such vast and complex questions without the collaboration of specialist bodies.
(30) It was also necessary to co-ordinate Unesco's activities with those of the other Specialized Agencies. With regard to the "campaign against cancer" project, Mr. Stankovic observed that the World Health Organization was also interested in that question, and he thought that the respective provinces of the two Organizations should be carefully defined. It would perhaps be preferable, on that account, to call the project "Basic research on cell growth", in accordance with the suggestions made by WHO in document 8C/PRG/20, Add. 1, page 2.

(31) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) hoped Unesco would give more support to the International Council of Scientific Unions, the European Nuclear Research Centre at Geneva and the Computation Centre in Rome. He also noted that twelve of the fellowships provided for in the programme of the Department of Natural Sciences were placed under the "higher budgetary level", and asked that, if necessary, those fellowships be reserved primarily for the Geneva and Rome Centres.

(32) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) congratulated the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences on having established world-wide services with a budget smaller than that of many national councils for scientific research. He had, however, two remarks to make on the Department's draft programme.
(33) In the first place, the biological aspect of man's life received too little attention. It was all very well to deal with the environment and the material conditions of human progress, but more importance should be accorded to the problems of genetics, endocrinology, the nervous system and the brain. In a chapter in which the improvement of the economic and social conditions of life was taken to be one of the fundamental aims, the biological being who was to benefit from all those efforts should not be forgotten.
(34) The other problem that seemed to receive too little attention was that of the relations between science and ethics. Mr. Berredo Carneiro did not want restrictions to be placed on freedom of scientific research, but he thought it was time to set limits to the possible applications of scientific knowledge. International conventions were already in force on such matters as the production of drugs and narcotics. At a time when governments tended increasingly to take over scientific production, they should be asked to conform to certain rules.

(35) Mr. RAADI (Iran) was sure that the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences had not intended to place in order of importance the four standpoints from which science could be viewed. Indeed, the last two he had mentioned might determine the first two.
(36) Mr. Raadi thought that both the teaching and dissemination of science and aid to Member States in scientific matters should have priority. The development of international research and co-operation was impossible so long as science was not taught and scientific knowledge spread throughout the world.
(37) Mr. Raadi also thought it very important to increase the number of fellowships.
(38) With regard to the relations of science and ethics, Mr. Raadi thought that progress in specialization was causing scientists to retire into an ivory tower and to lose touch with general ideas affecting the whole of mankind. It would be advisable to see that a close connexion was maintained between science and general education in institutes and estaolishments where science was taught.
(39) Taking up the remarks of the Israeli delegate on the need for paying due attention to the history of science, Mr. Raadi emphasized that the question should be approached from the standpoint of cultural history as a whole and that barriers should not be raised between science and general culture.
(40) Finally, Mr. Raadi hoped there would be closer collaboration between the various councils set up under Unesco's auspices.

(41) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) began by joining in the tribute to the memory of the great physicist, Enrico Fermi.
(42) He felt that after reading the preamble to chapter 2 and hearing Mr. Auger's statement, all delegates were bound to feel satisfaction at the balance achieved by the Department of Natural Sciences. Mr. Al-Koussi was sorry, however, that a working party had not been set up at the current session of the Conference, to study the Department's programme, for it was a field on its own.
(43) He was pleased at the results secured in international scientific co-operation, at the work accomplished in liaison with ICSU, and at the progress achieved with regard to scientific documentation.
(44) He thought it would be advisable to make a list of all the institutions and laboratories that might render practical services to nations or groups of nations.
(45) He noted with satisfaction the interest Unesco was taking in oceanographic problems. In oceanography, research was invariably rapidly rewarded. There was, for instance, no doubt that such important questions as the life and migrations of the tunny could be settled only by international co-operation.
(46) So far as the relations between science and society were concerned, dealt with in paragraph 9 of the preamble to chapter 2, Mr. Al-Koussi thought that the Department of Natural Sciences should co-operate closely with the other departments, and particularly with the Department of Mass Communication, once it had been reorganized.
(47) Mr. Al-Koussi, however, deplored the increasing clumsiness of the international bureaucracy, which rivalled that of national government departments. It was understandable that scientists should often feel impatient and disillusioned, lost, as they were, in a labyrinth of meetings of experts, commissions, committees and seminars. What practical results had, for instance, been obtained under the arid zone programme? Had any field research been undertaken? It would be better to send teams of experts to work in some arid region. Their work was sure to be useful, and direct action was better than symposia and meetings of experts.
(48) In the same way, Mr. Al-Koussi hoped that oceanographic research in the Indo-Pacific region would be begun shortly.
(49) Finally, he strongly urged the need for greater concentration of efforts.

(50) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) noted that all the delegates who had spoken had laid stress on the importance of some part of his Department's programme. Each part had been regarded as meriting priority by one or other of the preceding speakers. It might, therefore, be concluded that there was no serious error of proportion in the programme, since no project had been severely criticized.
(51) For instance, the Spanish delegate had thought it better to stabilize the appropriations for scientific research in order to promote collaboration with international organizations and improve scientific documentation, whereas the Israeli delegate had been in favour of increasing the funds for research.
(52) These were budgetary problems, and the Department of Natural Sciences, with the appropriations proposed, could do no more than was suggested in that chapter. It was, incidentally, the General Conference which fixed the amount of subventions.
(53) With regard to the Soviet delegate's remarks, Mr. Auger drew the Commission's attention to documents 8C/PRG/24 and Addendum, in which the Secretariat proposed a work plan designed to implement the draft resolutions submitted by France (DR/1), India (DR/9 rev.) and Japan (DR/32 rev.), if they were approved.
(54) In answer to the Israeli delegate, Mr. Auger said that the Secretariat did not underestimate the importance of the problem of photo-synthesis, but there again it was a question of funds and of concentration of the programme. It was impossible to do everything at once.
(55) Referring to the Yugoslav delegate's remarks about the International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences programme, Mr. Auger said that the Committee was to meet in 1954 at Milan and would consider questions concerning scientific research in the universities and in industry and the openings for research workers.
(56) Unesco was always ready to collaborate with the other Specialized Agencies. For instance, the implementation of the Japanese draft resolution concerning the dangers resulting from the use of radio-active products would necessitate close liaison with WHO. In the same way, the French and Indian draft resolutions, already mentioned, implied close collaboration with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies concerned.
(57) In answer to Mr. Photiades, Mr. Auger pointed out that provision was made for a total of 38 fellowships, for two years, in his Department's programme. Several of them would certainly be used for the activities Mr. Photiades had mentioned.
(58) Mr. Auger then explained that the International Union of Physiological Sciences was soon to join ICSU and would thus be able to benefit from Unesco's aid. As for the relations between the natural sciences and the social sciences, Mr. Auger emphasized that the question of race, for instance, was both social and biological. He reminded the Commission that the periodical, Impact, was designed to deal with the problems involved in the relations of science and society. That publication was therefore an answer to the question with which certain delegates had been concerned.
(59) Mr. Auger agreed with Mr. Raadi that it would be regrettable to isolate the sciences from humanistic studies, but in his opinion it was no less important to see that specialists in the literary branches of study were not completely ignorant of contemporary science. The efforts made to encourage the teaching of science and the spread of scientific knowledge among adults should help to remedy existing shortcomings.
(60) Lastly, Mr. Auger joined with the delegate of Egypt in deploring the clumsiness of the modern bureaucratic system. But he emphasized that successive consultations were the only way of reaching general agreement on a particular problem in accordance with democratic principles. He also reminded the Egyptian delegate that an important

project for the study of a given arid region was mentioned in paragraph 98 of the chapter under consideration.

(61) The Commission finally approved paragraphs 1-16, subject to later changes in the figures.

2.1 Development of international co-operation

Paragraphs 17-24

(62) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the first paragraph of draft resolution 8C/DR/18, submitted by the Indian delegation, and the comments made on it by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (document 8C/BUD/1, page 11).

(63) The project was supported by the delegates of Iran and Liberia.

(64) In reply to a question from Mr. ANGELL (United States of America), Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the project had no budgetary implications, if it was simply a question of inviting Member States to make requests. The necessary funds would then be drawn from the technical assistance budget.

(65) The project was unanimously approved.

(A) International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU)

(66) Mr. SEVERI (Italy) recommended increasing the subvention to ICSU. He made special mention of the needs of the Zoological Station at Naples, which depended for its resources on ICSU.

(67) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom), referring to paragraphs 20-24, said that he had to speak in the dual capacity of delegate of the United Kingdom and observer for the International Council of Scientific Unions.
(68) Speaking in the latter capacity, he said that many people were not aware of the scope of ICSU's activities, which included assistance to the meteorological station at Stockholm, the physical station in the Pyrenees and a number of abstracting centres, which all worked in the service of science. The original budget of $245,000 had been reduced by stages to the sum of $180,000 proposed for 1955 and 1956, regardless of the fact that there were now eleven unions to support and three new ones shortly to be added. The Secretary-General of ICSU had, at the last meeting of the Council's Executive Board, asked for additional funds for carrying on activities. In view of the increase in membership he felt justified in proposing that Unesco's subvention should be increased by $50,000.
(69) Speaking as the representative of the United Kingdom Government, however, he was obliged to oppose the granting of any subvention to ICSU, and to propose that any savings made on the science budget should be diverted to technical aid.

(70) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) thought it essential to strengthen ICSU, which was one of the pillars on which Unesco's work rested.

(71) Mr. LEROY (France) hoped that additional funds might be made available to ICSU.

(72) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) strongly supported the proposal to increase the subvention to ICSU, which was performing valuable work for international co-operation in science. It would be less costly for Unesco to support the Council than to undertake such activities itself.

(73) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) reminded the Commission that the proposal to increase the subvention was neither made nor supported by the United Kingdom. Moreover, the budget of Unesco had already been exceeded by $100,000 and there was little possibility of any surplus being available for the purpose.
(74) He was in favour of concentrating on activities of major importance and opposed an increase in the subvention.
(75) On a point of order, the proposal was formally moved by the delegate of the Netherlands and seconded by the delegate of France.

(76) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) supported the proposal, with the proviso that certain of Unesco's activities, such as the conference on public understanding of science, and science exhibitions, should ultimately be taken over by ICSU.

(77) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that ICSU could render great services to the Secretariat, when, for instance, the opinion of specialists was sought on some project. It was, however, difficult to commission ICSU to carry out specific projects, as the Council had only a very small secretariat, and, to obtain satisfactory results, it would have to establish a large service comparable to the Department of Natural Sciences itself.
(78) However, an attempt was being made to achieve closer collaboration between Unesco and ICSU. In the field of scientific literature, for example, ICSU had set up an Abstracting Service, which received contracts from Unesco and had already achieved remarkable results.

(79) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) said that the proposal was entirely unrealistic and he would oppose it. There was no possibility of a surplus in the budget, and far more likelihood of a deficit.

(80) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) asked if figures could be given so that the Commission would know the implications of the proposal.

(81) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands), referring to the suggestion of the Indian delegate, said that abstracting was one of the activities which might well be transferred from Unesco to ICSU. In reply to the delegate of Brazil, an additional $20,000, if devoted entirely to travel costs, would enable the scientific unions to meet more frequently. Hitherto work had been hampered by the lack of funds for meetings outside the ICSU congresses.

(82) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that

he was not very well informed about the activities of ICSU, but he did not think it advisable to contemplate hypothetical requests. In order to increase the ICSU subvention, funds would have to be withdrawn from other headings, a course of action which he considered to be futile. New schemes should be based on funds actually available. For that reason, he endorsed the views expressed by the delegate of the United States of America.

(83) Mr. LAUGIER (France) whole-heartedly supported any proposal to increase the subvention granted to ICSU. He added that the Commission's recommendation should also have weight with the Executive Board. If any savings were made on certain items in the budget as the work proceeded, a request should be made that those funds be allocated to ICSU.

(84) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) fully supported the proposal of the Netherlands delegate, for it seemed inconceivable to him that ICSU should receive only one-fiftieth of Unesco's budget.

(85) The recommendation of the Netherlands delegate was finally approved by 31 votes to 16, with 5 abstentions.

(86) Paragraphs 17-24 were then unanimously approved.

(B) Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences (paragraphs 25-27)

(87) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said he had the honour of representing the interests of CIOMS at the General Conference. He asked the Chairman to take a vote on the proposal made in paragraph 27, which fully met the needs of CIOMS. As Brazilian delegate, he entirely supported the proposed subvention.

(88) Mr. RAADI (Iran) also supported the proposal.

(89) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) strongly supported the subvention, but suggested that better international representation on the executive committee would be secured if the term of office were reduced from nine years to, say, three years, with a lapse of time before the same member could be reappointed.

(90) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) suggested that the Director-General be asked to send the CIOMS a note on the observations made about its executive committee.

(91) It was so decided.

(92) Paragraphs 25-27 were unanimously approved.

(C) Union of International Engineering Associations (paragraphs 28-31)

(93) Unanimously approved.

(D) Assistance to international scientific activities (paragraph 32)

(94) Unanimously approved.

(i) General Assembly of the International Union of Biochemistry (paragraph 33)

(95) Unanimously approved.

(ii) International Geophysical Year (paragraphs 34-36)

(96) After the Secretary of the Commission had read out the comments at the top of page 10 of document 8C/BUD/1, paragraphs 34-36 were unanimously approved.

Representation at meetings (paragraphs 37 and 38)

(97) Unanimously approved.

(98) Resolution 2.11 was unanimously approved.

Project 2.12 - Improvement of scientific documentation

Paragraphs 39-48

(99) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the second part of draft resolution 8C/DR/18, submitted by the Indian delegation.

(100) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that, as certain seminars had already been held in the field of scientific co-operation, the second part of his resolution was no longer necessary and he withdrew it.

(101) Project 2.12 was adopted.

(102) At the CHAIRMAN's request, the Secretary of the Commission read out the comments of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget regarding the proposed contract with the Council of International Organizations of Medical Science (document 8C/BUD/1, page 10, (42) (A)).

(103) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) wished to know why the Advisory Committee had recommended striking out an activity which had always been performed satisfactorily by the organization in question.

(104) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) strongly supported the publication of medical abstracts, but was opposed to their translation. Errors in translation could have serious medical results.

(105) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) thought that it would be more appropriate for the activity in paragraph 46 to be handled by the International Federation for Documentation. There was a danger of duplication if Unesco intervened.

(106) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the question was whether the lists of periodicals should be drawn up by specialist bodies or by some central body such as the International Federation for Documentation. In the latter case, the Federation would have to be granted a subvention. But the better course seemed to be to commission specialized organizations to carry out particular tasks.

(107) The CHAIRMAN wondered whether the Secretariat should not consider consulting the International

Federation for Documentation and the International Federation of Library Associations on all types of bibliographical work.

(108) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Director-General, who was particularly interested in such questions, saw no reason why that should not be done.

(109) The Advisory Committee's proposal was put to the vote and approved by 31 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions.

(110) Speaking on a point of order, Mr. LAUGIER (France) regretted that the Commission had agreed to reduce a subvention approved by the Executive Board and that the decision had been taken before Mr. Berredo Carneiro had obtained the information for which he had asked.

(111) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) also regretted that the vote had been taken before the reasons for the Advisory Committee's recommendation had been explained.

(112) The CHAIRMAN said he had thought that the United Kingdom delegate's remarks could be taken as a reply.

(113) By 25 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions, the Commission finally decided to rescind its previous decision, pending the receipt of further information from the representative of the Advisory Committee.

(114) Mr. SEVERI (Italy), on behalf of his delegation, submitted the following draft resolution:

"Unesco shall encourage and promote the translation of treatises on the teaching of the applied sciences, in the case of texts of universal value. Proposals regarding the translation of a text into the language of a given country shall be submitted to the Director-General by the National Commission of the country that wishes the translation to be made.

The Director-General shall recommend such proposals to the State in which the original text was published and to scientific or cultural institutions, and shall bring them to the notice of publishers likely to be interested".

(115) The proposal, seconded by the delegates of Iran, Chile and Spain, was unanimously approved.

(116) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the remarks of the Advisory Committee on paragraph 54 (International Anatomical Nomenclature Committee).

(117) In answer to a question from Mr. STANKOVIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the Advisory Committee's proposal was the result of lengthy discussions. To obtain rapid publication of the important work concerned, the first of its kind, it had been thought preferable for Unesco to conclude a contract direct with the appropriate organization.

(118) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) thought that a wider interested public would be reached if the reports were published in the normal anatomical journals. Moreover, there would be no outlay for Unesco.

(119) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) considered the activity more appropriate for the World Health Organization than for Unesco.

(120) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that, under the agreement concluded between WHO and Unesco, the basic sciences came within the province of Unesco. A knowledge of anatomy was certainly essential to the doctor, but it was a basic science and therefore concerned Unesco.

(121) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) wished to raise the same questions as the delegates of the Netherlands and United Kingdom.

(122) The CHAIRMAN said that there could be no satisfactory discussion unless a member of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget were present to answer questions.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

# SIXTEENTH MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 3.40 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

(1) The CHAIRMAN, after explaining how the remaining meetings of the Commission were to be allotted in order to complete the examination of the programme, hoped that, at the next session of the General Conference, the Programme and Budget Commission might begin work during the first week of the session. He proposed to submit a resolution to that effect to the Conference.

**ITEM 8.4.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: NATURAL SCIENCES (continued)**

(Paragraphs 56-58)

(2) As paragraphs 42-48 and 54-55 were to be held over for later consideration, the CHAIRMAN opened discussion on resolution 2.121.

(3) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) considered that the project outlined in the resolution was of less importance than resolutions concerning pure science. The proposed work could be done by national efforts. He proposed that the Commission recommend to the Director-General that a reduction be made on that project and the money thereby saved used for projects on pure science.

(4) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the proposal of the Advisory Committee that the project for the establishment of terminological bureaux be placed in Category 3.

(5) The CHAIRMAN observed that the suggestion was in line with that made by the United States delegate.

(6) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) intimated that the Arabic-speaking countries would be holding a conference in September 1955 on scientific problems and that the agenda included the question of scientific terminology in Arabic. He wished to know whether Unesco would co-operate in that conference.

(7) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that, after considering the Advisory Committee's recommendation about the terminology bureaux, he had discussed the question with the Egyptian and Indonesian delegations, and several delegates had expressed a wish that the scale of the project be reduced rather than that it be abandoned.
(8) The Director-General therefore proposed simply to provide aid to Member States, which would mean sending experts to some of them - in particular, Egypt and Indonesia - to help them in working out terminology. Assistance of that kind would require only half the sum budgeted for.

(9) The CHAIRMAN asked whether any delegation would like to submit a proposal along those lines.

(10) Mr. JOHANNES (Indonesia) asked whether the project came under general activities or special activities. If it came under general activities, the Indonesian Government would appreciate help from Unesco for translation into Indonesian.

(11) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that the Indonesian delegate's proposal was equivalent to placing the project in Category 2 and that it was for the Commission to decide on that point.

(12) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of Egypt.

(13) The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat agreed to the transfer of the item, and put the proposal to the vote, with the appropriation of $6,000 a year suggested by Mr. Auger.

(14) Approved.

SECTION II 2.2 - Contribution to research, particularly for the improvement of the economic and social conditions of mankind

(Paragraphs 59-63)

(15) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) said that he would take the necessary steps to secure ratification by the Mexican Government of the Convention for the establishment of the International Computation Centre.

(16) Mr. SEVERI (Italy) was very glad to hear that Mexico was to join the International Computation Centre.
(17) He reminded the meeting that Rome had been selected for the Centre's headquarters and that a preparatory committee was already arranging for the first general assembly of Member States. The committee had premises at the headquarters of the National Research Council and provision had been made for a new building. Draft regulations were being drawn up and a comparative study of calculating machines had been undertaken, the results of which would be communicated to Unesco.
(18) Mr. Severi mentioned that Italy did not wish to be in charge of the Centre and considered that the

appointment of a director of another nationality would help to give the Centre a more international character.
(19) He also mentioned that, owing to lack of funds for recruiting qualified staff, the preparatory committee had been obliged to refuse the offer of several electronic machines to be supplied free of charge.
(20) The Italian delegate deplored the decision taken by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget to transform the subvention originally proposed into a loan. His delegation would like the subvention for which provision had been made in the 1953-54 budget, and which had been agreed in principle by the Executive Board, to be put back into the budget for 1955-56. Without a minimum sum at its disposal the preparatory committee would not be able to perform the task entrusted to it.

(21) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board was extremely interested in the project. At its thirty-sixth session it had proposed the creation of the Advisory Committee on Research.

(22) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) pointed out that the Commission was once more faced with a project undertaken at Unesco's suggestion and with its help; it would be foolish for the Organization to equivocate over giving the Centre the funds needed for running it.
(23) He supported the request of the Italian delegate.

(24) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said that his Government was prepared to give its whole-hearted support to the implementation of the project, and was making arrangements, through its National Council for Scientific Research, to ratify the convention for the establishment of the Centre.

(25) In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the Advisory Committee had recommended that contracts totalling $3,000 be granted to the preparatory committee for the two years.

(26) Mr. SEVERI (Italy) recalled that the sum originally contemplated was $5,000 and deplored the suggested reduction, which would prevent the Centre from recruiting specialized staff capable of operating the machines offered to it.
(27) He observed that, as soon as it began work, the Centre would have the support of many countries which already possessed national computation centres.

(28) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had recommended approval of the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/29 to the General Conference because it wished to give the Centre a chance to make its preparations while awaiting the ten ratifications.

(29) Mr. LAUGIER (France), on behalf of his delegation, hoped that Unesco would support the International Computation Centre for as long as necessary. He pointed out the importance of the work undertaken by the preparatory committee, both in the technical sphere and in that of scientific research.
(30) Although most large countries already possessed calculating machines, many smaller countries had not yet been able to procure them. The Centre met a need for international co-operation.
(31) He thought it quite impossible for Unesco to abandon a body which it had helped to found and which was destined to become a centre of mathematical thought.
(32) Mr. Laugier therefore supported the Italian delegate's proposal, and urged that the $5,000 be granted to the Centre in the form of a subvention instead of a loan.

(33) The delegate of Uruguay also supported the proposal.

(34) It was then put to the vote and approved by 35 votes, with 7 abstentions.

Project 2.21: International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences

(35) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out a draft resolution submitted by the Uruguayan delegation (document 8C/DR/54), together with the Advisory Committee's recommendation that consideration of the proposal be postponed until a later session of the Conference.

(36) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board, in consultation with the Secretariat, had decided to consider documents 8C/DR/35, 8C/DR/54 and 8C/DR/60 together. It had recommended approval of the resolutions contained in documents 8C/DR/35 and 8C/DR/54 but had suggested that the proposal contained in document 8C/DR/60 be deferred until the ninth session of the General Conference.

(37) The Advisory Committee's proposal with regard to draft resolution 8C/DR/54 was approved.

(38) The CHAIRMAN requested the Commission to examine draft resolution 2.21.

(39) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) suggested that the first clause of resolution 2.21 be amended to read: "In order to contribute to scientific research, particularly for the improvement of the biological, economic and social conditions of mankind... ".

(40) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that the Indian Government considered the project concerning special scientific research was one of great importance. He felt, however, that it should include research on lagoons and coastal areas.

(41) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) said that in the Cajal Institute, Spain possessed one of the most up-to-date neuro-biological research centres, where techniques of the highest value were being developed. It was proposed to transform that national institute into an international neuro-biological centre and he suggested that, when the time came, the National Commission should get into touch with the Secretariat.

(42) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) was surprised at the high figure given in paragraph 64 for staff costs.

(43) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the staff in question did not work exclusively for the International Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme, but divided their time between the committee and assistance to scientific research, for which provision was made in draft resolution 2.22. If the total sum proposed for the two projects were approved by the Commission, it might be advisable to reconsider the amounts allotted to each of them.

(44) Mr. JOHANNES (Indonesia) proposed that the words "or other appropriate bodies designated by the National Commission of the State concerned" should be added after the words "National Research Councils" in line 4 of resolution 2.21, because some countries had no national research councils.

(45) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) seconded the Indonesian proposal. Countries like Ceylon had several scientific research institutes but no research council as yet. For maintaining contacts with such countries that amendment was necessary.

(46) Mr. PAGE (Canada) supported resolution 2.21 in principle but suggested that the International Advisory Committee should be more selective in the work it undertook.

(47) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the amendments to resolution 2.21, proposed by the delegates of Brazil and Indonesia.

(48) Approved.

(49) Resolution 2.21 was approved with those two amendments.

Resolution 2.22: Assistance to scientific research

(50) The CHAIRMAN intimated that draft resolutions concerning item 2.22 had been submitted by the delegations of France (document 8C/DR/1), India (document 8C/DR/9 rev.) and Japan (document 8C/DR/32 rev.). As the three drafts could be combined into a single text, the Chairman asked whether such a text had been drafted.

(51) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the Japanese delegation had prepared the new draft; it was being reproduced and would be examined later; if approved, it would become resolution 2.221.

(52) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the recommendation of the Advisory Committee that top priority be given to project 2.22.

(A) Arid zone (paragraphs 76-84)

(53) Mr. IBAÑEZ GOMEZ (Chile) pointed out that the study of arid zones was of great importance to his country and he hoped that Chile would be included in such a study. Much of its territory was unfit for cultivation, and through studies of that kind very extensive areas could be brought into production.

(54) Referring to paragraph 81, he urged that the reports to be published should appear not only in French and English but also in Spanish.

(55) Mr. LEROY (France) observed that paragraph 79 provided for the publication in English of the proceedings of the symposium on wind and solar energy. While he recognized that English was a universal language, he deplored the fact that the work in question and certain others already published on allied subjects were not to be published in French also, for they might well be of interest to the French Union.

(56) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the text was at fault on the point and that the publication was to be bilingual, with the English and French speeches reproduced in the original language. The system had already been used on several occasions when the two languages had been employed at a meeting.

(57) Mr. LEROY (France) also asked that, whenever a publication appeared in one language only, it should always be in the author's own language.

(58) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) thought that, as Unesco had limited resources, it should concentrate on major projects. He approved the proposal for research fellowships in paragraph 83. Such fellowships would be useful in conveying information from area to area.

(59) Mr. TOROCHESHNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union attached great importance to the arid zone question and felt that it should be placed in Category I. It was important to study the nature of the causes in order to prevent the creation of further arid zones. By undertaking studies in a series of regions data would be collected which would be important in the improvement of living conditions in arid areas. He assumed that the Director-General would carry out that important research work with the assistance of the countries concerned.

(60) In the Soviet Union much irrigation work had transformed a series of arid areas into fertile regions. In addition, the question of drought had been solved in limited areas by utilizing the water from small rivers to form reservoirs which could serve larger areas.

(61) Another significant factor in the problem of drought was deforestation. The Soviet Union had undertaken large schemes of reafforestation in an attempt to avoid the drought menace. The work should, however, not be limited to questions relating to flora and fauna but should attempt to conquer the whole problem of turning arid zones into fertile regions.

(62) He hoped that the Director-General would select specialists for arid zone research who were interested in combating the whole arid zone problem.

(63) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) considered the resolution very important. He would support any additional help given to the project if it were in line with the policy of concentration of the

programme. He was prepared to accept a reduction with regard to the projects on the humid tropical zone, the money thus saved being allocated to the arid zone project.

(64) Mr. PAGE (Canda) supported the remarks made by the United States delegate. While not denying the usefulness of the projects included under resolution 2.22, he thought there were too many of them. In his opinion Unesco should concentrate on the arid zone project and consider the possibility of releasing funds from other projects for that purpose.

(65) Mr. STEINIG (United Nations) assumed that the work of the United Nations on water control, drought, etc. was known to members of the Commission and said that it bore a close relationship to the projects outlined in resolution 2.22. Committees of the Economic and Social Council were studying problems of the arid zone and humid tropical zone and had published their first findings. He assured the Commission that Unesco would be regularly informed of developments on projects undertaken by the United Nations in those fields.

(66) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) proposed rejection of the United States suggestion that work on the humid tropical zone should be suspended and that the funds saved should go towards arid zone research.

(67) The CHAIRMAN said that a recommendation to that effect had been made, but it did not provide for transferring the funds from paragraph 88 to paragraph 84.

(68) Mr. STANKOVIC (Yugoslavia), on behalf of his delegation, supported the draft resolution (document 8C/DR/98) on the semi-arid zones of the Mediterranean, submitted by the Italian delegation.

(69) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research habitually covered the semi-arid regions, many of which were in process of becoming arid.

(70) Mr. SEVERI (Italy) said that he had already cleared up the matter unofficially with Mr. Auger, and the Italian delegation would not press for a vote on the resolution it had submitted. Furthermore, it seemed to him that, since the countries of southern Europe - Greece, Italy, Spain - had been mentioned as possessing arid zones, Yugoslavia might well be added to them.

(71) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that France itself had been the scene of studies by the Advisory Committee on the Arid Zone, which had sent a mission to the Montpellier area.

(72) The CHAIRMAN read out a recommendation by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget that the draft resolution (document 8C/DR/59) submitted by the Belgian delegation be rejected.

(73) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) said that his delegation was willing to withdraw its proposal.

(74) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) noted that paragraph 94, which provided for a general study of given arid regions, met the wishes of the Belgian delegation.

(B) Humid tropical zone (paragraphs 85-88)

(75) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) strongly opposed the suggestion to postpone work on humid tropical zone research, giving reasons. He considered that plans could be drawn up immediately, but suggested that it should be done in a different way from that proposed in the programme. He proposed that Unesco should ask the National Commissions to study the problem in their own countries, telling them what kind of information was required. He was prepared to give a note on the nature of that information to the Secretariat. The following year a meeting of specialists, including experts from the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labour Office and the World Health Organization, could be held to consider reports, and from those reports, a work plan could be drawn up for consideration by the ninth session of the General Conference.

(76) If more money than was required for the above should be available, he would suggest that the work be done on a regional basis, the regions involved being Central America, Central Africa, South and South East Asia.

(77) He proposed that an immediate start be made. If the work were postponed, parts of the humid zone would in time become semi-arid and the problem would be larger than ever.

(78) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget that the execution of the humid tropical zone programme be postponed for a year.

(79) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) recalled that in 1946 he had made a proposal to Unesco for the establishment of an International Institute of the Hylean Amazon. The project had been adopted and extensive studies had been carried out with the co-operation of several international organizations and assistance from experts. A convention had been drawn up and signed by 9 States situated in humid tropical regions, but political considerations had prevented its ratification. After that setback, the Brazilian Government had itself, through its National Council for Scientific Research, founded a research institute in the Amazon region. The work had thus not been interrupted and the scientific data collected by the Institute of the Hylean Amazon, which were considered to be of great value by the experts who had examined them, had not been wasted.

(80) The Brazilian delegate thought it would be a pity to postpone the proposed work for a year or two, particularly as an advisory committee would not run up against the political obstacles which had prevented the Institute of the Hylean Amazon from continuing in being.

(81) He therefore supported the proposal by the delegate of Ceylon.

(82) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) endorsed the remarks by the delegate of Ceylon, agreeing that the problem needed immediate attention. He concurred with the suggestion that the National Commissions should study the problem and make reports. He hoped that the Secretariat would be able to prepare a plan along those lines.
(83) He suggested that the National Commissions be permitted to designate the experts for those studies.

(84) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) supported the proposal by the delegate of Ceylon.
(85) The humid tropical zone was an area which was 90% utilized for growing rubber. The natural consequence of increasing the supplies of rubber was that less space was available for growing food. He suggested that action be taken before the problem became out of control.

(86) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) supported the proposal of the delegate of Ceylon that there should be no postponement. He thought that the point made by the delegate of Liberia concerning the ever-increasing acreage being taken up by rubber plantations was important. There were innumerable problems of the kind which had an important bearing not only from the economic point of view generally but especially from the point of view of growing food.
(87) He supported the proposal of the delegate of Ceylon that the resolution should be adopted.

(88) Mr. PAGE (Canada) supported in principle the proposal contained in document 8C/DR/99, and would agree to methods being used which would lend additional financial support to the arid zone project and ultimately to the humid tropical zone project. That could be done by suppressing paragraph 88 and by allocating only the amount proposed for 1956 to the project proposed in document 8C/DR/99. Both projects would then be brought into action in a proper fashion.

(89) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) appreciated that several delegations were anxious that a start be made in 1955 on research on the humid tropical zone.
(90) He proposed the following solution, which was based on the original estimates: in 1955 $2,000 would be spent in the form of contracts with experts on preparing for the following year's work, and National Commissions would be asked to take part in that preparatory work; in 1956, $10,654 would be allotted to the execution of the project. Thus the first year would not be wasted.

(91) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) agreed with Mr. Auger that the total amount would not be required in the first year. He suggested that subventions should be given to scientific co-operation officers in the first year and a sum of $12,000 be set aside for a meeting of experts in the second year.

(92) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) supported the remarks made by Mr. Auger. He thought that the requirements of British colonies would be met and that the procedure would lead to a more satisfactory study for future years.

(93) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to take a decision on Mr. Auger's suggestion, which met with the approval of the delegate of Ceylon and had also been supported by the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(94) Approved.

(C) Physical oceanography and marine biology (paragraphs 89-91)

(95) Mr. KAYA (Japan), referring to paragraph 89, hoped that the proposal would be approved and that the programme of work would become more definite during the coming two years.
(96) He proposed that the word "physical" be deleted from the title of the project.
(97) The Japanese delegation had submitted the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/61 because it wished to see the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Oceanographic Research similar to that which had been established for the arid zone programme. That Advisory Committee would be concerned in co-ordinating oceanographic research in various regions, especially in the Indo-Pacific region and in Latin America. The Secretariat had prepared document 8C/PRG/22 which contained all information necessary for the discussion of the Japanese draft resolution. It also contained an amended work plan, with which the Japanese delegation was in complete agreement.

(98) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) expressed satisfaction that the Director-General had considered it important to undertake research on oceanography and marine biology. He feared, however, that the research as planned might be directed only towards the deep sea. The Burmese delegation would like to see it extended to shallow waters.
(99) He proposed that a sentence should be added at the end of paragraph 89, which would read: "Such fundamental oceanographic research should include a study of similar problems in coastal areas and lagoons".

(100) Mr. IBANEZ-GOMEZ (Chile) was in favour of paragraph 89 and agreed with the Japanese delegate's comments.
(101) He considered it advisable to delete the word "physical" qualifying "oceanography"; the survey might then include other subjects.
(102) Any oceanographic research in any part of the Pacific would form part of a much needed body of work. It was impossible to understand certain scientific problems of marine biology without a knowledge of the ecology of neighbouring and even of distant areas.
(103) The assistance given by Unesco's Science Co-operation Centre in Montevideo had made it possible to determine the basis for future studies in marine biology and to strengthen the first institute of the kind to be established in that part of the continent. A series of marine biological

stations should be set up to work with it, as uncoordinated research was of little practical use.

(104) Mr. AL- KOUSSI (Egypt) warned the Commission against the danger that energies might be dissipated in oceanographic research, and urged that a clearly defined subject, or a specific region, be chosen for the proposed action by Unesco.

(105) The CHAIRMAN thought he should make it clear that the Commission was not being asked to take a decision on paragraphs 89-91 but on the amended text appearing in the Annex to document 8C/PRG/22, which had been approved by the Bureau and the Executive Board of ICSU.

(106) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had approved the latter text.

(107) Approved.

Higher Budgetary Level

(A) Arid zone (paragraphs 92-100)

(108) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) observed that the arid zones it was proposed to study were those in Latin America, the Middle East and South Asia. The Spanish delegation proposed that the Mediterranean area should also be included, comprising both the European and the North African shores.

(109) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) saw no scientific objection to including the regions of Southern Spain and North Africa in the suggested list.

(110) Paragraphs 92-100 were approved.

(B) Campaign against cancer (paragraphs 101 and 102)

(111) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget that the project be held over for the 1957-58 programme.

(112) Miss TULCHINSKAIA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that her delegation could not accept the Advisory Committee's recommendation, and supported the project set forth in the programme.
(113) In her opinion, the problem was the practical application of the results obtained. Unesco was not concerned with the causes of cancer, which was the subject of research by the greatest specialists, but should play its part in co-ordinating research and promoting the practical application of results.

(114) Mr. VANECEK (Czechoslovakia) reserved the right to submit detailed proposals on the problem later, but wished to state that Czechoslovak scientists would co-operate whole-heartedly in any work undertaken on the problem of cancer.

(115) Mr. LAUGIER (France) said that France was profoundly convinced that international institutions had responsibilities to fulfil with regard to the progress of sciences which alleviated human suffering.
(116) France had been the first country to ask the United Nations to take international action to encourage scientific research and discovery. At one of the first meetings of the Economic and Social Council, the French delegation had submitted a resolution requesting the Secretary-General of the United Nations to consult Unesco and the other Specialized Agencies concerned, and to submit a general report to the Economic and Social Council on the establishment of United Nations research laboratories. The resolution met with more or less general approval and received 15 votes in favour out of a total of 18.
(117) The report requested had been written and, although there were slight differences of opinion on the methods to be used, it was unanimously agreed that the United Nations could not ignore questions of scientific research and scientific discovery
(118) Unesco's reply was particularly useful and constructive; in particular it recommended the establishment of an institute for the study of the chemistry and biology of self-reproducing substances, including the study of cancer research.
(119) At the request of the Economic and Social Council, a joint committee of United Nations and Unesco experts, bringing together eminent scientists from different countries, was held at Unesco House. In its recommendations, that committee gave a high place to the foundation of an international institute for the chemistry and biology of living matter.
(120) Mr. Laugier also recalled a resolution of the Economic and Social Council dated 14 August 1950, which made Unesco responsible for initiating action in that field and requested the Organization to make an appraisal in order of priority of the problems of scientific research referred to in the report of the committee of scientific experts, and to evaluate the contribution that existing research centres could make to the study of those problems.
(121) The French delegate further quoted a resolution of the International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme, recommending that a meeting of experts be convened (1) to consider means for an intensification and better co-ordination on the national and international plane of fundamental research relating to cancer, (2) to recommend a plan of action to WHO and Unesco.
(122) On behalf of his delegation, Mr. Laugier felt obliged to urge the Commission to join with the Executive Board in approving the request for the very modest sums included in the budget, so as to enable Unesco to fulfil the mission entrusted to it.
(123) He recalled the anxiety felt lest the work of WHO and Unesco might overlap. If such difficulties existed, they should, in his opinion, be removed without delay by the co-ordinating bodies of the United Nations. But they did not exist, and the two organizations had shown an excellent spirit of co-ordination. Mr. Laugier referred to a statement, made by the representative of WHO to the Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme, that Unesco's rôle was to promote the progress of basic scientific knowledge, particularly in the fields of biology, physics and chemistry, which might prove helpful in the fight against cancer, while

the actual fight was the business of WHO. The French delegate was convinced that the two organizations were in a position to undertake concerted action to overcome that scourge. He solemnly called upon the Commission to accept its responsibilities, reminding members that the work of all great scientists came within Unesco's province.
(124) Mr. Laugier went on to say that, if Unesco postponed its decision, it would, for one or more years, be depriving the whole of mankind of the international assistance that it had a right to expect in the struggle against a scourge which was growing daily more terrible.
(125) The French delegate ended with the hope that a large majority would vote the Director-General's proposal.

(126) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) spoke on behalf of one who had no voice in the Commission - the "man in the street".
(127) He assumed that the "man in the street" was anxious to have information about Unesco and consulted the documents available to him. He found in them general information which made little impression on him. The "man in the street" knew that such scourges as cancer existed, but the information he could obtain about them was vague and not always impartial. But if he were to learn that Unesco by agreement with WHO had undertaken to discover whether it was possible to co-ordinate research on that subject for constructive purposes, he would take courage and conceive hopes which would draw him closer to Unesco. At the same time great caution should be shown in raising such hopes.
(128) Even if Unesco's efforts did not succeed, it would still redound to the credit of the Organization to have recognized the importance of the problem and tried to solve it.
(129) Referring to the sums which Unesco had agreed to spend on organizing conferences, on publications, on subventions, and on building its headquarters, he wondered how the Organization could refuse the very small sum requested for the attempt to render an invaluable service to humanity, and he thought that public opinion would judge its hesitancy harshly if it knew of it.
(130) The Swiss delegate also considered that Unesco should not refrain from any action which appealed to popular sentiment.
(131) He therefore urged the Commission to vote in favour of the project relating to the campaign against cancer.

(132) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) assured the Commission that the Executive Board would gain fresh inspiration from the moving discussion which had taken place. Two points were clear, namely, that human suffering should be prevented and that human resources should be conserved.
(133) The Executive Board had recommended that a sum of $17,680 should be allocated for the project on the grounds that the campaign against cancer was of universal importance.

(134) Mr. LI U YING (China) said that his delegation unreservedly supported the proposal in the draft programme and budget and fully concurred in the French delegate's views.
(135) He recalled that, at a plenary meeting, he had advocated the establishment of a cancer institute, and he hoped that the suggestion would be accepted.

(136) Mr. PAGE (Canada) felt embarrassed at having to mention budget limitation, concentration of effort and publicity after hearing the moving appeals which had been made. But he considered that the Advisory Committee had made a sensible recommendation, as it would be better for purposes of concentration to ensure successful completion of a project before extending the programme. He thought that it was harmful to Unesco to extend that programme to wider fields if projects were never completed. Many other agencies were occupied with work in connexion with the cancer campaign and Unesco was not in a position to add sufficiently to the success of the campaign to make it worth starting.

(137) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) had listened with interest to the eloquent appeal to the emotions made by the French delegate. If Unesco established an international laboratory for the study of cancer, it would have to recruit staff from other existing laboratories and the net increase in cancer research would be nil. He recalled the decision taken by the Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences that it would be better to use available funds to help countries set up their own research unit than itself to set up an international research unit.
(138) The United Kingdom delegation would oppose the proposed project and would support the recommendation by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(139) Mr. STANKOVIC (Yugoslavia) reaffirmed his delegation's interest in every aspect of the cancer campaign.
(140) He agreed with the French delegate with regard to co-operation between Unesco and WHO.
(141) He proposed that, in conformity with the suggestion made by the Director of WHO, the project under consideration be entitled not "Campaign against Cancer", but "Basic Research on Cancer".

(142) Mr. SIDDIQI (Pakistan) was of the opinion that such a project was an activity that belonged to Unesco. It was of the utmost urgency and could not be postponed. He proposed that the Director-General's project should be adopted.

(143) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) also felt that he had been put in a difficult position and was being forced to say whether he was for or against the cancer campaign. While in sympathy with the campaign, he wondered whether a project undertaken by Unesco would not overlap the activities of the World Health Organization. He asked whether the representative of WHO could make a statement on the question. In the absence of an assurance that there would be no overlapping, he would vote against the proposal.

(144) Dr. HIGGINS (World Health Organization) said

that there could be no duplication in the work of the two organizations since the competence of the two bodies had been very clearly defined and their views on the cancer problem had been set forth by the representative of WHO at the eighth plenary meeting on 16 November and could be consulted in the provisional record.
(145) The Director-General of WHO had also addressed a letter to the Director-General of Unesco, which appeared in document 8C/PRG/20 Add. 1, suggesting that, wherever the phrase "Campaign against Cancer" appeared in documents, it would be more appropriate to use the term "Basic Research on Cancer".
(146) He emphasized that the World Health Organization had been taking an interest in the important problem of cancer and would continue to do so within its own purview.

(147) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) wished to consider the problem from the scientific point of view.
(148) In the first place, he thought that a project for which such an insignificant sum was asked could not be abandoned for reasons of economy. If such reasons were to predominate, they would put an end to most Unesco projects.
(149) The Brazilian delegate also thought that there could be no duplication between Unesco's activities and those of WHO. WHO had not yet taken up the problem of cancer, and it was to be feared that, if the two organizations waited for each other, nothing would be started.
(150) Unesco's field was basic research. However small its resources might be, the Organization could not refuse to take part in the campaign against a disease which so ravaged the population, or to co-ordinate the research undertaken on it.
(151) He recalled the speech by the Czechoslovak delegate and was glad that the countries of Eastern Europe were willing to pass on the results of their research to other countries. He expected very considerable results from the collaboration of Eastern and Western scientists.
(152) He therefore warmly advocated that the project proposed by the Secretariat be approved.

(153) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) wished to add a biochemist's views to the discussion.
(154) Recalling the terms of the draft resolution which appeared in the programme, he did not think that anyone could say which piece of basic research work would throw light on the cancer problem, or, rather, he felt that every piece of research work would help towards its solution. It was not certain that cell growth explained cancer, and certain biologists claimed that cancer cells in no way differed from normal cells. The question was therefore still at a preliminary stage, which necessitated a great deal of caution in deciding what lines research should follow.
(155) Mr. Florkin hoped that the field for the suggested co-ordination would be clearly defined, and that the International Union of Biological Sciences and the International Union of Biochemistry would be consulted.

(156) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) felt that those delegates who decided to support the practical point of view were at a disadvantage in a discussion which had been on a high emotional level. He feared that Unesco's participation in the campaign against cancer would raise false hopes.
(157) Unesco's budget would not permit of much being done. Owing to the world-wide interest in cancer research, he did not think that it would be necessary for Unesco to act as a clearing house for information. He was opposed to the project not because he was opposed to cancer research, but because he felt that Unesco should use its funds where most good could be done. If the project were to be adopted by the Commission, he proposed that it should be relegated to Category 4 as being of least promise as far as results were concerned. In his opinion it would be better to spend the money on basic research, as cancer was outside Unesco's field of activities.

(158) The CHAIRMAN put paragraphs 101 and 102 to the vote. They were approved by 21 votes to 18, with 7 abstentions.

(159) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) thought that draft resolution 8C/DR/60, submitted by his delegation, should be examined after resolution 2.22.

(160) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that there was also a draft resolution submitted by the French delegation, dealing with the proper use of natural resources. It should be discussed at the same time as the Belgian delegation's resolution.

(161) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that resolution 2.22 ended with the project relating to the cancer campaign and that the other draft resolutions, including those relating to atomic energy, should be examined separately.

The meeting rose at 7 p. m.

# SEVENTEENTH MEETING

*30 November 1954 at 9.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.2 OF REVISED AGENDA : NATURAL SCIENCES** (continued)

(Document 8C/DR/108): Peaceful use of atomic energy, draft resolution presented jointly by the delegations of France, India and Japan

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the delegate of India to introduce the proposal, which combined the three proposals submitted by the Governments of France, India and Japan in documents 8C/DR/1, 9 and 32 respectively.

(2) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that the Indian Government and National Commission believed that the only way to secure peace and happiness in the world was to divert the efforts and resources at present expended on the production of armaments to the more humanitarian task of using the momentous discoveries of atomic energy in the service of mankind.
(3) The original proposal in document 8C/DR/9 was based on a decision by the National Commission nearly a year previously; a revised version had been submitted in document DR/9 (rev.), following the announcement of the important resolution passed by the United Nations Political and Security Committee on 23 November.
(4) It was inevitable that, once the destructive potentialities of atomic energy were known, attention would be turned to discovering how it could be used to preserve instead of to annihilate the human race, and to promote peaceful co-operation, friendship and better understanding.
(5) The conquest of time and space had brought nations closer together, and humanity could only be saved by universal action. A new hope had appeared on the horizon, and it was for Unesco to seize the opportunity offered by the United Nations and to work for peace in the world.
(6) He supported the amendments of the French and Japanese delegations, together with the budgetary implications, and urged that the Director-General should be free to use the funds as he thought best.

(7) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he was personally interested in the proposal and agreed with the delegate of India as to the importance of following the lead set by the United Nations. He would like the Commission to know that an important part had been played by the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences, who had been called in to participate in the work of the Bunche Committee when the proposals were being drafted.

(8) Mr. KAYA (Japan) said that the most urgent need at the present time was for medical and biological research on the effects of radio-activity. Through ignorance or negligence in the treatment of radio-active substances, the injury might be extended to innocent people through water, air, soil or food. No conclusions had yet been reached on methods of decontamination and other important aspects and it was impossible in the circumstances to provide protection against atomic injury.
(9) It was evident that research involved complex problems, and could not be conducted without close co-operation from experts in such fields as medicine, biology, meteorology, oceanography, chemistry and physics. Hitherto there had been little co-operation, and for that reason the Japanese delegation had proposed the calling of a meeting of experts for exchange of information and promotion of research.
(10) Certain circumstances had led the Japanese delegation to amend the resolution, notably the recent action on the part of the United Nations.
(11) It had also been pointed out, in document 8C/PRG/20, Add.2., that the Director-General of the World Health Organization considered that the Japanese proposal impinged on the activities of that Organization. While agreeing that the main objectives of the resolution came within the field of WHO's activities, there were many important problems requiring research which did not touch on health; for example, contamination of air, rain and sea water; analysis of radio-active isotopes; and mutation in human beings caused by radiation.
(12) Nevertheless, taking all things into consideration, the Japanese delegation had agreed that it would be most appropriate for Unesco to work in co-operation with the United Nations and the World Health Organization.

(13) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan), having explained the joint draft resolution, proposed that the last two lines of paragraph three of the joint resolution should be amended by deletion of the words "as protection against" and their replacement by the words "such as those involved in the...". The resolution would then have a wider scope and study would not be limited to the harmful effects of radio-activity.

(14) Mr. LEROY (France) fully endorsed the opinions expressed by the delegates of India and Japan. In the name of the French delegation, he urged the need for such measures. In his opinion, it was not a question of undertaking activities parallel to those of the United Nations, but of taking the necessary steps to achieve close co-operation with the latter in the field under discussion.

(15) The French delegation believed that an international agency would offer many advantages, particularly for collecting and distributing information. It would also be useful to form a "pool" of isotopes available to all those interested, and it was important to study the question of protection against the effects of radio-activity, particularly for the research workers themselves. Such an agency would facilitate co-operation between all the specialists concerned.
(16) Mr. Leroy added that the French delegation attached particular importance to the last paragraph, which should enable research workers all over the world to intensify their efforts.

(17) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) warmly supported the Indian resolution, together with the amendments proposed by the delegates of France and Japan, and hoped that Unesco would co-operate in the United Nations plan for the peaceful use of atomic energy. The plan, which had been initiated by President Eisenhower and developed by conversations with the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Australia, Belgium, the Union of South Africa and Portugal, included the establishment of an international atomic agency and the convening of an international scientific conference in 1955, both under the auspices of the United Nations. Unesco and the other Specialized Agencies could play extremely useful parts.
(18) The United States of America believed that there were great potentialities in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, but that it was necessary to educate people in order to eradicate existing fears. Nuclear fuel, for example, was simply a newer variety of fuel, potentially so abundant as to remove future shortages, but, like all fuel, needing care in handling. Development and exploitation of coal and petroleum, for example, had unfortunately always been accompanied by dangers, and continuous research was necessary to reduce hazards and perfect safety measures. In the United States of America considerable effort was being devoted to finding safeguards, making diagnosis and improving treatment of injuries in connexion with radio-active materials. In the interests of spreading information, it would be useful for Unesco to co-operate with the proposed United Nations atomic energy agency and the World Health Organization.
(19) Turning to the constructive aspect, the problem to be solved was how best to use atomic energy both as a fuel and in the form of isotopes. At present the use of nuclear power depended on economic considerations and the first areas to enjoy its benefits should accordingly be those where other forms of power were expensive or non-existent. Reactors, working on the same principle as power reactors, could be built comparatively cheaply in many parts of the world, and could be used for training purposes and also for the production of radio-isotopes.
(20) The two main uses for radio-isotopes were to change living organisms and as tracers. The first was of great importance in the treatment of cancer and the preservation of food. As tracers, they could be used either in growing plants: in the study of genetics, plant and animal growth, reproductive processes and the production of food from common chemicals by photosynthesis; or in inanimate physical activities: as control devices in industry, or to study the physics of the earth in order to gain knowledge which would improve long-range weather forecasting and thus benefit the production of food.
(21) Up to the present time, the United States of America had made 2,800 shipments of isotopes to fifty different countries. Under the United Nations plan, such activities would be multiplied and countries would also be encouraged to produce their own isotopes.

(22) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) supported the resolution, but had the following comments to make.
(23) While certain aspects of research on the use of isotopes could be assisted by international co-operation, some countries were already working with isotopes, and it was important that their work should not be impinged on by the proposed international agency.
(24) With regard to the effects of field radio-activity, he agreed that some aspects came within the field of the World Health Organization, but there were many others to be considered. He hoped that, since the scheme was being organized by the United Nations, there would be a correct distribution of responsibilities between the Specialized Agencies.
(25) Finally, no mention had been made of the work of the International Commission on Radiological Protection and other organizations. It was important to make use of existing research and knowledge.

(26) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) considered that the merit of the proposals in the draft resolution presented by India, Japan and France was obvious, and that they need not be discussed in detail. They deserved to meet with enthusiastic and unanimous approval because they were in keeping with the spirit of Unesco. The peoples of all countries wanted science to be put at the service of man, and it was natural for isotopes to be used for mankind's benefit. Chile would therefore vote in favour of establishing an international institute for research into those problems.

(27) The CHAIRMAN requested members to close the discussion as quickly as possible.

(28) Mr. VILLAR (Uruguay) warmly praised draft resolution 8C/DR/108. Referring to the utilization of nuclear energy, he drew attention to the new possibilities opened up by recent discoveries. They would make nuclear energy more widely available in the world, would increase the benefits which electrical energy could bring to countries where it was difficult to transport fuel or where water power was lacking and would enable regions of great natural wealth to be exploited to an extent not yet practicable owing to lack of means. He thought that great importance should be attached to small atomic piles, since they were easy to utilize.

(29) Mr. RAADI (Iran) did not wish to repeat the cogent remarks of previous speakers, but it seemed to him that current scientific research should be accompanied by a campaign to publicize the dangers of radio-activity and

the possibilities of utilizing atomic energy for peaceful purposes.
(30) Unesco could render considerable service to the public by instructing its Department of Mass Communication, for instance, to throw some light on the mystery at present surrounding atomic energy research.
(31) Mr. Raadi wondered whether the authors of draft resolution 8C/DR/108 would agree to add to the third paragraph of their text a clause - subject to later verbal improvements - on the lines he had suggested.

(32) Mr. SEVERI (Italy) warmly welcomed draft resolution 8C/DR/108 and emphasized the importance of international research into methods of safeguarding research workers against the dangers inherent in their work.

(33) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) supported the joint proposal, although he preferred the original one submitted by the Indian delegation. Poland had repeatedly stressed the danger of using atomic energy for destructive purposes. There was widespread evidence of the desire among the people and among social as well as scientific bodies, in developed and underdeveloped countries alike, that it should be used for peaceful purposes. The unanimous adoption of the United Nations resolution was also significant, and he hoped there would be unanimous approval of the proposal now before the Commission. Unesco had an important rôle to play, and he urged priority for the implementation of the resolution.
(34) Certain countries where nuclear energy was already highly developed had an obligation to the rest of the world: first to prohibit the use of atomic weapons and eliminate fear in the world; and second to develop and encourage the peaceful use of atomic energy. In implementing the resolution, the Director-General should work in close contact with those countries and make use of their knowledge and experience.

(35) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board was whole-heartedly in support of the use of atomic energy for the benefit of mankind and had devoted much time and effort to the problem. The Board had supported the French proposal in document 8C/DR/1, with the proviso that before any meeting of experts were held the countries concerned should be consulted to ascertain their interest in the problem.
(36) The Board had unanimously recommended adoption of resolution 8C/DR/9, but had suggested that document 8C/DR/32 should be revised in the light of the United Nations resolution. The Board had not been able to review the joint resolution, but, in view of the foregoing comments, and the fact that the Japanese resolution had been amended, in her opinion, approval could be taken for granted.

(37) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Committee had examined draft resolutions 8C/DR/1, 9 and 32 together, in view of the obvious connexion between them, and had considered them extremely important.
(38) The Committee had pointed out the need for close co-operation with the United Nations and, in the case of the resolution on an international programme of research on problems connected with the use of radio-isotopes, had recommended that the choice of experts should not be limited to Europe and that the advice of the Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme be sought.
(39) The Committee had also asked that WHO be approached with a view to defining exactly the respective fields of competence of that body and Unesco in connexion with the Japanese proposal for protection against the effects of radio-activity. A most satisfactory reply had been received from WHO.
(40) Mr. Cabouat added that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had not studied the draft resolution at present before the Commission but recommended the adoption of any resolution which would enable Unesco to co-operate with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in the field of atomic energy. The work plan drawn up by the Secretariat was also intended to give effect to the three original draft resolutions.

(41) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the draft amendment earlier proposed by the Japanese delegate and consisting of the addition of the following words after "certain technical questions" in the third paragraph of resolution 8C/DR/108: "such as those involved in the effects of radio-activity on life in general".

(42) The above amendment was seconded by Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark).

(43) Mr. Chevalier then read out a draft amendment submitted by Mr. Raadi; it was to add to the third paragraph the words: "as well as for the diffusion of objective information concerning the dangers and the peaceful uses of atomic energy".

(44) The amendment was supported by Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile).

(45) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought that the authors of the draft resolution under consideration would not object to changing its form slightly so that it might be included in the programme for 1955-56. The first two paragraphs would be considered as a preamble, then paragraphs 3 and 4 would appear as "Resolution 2.221", and the last paragraph would be deleted and replaced by the corresponding work plan.
(46) It would also be advisable to add to paragraph 108 a work plan corresponding to Mr. Raadi's proposal.

(47) Mr. RAADI (Iran) agreed with Mr. Auger's suggestions.

(48) In reply to a question from the delegate of the USSR, the CHAIRMAN said that the work plan referred to at the end of resolution 8C/DR/108 was the one set out in document 8C/PRG/24, Add. 1.

(49) Resolution 8C/DR/108, as amended, was put to the vote and adopted unanimously.

(50) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) was grateful for the opportunity to raise a point of procedure. A member of his delegation, referring to paragraphs 79 and 81 of the chapter on Natural Sciences, had asked for the documents there mentioned to be translated into Spanish. No immediate reply had been given. A letter had been sent to the Secretariat but it had not yet answered. The previous week, the Argentine delegate had made a similar request with regard to the chapter on Education. Mr. Zamorano Hernandez would like to know what action had been taken on those requests. The Chairman had alluded to their financial implications, and the speaker once more asked if he would indicate the Commission's views in the matter.

(51) The CHAIRMAN replied that Mr. Zamorano's question differed from that put previously by the Argentine delegation. The Secretariat had in fact replied that the translations asked for by the Argentine delegation involved no special expenditure because the documents in question were merely roneographed.
(52) The translations requested by the Chilean delegate, on the other hand, would entail a total expenditure of $4,530. If the Commission felt that it should accede to the request, it would have to be transmitted to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget for its opinion.

(53) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) supported the Chilean delegate's request, which was based on the reasons expounded by his delegation when it had made a similar request with regard to the chapter on Education. Reports on the arid zone were of the greatest interest to Latin America, which asked the Commission to view its request with favour.

(54) The Chilean delegate's proposal was put to the vote and approved by 19 votes to 5, with 21 abstentions.

(55) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) said that there was a difference between his own understanding of the amendment submitted by the Iranian delegate and the wording given by the Chairman. The version which he had voted for was: "as well as for the diffusion of information concerning all aspects of the peaceful utilization of atomic energy".

(56) The CHAIRMAN, speaking in English, read the text before him, which was as follows: "and to disseminate objective information on the dangers and on the peaceful use of atomic energy".

(57) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) asked if the Iranian delegate would be agreeable to the deletion of the word "dangers" and the substitution of the words: "concerning all aspects of the peaceful utilization of atomic energy", which would broaden the scope of Unesco's work.

(58) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Commission had already approved the amendment submitted by the delegate of Iran.

(59) Mr. RAADI (Iran) hoped that steps would be taken to disseminate objective information on the peaceful utilization of atomic energy. As his original proposal had been made subject to improvements in drafting, he left it to the Commission's discretion to decide on the exact wording.

(60) Mr. PAGE (Canada) supported the United States delegate. The selection of one aspect would give it undue emphasis. He also opposed the word "objective", since it might imply that Unesco was not in the habit of supplying objective information.

(61) Mr. RAADI (Iran) thought that the following wording would convey the unanimous feelings of members of the Commission: "... and to the dissemination of objective information concerning all aspects of the peaceful utilization of atomic energy".
(62) Mr. Raadi wished to retain the word "objective", as he thought that it was the Secretariat's task to collect and sort out information before disseminating it.

(63) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) said that he was prepared to withdraw his opposition to the word "objective", but insisted on the inclusion of the word "peaceful".

(64) Mr. RAADI (Iran) signified his acceptance.

(65) Mr. PAGE (Canada) also agreed not to press for the exclusion of the word "objective". It was essential to retain the word "peaceful", however, since otherwise the Department of Natural Sciences could be asked to give plans for the latest hydrogen bomb.

(66) It was agreed to accept the text as read out by the delegate of the United States of America in place of the one previously adopted.

(67) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the Secretariat had just received the text adopted by the United Nations Political and Security Committee on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It differed slightly from that attached to document 8C/PRG/24, but the paragraphs relating to co-operation between the United Nations and Unesco had not been changed. The Secretariat would shortly circulate the document for information purposes.

(68) On a point of order, Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) wondered whether it was usual to reopen the discussion on resolutions which the Commission had already approved.

(69) The CHAIRMAN recognized that the Egyptian delegate's comment was most pertinent, but recalled that he had asked the Commission whether it approved of the United States delegate's proposal, which was supported by the Canadian delegate. He also felt that a certain degree of flexibility should be preserved in the Commission's transaction of business.

(70) Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) thought that the reference in the first paragraph of resolution 8C/DR/108 to the Political and Security Committee of the United Nations was due to a

misunderstanding and that the organ concerned was the Political Commission.

(71) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) was of opinion that the General Assembly of the United Nations should be mentioned in the final version, as in the last resort it would have to reject or approve the resolution concerned.

Paragraphs 42-48

(72) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) informed the meeting of the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the proposed contract with the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences for translating medical abstracts should be cancelled, and the appropriations for 1955 under paragraph 48 thereby reduced by $3,000 (see document 8C/5, corrigendum, page 9).
(73) The above recommendation had been approved after a short discussion, during which it was mentioned that some delegates had informed the Committee of the feeling in certain National Commissions that the translations were not indispensable, and that a saving might be effected under that head.

(74) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) recalled his statement at a previous meeting on the danger of mistranslation of medical abstracts. He thought that the project had been dropped.

(75) In reply to Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt), Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the translations in question were English, French and Spanish only.

(76) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) wondered whether it would be possible for the translations to be in Spanish only, as that would be more economical.

(77) Speaking as representative of CIOMS, Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO wished to know Mr. Auger's views on the Advisory Committee's suggestion.

(78) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) recalled that certain appropriations had had to be cancelled in favour of more important projects, but, in the present case, the cancellation was not counterbalanced by any increase elsewhere. He added that, in his opinion, the $3,000 were not essential.

(79) The Advisory Committee's recommendation was unanimously approved.

Paragraphs 54 and 55

(80) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) explained that several members of the Committee had expressed doubts, not about the substance of the Secretariat's proposal, but about the method envisaged. It had been felt that the work would receive more publicity if the help of specialized periodicals were called in, but, because of the commercial negotiations that would be necessary, it had seemed preferable to adopt the measures proposed by the Secretariat.

(81) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) understood that the International Anatomical Nomenclature Committee was responsible for selecting and publishing for the next International Anatomical Congress a nomenclature which would appear in its records. He saw no difference between that solution and publication in specialized periodicals.

(82) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that commercial firms preferred to publish the nomenclature in its final version, while Unesco was aiding the preparatory work at present in progress.

(83) Paragraphs 54 and 55 were unanimously approved.

Draft resolutions 8C/DR/35, 8C/DR/54, 8C/DR/60

(84) At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion, the delegates of France, Uruguay and Belgium agreed to prepare a joint resolution for consideration at the next meeting.

2.3 Teaching and dissemination of science

Paragraphs 103-106

(85) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) thought that paragraphs 103 and 104 of the preamble were somewhat obscure and ambiguous. It was, for instance, over-dogmatic to say: "The great fund of knowledge .. becomes a resource for humanity and a means of improving the conditions of life only when it reaches the public, is understood and put to use". That statement seemed to him to be exaggerated; in his opinion, the dissemination of science should consist in making scientific discoveries known among the general public. Unless it were popularized, scientific thought would not penetrate the minds of the masses. He asked the Department to set out its objects with greater clarity. He believed that the latter should be: (1) to disseminate scientific knowledge in order that the public might be familiar with the work scientists were doing, support it and co-operate with them in its own way; (2) to disseminate scientific knowledge without popularizing it unduly; people should be "uplifted" through the acquisition of such knowledge. In his opinion, paragraphs 103 and 104 said little to that effect.

(86) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) entirely shared the Chilean delegate's views with regard to science teaching - it should not be limited to publicizing a certain number of results, but should try to make the scientific spirit understood.
(87) Mr. Auger added that the aim of paragraphs 103 and 104 was in no wise to lay down the law on the subject. Perhaps it would be advisable to publish some twenty pages setting out the Secretariat's ideas, for example, in the series "Unesco and its programme".

(88) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) recalled that the Department of Natural Sciences had already published an account of its ideas and intentions. That work had been most interesting, but he felt that he ought to draw the Commission's attention to the danger of expressing an opinion on complex questions which were more suitable for committees of experts.

(89) Mr. WEILENMANN (Switzerland) wished to add to the third line of resolution 2.31, after "in the sciences" the words "and especially the activities of adult education establishments". The Swiss delegation felt that it was necessary to make specific mention of bodies which devoted themselves to adult education and had already rendered considerable service.

(90) The above proposal was seconded by Mr. SEVERI (Italy).

(91) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) admitted that there might be many documents which explained the points to which he had referred, but wished to draw attention to the phrase in paragraph 104 which read "In the relatively undeveloped countries it is recognized that underdevelopment is largely the result of a lack of science". He thought that statement exaggerated and lacking in foundation. mention should also be made of other factors, for instance, economic or social conditions, etc. He therefore asked that the statement be deleted or explained in more detailed documents. At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion, he proposed that the paragraph be referred to the Drafting Committee so that other factors might be added as a basis for the assertion.

(92) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) objected to the wording of paragraph 104 on similar grounds. He did not think that there was any close connexion between a country's scientific knowledge and its degree of development. He emphasized the danger of brief, categorical statements, leaving no room for shades of interpretation.

(93) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) did not agree with the Chilean delegate and proposed the retention of the existing wording.

(94) In reply to Mr. KABIR (India), the CHAIRMAN recalled that the Commission had already had an opportunity to introduce changes into the resolutions and work plans.

(95) By 29 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions, it was finally agreed to refer paragraph 104 to the Drafting Committee, as suggested by the delegate of Chile.

(96) The proposed amendment to resolution 2.31, submitted by the Swiss delegate and seconded by the Italian delegate, was approved by 35 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

(A) General scientific information (paragraphs 107-115)

(97) Mr. VO VAN LUA (Viet-Nam) considered that in paragraph 112 it was not enough to talk of increasing the number of articles in Impact and the number of copies printed; the need to improve its layout and redouble efforts to make it pay should also be emphasized. The speaker added that the review was nevertheless considered of great interest by scientists in his country.

(98) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) was willing to accept a change in the work plan on the lines suggested by the delegate of Viet-Nam.

(99) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) thought that the projects described in paragraphs 107-114 were admirable.

(100) He was however, concerned at the low circulation of Impact and the fact that it was run at a loss. The articles were good, but he considered them too costly. A publication of a more popular character, with a wider circulation, might be more satisfactory.

(101) He also doubted the value of travelling exhibitions and thought that travelling fellowships might be of more use.

(102) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) stated that the Egyptian Government was prepared to give material assistance to the plan to publish some of the Impact articles in Arabic. He agreed with the criticisms voiced by the delegate of Viet-Nam with regard to the layout of the review, although he found its contents excellent and was not in favour of turning it into a more popular type of publication, as suggested by the delegate of the United Kingdom. Mr. Al-Koussi was convinced that a greater effort should be made to increase its circulation.

(103) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the Secretariat was perfectly willing to alter the layout of Impact. He had been very pleased to hear the complimentary remarks about the articles published in it.

(104) He added that efforts would be made to increase Impact's circulation. It was true that contracts and other arrangements at present in force raised certain problems, but he was able to announce that new arrangements had been made for the United Kingdom.

(105) In reply to Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon), Mr. Auger explained that there was no appropriation under paragraph 113, that explained the words: "The Secretariat will also study the possibility of having selected articles from Impact published in Arabic...". The assistance of the Egyptian Government, however, would probably make it possible for articles to be published in Arabic without any additional appropriations; in that case, the relevant passage in the work plans could be altered accordingly.

(106) Section (A) was then approved.

(B) Travelling science exhibitions (paragraphs 116-118)

(107) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) thought that travelling exhibitions were useful, but that there

were not enough to supply all countries. A large number of small exhibitions would be more effective. He noted that exhibitions were withdrawn after a certain period and proposed that they should then be given to Member countries to use as a nucleus for permanent scientific exhibitions.

(108) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought the suggestion made by the delegate of Ceylon excellent; it was perfectly possible to leave a scientific exhibition in the last country where it had been shown, instead of bringing it back to Paris, so long as the government of the country undertook to carry out the necessary repairs and use the exhibition as the nucleus of a science museum.

(109) Mr. PAGE (Canada) approved the general proposals contained in paragraphs 116-118 and agreed with the suggestions of the delegate of Ceylon. He asked, however, if it would be possible to obtain, through the exhibition staff or appropriate persons in the countries receiving exhibitions, some idea of their value and public response to them. Some method of assessment would help in planning future exhibitions.

(110) Section (B) was approved.

(C) Conference on the Public Understanding of Science (paragraphs 119 and 120)

(111) Section (C) was approved.

Higher Budgetary Level

Travelling science exhibitions (paragraphs 121 and 122)

(112) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) agreed with the Canadian delegate's suggestion. As there were no data available on the results of the travelling exhibitions, he asked for fuller information before voting for increased appropriations under that head.

(113) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought it very difficult to say exactly how much success an exhibition had. The number of visitors gave some indication; 80,000 was the figure for attendance at Lima and 20,000 for Pnom-Penh. Further, according to information gathered from educators in countries where the exhibitions had been shown, visitors had managed to acquire a considerable amount of knowledge and ideas from them.

(114) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) stated that Unesco's exhibitions had met with considerable success in his country, and he thought that the Organization's efforts in that field should be encouraged.

(115) Mr. VO VAN LUA (Viet-Nam) pointed out that Unesco exhibitions were extremely useful, for they made the Organization known to populations which perhaps would have had no other opportunity to come into contact with its activities. The exhibition recently organized in Viet-Nam had been a complete success.

(116) Mr. Vo Van Lua also favoured the project for films to accompany the exhibitions.

(117) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) said that, in Belgium, filmstrips about the travelling exhibitions were already in use at all educational levels, and were found very helpful in science teaching.

(118) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) was interested in the educational value of travelling exhibitions, but had doubts about the results obtained. He suggested that, when examining the results of exhibitions, consideration should be given to the possibility of receiving countries' playing a greater part in their preparation. Such a policy would, in his opinion, result in exhibitions which were more suited to the needs of the respective countries and areas, and would also help in training nationals to present their own exhibitions.

(119) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) had no doubt of the educational value of travelling exhibitions. Recent experience in Latin America was sufficient to justify continuing the project, and he strongly supported it. He also agreed with the delegates who had advocated the policy of linking travelling exhibitions with local effort.

(120) Paragraphs 121 and 122 were approved.

(121) Resolution 2.31, as amended by the delegate of Switzerland, was adopted.

Resolution 8C/DR/56 (rev.): Dissemination of science

(122) The proposal submitted by Uruguay was seconded by the delegates of Italy, Chile, Turkey and France.

(123) The delegate of Uruguay accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the proposal should be considered as a technical assistance item either in the 1955-56 or the 1957-58 programme.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/51: Scientific and technical education

(124) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) pointed out that the present rapid development of science raised serious problems in teaching it, particularly in secondary schools. The Spanish teaching profession was much occupied with the problem and had put it to the Director-General during his visit to Spain the previous May. That visit had aroused great interest in the country and the Director-General had expressed appreciation of Spain's efforts to co-operate effectively with Unesco. It had been decided at that time to suggest to Unesco projects which were (a) international in scope, (b) of practical interest and (c) urgently required. One such project was the establishment of a "Pilot Centre for the study of methods of teaching science in secondary schools and for the training of teachers of scientific and technical subjects for such schools", referred to in draft resolution DR/44, which was an amendment to resolution 2.32. Document 8C/DR/51 had been added for purposes of information. To the data given in documents DR/44 and DR/51 should be added the fact that the second Latin American Congress on Education, held in Quito the

previous October, had recommended the project. Spain was ready to establish the Centre in order to meet its own needs, co-operate more closely with Unesco and implement the recommendation of the Quito Congress. The ever-increasing stream of Latin American students coming to Europe to study in Spanish schools had made it still more desirable to set up such a Centre. Spain was bearing all the costs of establishing and maintaining the Centre and was only asking Unesco for a contribution towards laboratory equipment, documentation and books, and possibly for some professor or expert who might be needed.

Project 2.32: Teaching of sciences

(125) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) asked the Director of the Natural Sciences Department what were meant by "State primary and secondary schools" in resolution 2.32 of the draft programme and budget.

(126) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that the words referred to primary and secondary education, as understood in France, at any rate.

(127) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) said that as a university professor he had difficulty in advising State scholars on their choice of universities in other countries. There was a need for a manual of world universities with detailed information on the specific branches of science that were taught. He proposed the inclusion of such a manual in project 2.32

(128) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) referring to resolution 2.32, doubted the necessity for improving science teaching in fundamental education since the main concern in fundamental education was to teach reading and writing and to improve economic conditions. His experience of the teaching of science in primary and secondary schools showed that schoolchildren who had been taught science for a number of years had little grasp of scientific ideas and had not developed a scientific outlook.

(129) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) repeated the question asked by the Chilean delegate. He wished to know whether the expression "secondary schools" included all educational establishments between elementary schools and universities. He thought that the point should be clarified.

(130) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark), referring to the remarks of the Burmese delegate, pointed out that the International Universities Bureau had already published a list of universities and was working on a cataloguing system. The Burmese delegate would, he felt sure, receive useful information if he applied to the Bureau.

(131) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) mentioned two volumes on universities which had been published in the United States of America.

(132) In reply to Mr. RAADI (Iran), Mr AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) and the CHAIRMAN confirmed that the proposed addition to the work plan, corresponding to resolution 2 31, had been implicitly approved at the same time as paragraph 108.

(133) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan), referring to paragraph 132, extended an invitation to the proposed conference on science teaching and vocational and technical training in South Asia on behalf of his delegation and Government If it were decided to hold the conference in Pakistan, his Government would offer all possible facilities to ensure its success.

(134) Mr. PRASAD (India) supported the proposal of the delegate of Pakistan.

(135) In connexion with resolution 2.32, Mr. Prasad referred to a proposal which had been made by the National Committee of the International Mathematical Union to organize a conference of Member States in South and South East Asia. He read a resolution passed by the Executive Committee of the International Union on 31 August 1954 during its meeting at The Hague, as a result of which the Indian delegation had asked Unesco for a grant of $3,000. The request had been approved by the Executive Board, but rejected by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget on 11 November 1954 by a vote of 5 to 4 with 2 abstentions.

(136) The Indian Government attached great importance to the conference and had already set aside a sum to contribute to its cost. He accordingly submitted the following proposal.

"Considering that the Executive Committee of the International Mathematical Union, at its meeting held at The Hague on 31 August 1954, voted unanimously in favour of a conference on mathematical education to be held in India in 1956 for countries of South and South East Asia, the General Conference authorizes the Director-General to make a grant of $3,000 to the National Committee in India of the International Mathematical Union to organize the proposed conference".

(137) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that he had attended the meeting of the International Mathematical Union and could assert that the plan to hold a conference on the teaching of mathematics aroused the keenest interest.

(138) The Indian delegate's proposal, seconded by Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) and Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon), was approved on the understanding that it would be referred to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget for its opinion.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

# EIGHTEENTH MEETING

*30 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

(1) *The* CHAIRMAN *drew delegates' attention to a* detail: of a question with budgetary implications were referred to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, that Committee was not called upon to re-examine it in order to submit a fresh project to the Commission for approval. The Advisory Committee's work was already concluded before the Commission began its meetings, thenceforward its task was to co-operate with the Director-General in working out proposals for enabling the programme and budget to be brought into line with the appropriations voted by the Conference It would, however, take note of the Commission's wishes.

[illegible] 3.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: SOCIAL SCIENCES

[illegible] s. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social [illegible]ces) said that she was grateful for the opportunity to introduce the Department's programme to the Commission. The programme was divided into two parts, Section I on general activities and Section II on special activities. She drew attention to the statistical activities, which were in a special category, as they concerned every department of Unesco. Section I aimed at developing international machinery for the social sciences and Section II at helping to solve social problems of international importance by applying social science.

(3) She would only speak on the trends of development, pointing out Unesco's social science targets and how far they had been realized.

(4) The resolutions under 3.11 had as an objective the creation of international machinery for promotion of the social sciences. Unesco had to build from scratch, itself creating practically all the important social science associations, the international bibliographies for social science, etc., and now a firm foundation had been laid. In 1955-56 it was proposed to extend the geographical coverage of all the activities already established and at the same time to concentrate on fewer projects.

(5) The major social science associations were extending their activities to a greater number of countries, which involved higher costs and had thus necessitated a slight increase in subventions. It was intended to set up a system of social science correspondents in countries where there were too few social scientists to form an association. In addition, Unesco would help in arranging a meeting of the International Economic Association in Latin America and of the International Sociological Association in the Mediterranean next year.

(6) *The Social Sciences Department made much use* of the associations in the execution of its programme. This was particularly true of its co-operation with the International Social Science Council, which was set up in 1952 on a provisional basis but was now a fully developed organ, and carried the double function of a multi-disciplinary union like ICSU and CIPSH as well as being an advisory committee

(7) The same story of concentration on fewer activities, but of widened geographical coverage, could be told about the Department's documentation activities. The period 1955-56 should see a complete set of bibliographies for all the chief disciplines in the social sciences, with the aid of the International Committee for Social Science Documentation. Until 1954 work had been undertaken to cover the linguistic areas, first, of the working languages of Unesco, Spanish as well as other European languages, next Japanese, Hindu, Urdu, Thai and, in general, social science production in Asian countries. In 1955-56 it was proposed to establish machinery for an equally complete coverage of the production in Arabic and other languages of the Middle East. The only major linguistic area not systematically covered by the end of 1956 would be the Slavonic area.

(8) Finally, a major activity for the promotion of social science was contained in resolution 3.3, concerning the teaching of the social sciences. Again, the work had begun some 4 years ago by laying the foundations of a general, international fact-finding survey of social science teaching as it actually was at university level, and by having experts formulate a set of general recommendations for its improvement and extension. In the current programme period stress had been laid on regional activities, thus making it possible to adapt the recommendations to local needs and traditions. Consequently, it was logical to shift the accent in 1955-56 to direct aid to Member States. No fewer than 23 requests had been received from Member States for missions to advise on teaching reforms or to introduce teaching of new disciplines. In the future more attention could be directed towards the content of that teaching, curricula, teaching aids, etc.

(9) Mrs. Myrdal concluded by saying that, although an important first phase was being traversed in building up a social science machinery, thitherto non-existent at the international level, the task of promoting social science was by no means completed. After the foundations had been laid it was, however, logical to turn the work in the direction of closer co-operation with Member States, who alone could advance the social sciences to the point where they ceased to be underdeveloped sciences.

Paragraphs 1-15

(10) The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on the introduction to chapter 3.

(11) Mr. SEDES (France) explained the principles on which his remarks would be based
(12) The French delegation considered the Department of Social Sciences as the cornerstone of Unesco, and believed that its rôle was:
(1) to extend scientific knowledge concerning man in a given environment;
(2) to encourage Member States in research work, and help them to train and make use of specialists and to apply their knowledge,
(3) to keep Member States informed of research methods and of results obtained.
(13) Unesco's aim in the field of social sciences should be:
(1) to undermine social prejudice and break down the barriers between different societies,
(2) to develop a close understanding between the various human groups and give them a sense of each other's worth,
(3) to bring genuine, scientific backing to the educational activities of Member States.
(14) The French delegate added that the experience of all those concerned with the social sciences was sufficiently developed to ensure that those aims did not remain purely academic, but led to definite practical results.
(15) It was on those criteria that the French delegation intended to base its examination of the programme for the social sciences.

(16) Mr. VITO (Italy) appreciated the breadth of the social science programme, saying that it not only advanced the possibility of increasing interest in social science in all countries but emphasized the necessity of encouraging the exchange of results.
(17) The Italian delegation was glad to note that the activities proposed by the Secretariat were concentrated on the main areas providing problems of interest to social scientists. He suggested that Unesco should study economic and social problems and land reform from the aspects of interest to Unesco. Other aspects could be dealt with by other organizations. The aspect of interest to Unesco was how to organize community life and social relationships better.

(18) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that the social science co-operation body in the United Kingdom had asked him to express their appreciation of the proposed programme.
(19) In his opinion, parts of the programme needed clarification and others were overloaded or too ambitious. He hoped that the International Social Science Council would become more democratic and that it could be used for the distribution of funds

(20) Mr. LI U YING (China) had no general remarks to make, but intended to approach the question from a methodological standpoint.
(21) It seemed to him essential to enquire further into the problems raised by the social sciences - a subject still in its infancy. Reviewing the very diverse fields comprised by the social sciences, the speaker advocated the development, side by side with sociology, of an applied science which he would call "sociotechnics".

(22) Mr. LORENTZ (Poland) was pleased at the references, in the first sentence of the preamble, to the desire that the social sciences should aid man's progress towards peace and better living conditions and, later on, to the proposals for studying problems of international understanding and tensions.
(23) He wondered whether the latter projects, which he regarded as of major importance, had been given a high enough priority. Unesco's task was to smooth the way for discussion and for the pooling of experience between groups of mankind professing different beliefs. The Organization seemed, however, to be directing its energy towards training specialists, a task which he thought less urgent.
(24) He also thought the question of racial discrimination, dealt with in a draft resolution of the Indian delegation, deserved special attention.
(25) The Polish delegate felt, moreover, that the programme as a whole failed to express the need for universal brotherhood in the way that might have been expected of Unesco. The preamble to the chapter on the social sciences referred to a certain number of countries, but neither those of Eastern Europe nor China figured among them.
(26) Among the important questions which Mr. Lorentz thought might be usefully discussed between his own and other countries were women's cultural and political rights, industrial progress, and land reform While the programme was being examined, his delegation would stress the need to create a common pool of knowledge and experience between all countries on those subjects.
(27) The Polish delegate hoped that, when working out the 1957-58 programme, the Organization would duly consider giving the various countries a larger share in Unesco's work and that the obstacles to the admission of certain States would disappear.

(28) Mr. WADIA (India) congratulated the Director of the Department of Social Sciences on the excellent work done by the Department.
(29) It was a common experience that exact sciences attracted most attention because they could be studied dispassionately and because they furnished the peoples of the world with luxuries. The social sciences were in their infancy, but dealt with the living problems of humanity.
(30) The Indian delegation was closely interested in the training of social scientists, in the clearing house activities of Unesco, which would add to the fund of knowledge on social science problems, in the standardization of statistics, and in racial relations. It was particularly interested in the International Social Science Council.

(31) Mr. MORITO (Japan) explained why the Japanese delegation paid particular attention to Unesco's activities in the field of social science. A considerable number of factors causing or intensifying international tensions were to be found in that field. Studies, however, did not always promote

peaceful solutions of social problems. His delegation was convinced that Unesco was the most appropriate agency to tackle the complex problems involved, and that its contribution would be very great if problems were approached with realism and objectivity.

(32) The Japanese delegation welcomed the well-balanced concentration of the programme. It thought that Unesco's activities should be directed towards easing the tensions and conflicts arising from the economic, social and cultural life of each nation. His delegation agreed to the selection of the problem of race, the problem of human rights, the problem of migrants and the problem of the social impact of industrialization as major subjects for the programme.

(33) The problem of migrants might be regarded as one of the cultural and social aspects of the problem of population. The latter problem was of more concern to the United Nations than to Unesco, but he thought that Unesco could collaborate in that work on a much wider basis than merely by making a study of the migrants' problem.

(34) His delegation stressed the importance of regional and national activities in the sphere of social science. Many problems, such as minorities, could best be studied at the regional or national level. For that reason it supported the project for setting up a research centre both in the southern part of Africa and in South Asia and the projects concerning the holding of symposia and the undertaking of studies in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

(35) His delegation hoped that the results of the study of social problems and of measures for their peaceful solution would be widely disseminated in popular form through the most effective media.

(36) Lastly, the Japanese delegation supported the measures proposed for developing evaluation techniques of programme activities.

(37) The CHAIRMAN asked delegates to pay collective tribute to the labour involved in working out the programme of the Social Science Department, and in their statements to keep strictly to the discussion of its essential points.

(38) Mr IBANEZ-GOMEZ (Chile) associated himself with the tribute paid to Mrs. Myrdal by the Commission. He said that Chile, which had only very recently joined Unesco, had always been interested in the development of the social sciences, and that his delegation was very satisfied with the report presented by the Social Sciences Department.

(39) Social sciences were indispensable to the knowledge of peoples and to the promotion of mutual understanding. The study of social phenomena fostered the brotherhood of man and interdependence between States.

(40) Chile made the study of the social sciences at all educational levels compulsory. Its Faculty of Law was also a faculty of social sciences, and the country had social science seminars and study centres and special schools of social service.

(41) The free flow of information and publications should be intensified, and, in that respect, the work which Unesco was carrying out through its Social Science Bulletin was of great value. The Bulletin was not well enough known and deserved a wider circulation. It was the most important publication of its kind in the world.

(42) The Chilean delegation was interested in encouraging studies in comparative law - one of the needs of contemporary culture. The contradiction between different legal systems and techniques was an influence clouding understanding between peoples. Legislative systems needed unifying to facilitate international understanding. Unesco should strengthen its ties with the International Committee of Comparative Law, which had its headquarters in Paris and was an Organization of great value, with ramifications throughout the world, and particularly in Latin America.

(43) Lastly, an indispensable condition for international understanding was that international organizations, Unesco, and the principles of human rights should be made known to all circles in all countries. An enquiry had just been carried out in Chile on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The results of that enquiry, in which various sections of public opinion had been sounded, were most discouraging. They had shown that there was great ignorance, even in educated and university circles, about what international organizations were, and, furthermore, that people were sceptical and lacked faith in their usefulness. Insufficient information about the organizations which controlled the life of the world had so far been disseminated, and the little publicity they had been given had drawn far more attention to their failures than to their achievements. Unesco should circulate more information on the subject in all countries, paying particular attention to spreading a knowledge of its own special aims and of human rights.

(44) Mr FORSYTH (New Zealand) recognized and appreciated the difficulties which faced the Department of Social Sciences and the needs of the various countries for social science. He thought that the Department had perhaps been tempted to expand too rapidly. In his opinion it was desirable to limit the number of projects and to follow a precise and clear course of action.

(45) A vote was taken on the preamble to the Social Sciences chapter, which was approved.

Project 3.01: Social science co-operation offices (paragraphs 16-24)

(46) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that the Advisory Committee had made no comment on those items.

(47) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) drew attention to the Co-operation Office in Cairo, set up three years previously, which, thanks to the help provided by the Department of Social Sciences and to the zeal of the social science officer in Cairo, had already achieved very satisfactory results.

(48) Whereas, previously, nothing had been done in the field of social science, in the region, specialists in the Middle East were beginning to meet, to make contacts and to work together, but there still

remained much to do in a region of extreme social complexity.
(49) The Lebanese delegate expressed a certain concern, since he understood that the Secretariat was proposing to abolish the Cairo post and replace it by a non-permanent mission which would be responsible for carrying on the work already undertaken. He thought that would be a grave mistake, as the work begun in that region should not be interrupted. He therefore urged that the post be kept in being.

(50) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) assured the delegate of the Lebanon that no change was proposed and the post would remain. The social science officer would remain at his headquarters, but would direct his activities more specifically to countries of the region more distant from Cairo.

(51) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) was satisfied with Mrs. Myrdal's explanation.

(52) Paragraphs 16-24 were approved.

Section I

Project 3.11: Co-operation with international social science organizations and institutions

(53) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) remarked that, in allocating subventions, Unesco apparently tended to favour organizations set up under its auspices. For example, the International Social Science Council and the International Committee for Social Sciences Documentation were to have their subventions increased respectively from $15,000 to $18,000 and from $3,000 to $9,000, whereas the maximum increase granted to the various international social science associations was $1,000.
(54) The Belgian delegate proposed that each of the associations dealt with in paragraphs 35, 37 and 39 should have its subvention increased from $7,500 to $8,500 for each year, that the International Committee of Comparative Law (paragraph 41) should receive $7,000 in place of $6,000 for each year, and that the International Union of Scientific Psychology (paragraph 43) should have its subvention raised from $4,500 to $5,000 a year.
(55) As the Austrian delegate was not present, Baron van der Straten Waillet thought he should speak on behalf of the International Society of Criminology, a most deserving institution which would find itself in difficulties without the subvention of $1,000 it had received under the previous budget. The Belgian delegation supported the request of the Austrian delegation for the restoration of that subvention.
(56) Baron van der Straten Waillet thought the figures given for contracts reasonably satisfactory, but he considered that the system of contracts should be made more flexible and that provision should be made for:

(1) arrangements enabling awards to be made for good work carried out by associations on their own initiative,

(2) an amendment to the clause dealing with the evaluation of hours of work for purposes of payment, the only form of payment suitable for scientific work was an agreed sum;

(3) greater flexibility in the clause dealing with dates of payment, associations which provided guarantees should be able to obtain advances,

(4) an option for authors to take back their manuscripts if not published, without being obliged to buy them back.

(57) The Belgian delegate added that he intended no criticism of the financial departments of the Secretariat.
(58) He asked the Commission to consider the possibility of submitting a resolution to the Administrative Commission along the lines he had just mentioned.

(59) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the provisional budget ceiling had already been fixed and that, while the Commission was free to take any decisions it wished, it did not appear to be aware of the danger of swelling the estimated figure by proposing continual increases.

(60) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that his delegation was not given to asking systematically for budget increases. He felt it incumbent upon him, however, to support the Belgian delegation's request that the subvention which had been granted in previous years to the International Society of Criminology, be restored to the budget. The Society had carried out work of the greatest value, criminology was a very important science concerned with the study of conditions responsible for anti-social behaviour. It was strange that the subvention which the Society had been receiving from Unesco, and which it should continue to receive, had been withdrawn.

(61) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the resolution submitted by the Austrian delegation (document 8C/DR/13) would come up for discussion at the end of the chapter on Social Sciences.

(62) Mr. VITO (Italy) accepted the principle of the two resolutions under discussion (3.111 and 3.112).
(63) With regard to the statement in paragraph 29 that the development of social sciences at the national level was the responsibility of Member States, as was the establishment of social science committees within the framework of National Commissions, he recommended that Unesco associate itself with those committees. He stressed the importance of setting up national research councils where they did not already exist.
(64) He considered that the International Social Science Council should have as large a membership of different countries as possible. To that end, he recommended that the membership of its Executive Council should be increased in order to ensure a wider participation of countries.

(65) Mr. BRANDAO CAVALCANTI (Brazil) seconded the proposal of the Italian delegate. He mentioned that his country had just set up a National Social Science Council and hoped that aid would be forthcoming for its development.

(66) Paragraphs 31-33 were approved.

(67) Mr. SEDES (France) supported the Belgian delegate's proposal to increase the sums provided for in paragraphs 35, 37, 39, 41 and 43. He added, however, that he would propose reductions in certain items of the programme which would come up for discussion later.

(68) The CHAIRMAN put the proposal of the Belgian delegate concerning paragraph 35 to the vote.

(69) Approved by 11 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.

(70) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the Belgian delegate's proposal concerning paragraph 37.

(71) In addition to the French delegate, the delegates of Brazil and Chile supported the proposal.

(72) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) reminded the Commission that, at the Conference of International Non-Governmental Organizations, all the organizations had been asked to try to make contact with those countries where there were no national committees. The Lebanese delegate wondered whether the Belgian delegate's proposal was likely to promote such action.

(73) The CHAIRMAN stated that the Director-General had urged non-governmental organizations to request grants in the form of contracts rather than of subventions.

(74) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that there had already been an increase of $1,000 per year in the subventions to social science associations. That increase had been made in order to help cover the increased travel expenses envisaged for expansion of geographical coverage.

(75) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) found himself in a difficult position on the question of subventions. In his opinion, an element of irresponsibility was involved in raising the proposed subventions. The United States delegation would be consistent and oppose any such increase. He had heard no argument given which would justify it

(76) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) appreciated the disinterested attitude of the United States delegation. He wished to make it clear that the object of the Belgian delegation's proposal was to redress the balance between the "free" associations, on the one hand, and the committees set up under the auspices of Unesco, on the other, so as to ensure that the latter did not oust the former.
(77) He withdrew his proposal in respect of paragraph 37.

(78) Mr. PRATT (Australia), while sympathetic towards the work of the Association, was opposed to the granting of small subventions. In his opinion it would be more appropriate to leave the subvention total as it stood and to undertake work through the Association by means of contracts.

(79) The Commission adopted paragraphs 36 and 37 without amendment.

Paragraphs 38 and 39

(80) Mr. GANON (International Sociological Association) said that the Director-General's report on the subventions granted to international non-governmental organizations, including the International Sociological Association, showed that the subventions were in the nature of contracts, i.e., that the organization receiving the subvention was carrying out work which Unesco could not perform, or could not do so well or so economically.
(81) A study of the programme showed that the natural sciences had been granted several thousand dollars more than the social sciences. Research in the natural sciences was costly, but research in the social sciences was also far from cheap. The International Sociological Association had done all it could to pay its own expenses. As it had not the right to vote, it would be unable to register its support of the Belgian delegation's proposal, with which it was, however, in complete agreement.
(82) The Director-General's report also made it clear that, for an association to be considered international, two conditions had to be fulfilled: that it work on a worldwide scale, and that its membership be international. It was not sufficient for it to cover one continent, Europe, America, etc. The allocation of subventions to date had not taken those considerations into account.
(83) The sociological meetings for which subventions had been granted had all been held in Europe, and had been attended almost exclusively by Europeans. The social psychology and cultural anthropology surveys had taken in only one Latin American country, Mexico. The whole question was dealt with in document 8C/ADM/20, Annex XXVI. He was not asking that any subventions be withdrawn, but that account be taken of the merits of the International Sociological Association in the work of developing the social sciences.

(84) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) considered that the topic for discussion by the Third World Congress of Sociology was unrealistic unless precise terms of reference were decided beforehand. Time was wasted during conferences unless they were planned along specific and narrowly defined lines.

(85) The proposal of the delegate of Belgium concerning paragraph 39 was supported by the delegates of France and Uruguay.

(86) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) thought that some confusion had arisen as a result of his last intervention. He considered that all organizations should be treated alike.
(87) He asked whether the Commission had decided to leave the subvention to the International Economic Association as it appeared in paragraph 35. If not, he proposed that the Commission should do so for the reason that all organizations should be treated alike.
(87) He asked whether the Commission had decided to leave the subvention to the International Economic

Association as it appeared in paragraph 35. If not, he proposed that the Commission should do so for the reason that all organizations should be treated alike.

(88) The CHAIRMAN proposed that in the interests of consistency - and therefore of fairness - the Commission should take a decision on the advisability of increasing the sums mentioned in paragraphs 34-45, as a whole, without going into them again in detail.

(89) Mr. AWAD (Egypt) pointed out that the budget figures as proposed in the draft programme resulted from careful study by the Secretariat, which had consulted the organizations concerned. He was of the opinion that the Commission did not possess the means of judging the organizations without a more detailed study and he doubted the wisdom of trying to modify the figures. He agreed with the delegate of the United States of America that the proposed amounts should remain as they were.

(90) Mr. SEDES (France) was willing to take account of the comments made by the delegates of the United States of America, Australia and Egypt, provided that the Director of the Department of Social Sciences could assure him that the proposed subventions would enable the associations to continue their work and form national branches.

(91) Mr. ARSENAULT (Canada) said that his delegation agreed with the delegates of the United States of America, Australia and Egypt.

(92) Mr. WADIA (India) supported the opinion of the delegate of the United States of America. The temptation to vote an increase in the subventions was natural but he felt that, if a delegate proposed an increase, he might equally well propose cuts elsewhere in the programme.

(93) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that all the organizations to which it was proposed to give subventions had been created by Unesco and were equally close to Unesco's heart.

(94) In answer to the delegate of New Zealand concerning precise topics for discussion at conferences, she explained that the theme was "New research on how social change affects social institutions such as the family". Plans had been made by ISA for working papers on very precise points.

(95) The increase in subventions proposed in paragraphs 44 and 45 did not really constitute increased payments by Unesco, but included as a subvention certain sums which had been included under the heading of contracts in earlier periods.

(96) The Secretariat had carefully studied and weighed the subventions to be granted to organizations. Those organizations could, of course, use larger subventions, but were glad to accept the scale of subventions proposed as an expression of the fair judgment of the Director-General. All subventions had been approved by the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(97) Paragraphs 34-45 were approved by 37 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

International Statistical Institute (paragraphs 46-50)

(98) In reply to a question from the delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany why there had been an increase in the subvention to the International Statistical Institute, Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that formerly a sum of $9,000 had been given to the Institute in the form of a contract to supply international staff. That activity was now called a subvention and represented the same sum of money as before.

Unesco Institute for Social Sciences, Cologne (paragraphs 51 and 52)

(99) Approved.

Staff travel (paragraphs 53 and 54)

(100) Approved.

(101) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to consider the draft resolution concerning the International Society of Criminology (document 8C/DR/13), submitted by the Austrian, and seconded by the Belgian, delegation.

(102) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Advisory Committee had not felt able to recommend that the proposal be adopted, as the Society's activities were not closely enough related to those of Unesco.

(103) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had given the proposal very careful consideration but, in the interests of concentration of resources, had been unable to recommend its adoption by the General Conference.

(104) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) asked if the International Social Science Council was consulted on an application of that kind. In his opinion, some body should assist Unesco to reach a decision on such matters.

(105) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the International Council was consulted on the proposed programme as a whole. That request for a subvention had been received by the Secretariat much too late to be submitted to the Council. Unesco had co-operated with the International Society of Criminology and had in 1953-54 given it a small subvention to be used for work on teaching of criminology.

(106) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) proposed that consideration of document 8C/DR/13 should be postponed until the ninth session of the General Conference in order that the opinion of the International Social Science Council could be obtained.

(107) The United Kingdom proposal was supported by several delegates.

(108) Mr. VITO (Italy), speaking not only as a delegate but as a member of the International Social Science Council, pointed out that the Council had not been intended as a body to control Unesco subventions. The Council was not consulted on administrative problems but only on social science ones.

(109) Mr. AFTALION (Argentina) said that document 8C/ADM/20 gave an account of the work of the International Society of Criminology and its financial resources. The information given showed that the Society was reliable and that its activities met real needs. It was constantly engaged in international work connected with the study of the serious problem of crime, and it therefore seemed clear that Unesco should continue to take an interest in its efforts.
(110) It could also be seen from the above-mentioned document that the subvention to the Society was one of the smallest in Unesco's budget. It was unjustified from all points of view to cancel a subvention of $1,000 to an eminent and useful body. The Argentine delegation would support the maintenance, at least, of that sum in the budget. Anything less would show failure to recognize work of world-wide interest

(111) The CHAIRMAN asked the delegate of Belgium the amount of the subvention granted to the International Society of Criminology.

(112) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) confirmed that the subvention was $1,000.

(113) In answer to the delegate of the United States of America, who asked if he was correct in believing that work on criminology was more closely associated with the Social Affairs Department of the United Nations than with Unesco, Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied in the affirmative and added that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had asked to be consulted on any proposed subvention in that field.
(114) Unesco was, however, interested in the teaching of criminology and had intended giving contracts to certain organizations representing disciplines such as criminology to undertake work on teaching.
(115) The International Society of Criminology was doing very valuable work. It had certain resources of its own. It had been proposed, in the interests of concentration of the programme, not to give it a subvention.

(116) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) also expressed surprise that the subvention to the International Society of Criminology had been withdrawn. The new contributions made by psychology to the study of crime and of its penal consequences had completely transformed penology. No advance in penal legislation was possible without sound preliminary studies in criminology. Studies of that kind were carried out very seriously in Mexico, and a number of eminent men of international repute had come to the fore. The foremost penal experts in Mexico were at the moment devoting their attention to criminology.
(117) It was strange that such a small subvention to so important a scientific body had been deleted from the budget. It would be very regrettable if Unesco, which had taken a leading part in the study of the social sciences, were to neglect a fundamental subject which had transformed the classical concept of delinquency.
(118) The Mexican representative appealed to the Commission to maintain the subvention.

(119) Mr. VITO (Italy), raising a point of order, explained that he did not object to the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate to postpone consideration of document 8C/DR/13 until the ninth session of the General Conference, but with the reservation that the Secretariat should prepare a paper containing information concerning the work of the International Society of Criminology in the meantime.

(120) Mr. BERGSTRAESSER (German Federal Republic) could not see what criteria had been used to grant a subvention to the International Society of Criminology. The income of the Society amounted to $40,000 and the withdrawal of a contribution of $1,000 by Unesco was unlikely to diminish the Society's efforts.
(121) Secondly, referring to document 8C/ADM/20, he suggested that, in the future, an evaluation should be added to the reports of affiliated associations, based on the reports from those associations or on the experience of the Secretariat. Such evaluations would be of great assistance to members of the Commission for voting purposes.

(122) The CHAIRMAN considered that it would be a dangerous thing for the Secretariat to be asked to give the organizations good conduct marks. It should provide general information, leaving Member States at liberty to obtain further details.

(123) Mr. AWAD (Egypt) hoped that subventions of $1,000 would not be reintroduced in future programmes. Unesco was right in concentrating on major disciplines. He thought that the Commission should not alter the figures proposed by the Secretariat for the period 1955-56.

(124) Mr. SEDES (France) had felt inclined to agree with the United Kingdom delegate. After hearing the explanations given by Mrs. Myrdal, however, and knowing how useful the help of such a body might be to Unesco in its educational work, he was in favour of restoring the subvention.

(125) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), raising a point of order, pointed out that the United Kingdom proposal was an amendment to document 8C/DR/13. He accepted the amendment which had been proposed to his amendment, and moved that consideration of document 8C/DR/13 should be deferred.

(126) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/13, with

the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegate.

(127) Approved by 30 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions.

(128) The CHAIRMAN then submitted to the Commission the following draft resolution, submitted by the Belgian delegation:

"The Programme and Budget Commission,

Considering that the present rigidity of the contract system frequently inhibits the work of non-governmental organizations,

Requests the Administrative Commission to re-examine the system of contracts, with a view to:

1. Enabling awards to be made for studies or other work of outstanding merit contributing to the achievement of Unesco's aims,

2. Making the contract system, and methods of financial control, more flexible".

(129) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) welcomed the opportunity given him by the delegate of Belgium to explain the Secretariat's method of allocating subventions.
(130) The Secretariat considered subventions as sums of money granted for carrying out a programme project. As a form of aid, the method was flexible, with no hard-and-fast rules or conditions.
(131) With regard to the question of making advance payments, a satisfactory system had been established which was outlined in document 8C/ADM/5 Advances were made only when necessary but there was nothing to prevent the Director-General from making them.
(132) Questions of the waiving of copyright were dealt with through the Publications Board. Copyright was waived when it was thought useful to do so.
(133) He concluded by wondering whether the Belgian delegate would reconsider his position if the Director-General gave the Commission an assurance of flexibility and undertook to act in the new financial period in the light of the discussion which had taken place.

(134) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) was prepared to withdraw his draft resolution, if he received from the Secretariat an assurance of flexibility with regard to contracts.
(135) He asked for further information on two points:

(1) did the existing contract system allow for the possibility of recompensing work which had not been commissioned, but had proved useful?

(2) could an author who had handed over a manuscript to Unesco and surrendered the copyright, regain possession of his work, without repurchasing it, if Unesco decided against publishing it?

(136) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Porgramme and Budget) explained that, by the definition of a contract, services had to be rendered to Unesco before a contract was given. Compensation to organizations for work done and not asked for by Unesco would fall under the category of subvention.
(137) Copyright clauses were waived without incurring expense.

(138) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) withdrew his draft resolution.

Project 3.12: Clearing house for information and advisory services (paragraphs 55-70)

(139) Mr. WEILENMANN (Switzerland) considered that adult education institutes should be given the place they deserved and, for that purpose, proposed adding at the end of paragraph 57 the words "with the help of the institutes of adult education".
(140) He emphasized the importance of resolutions 3.122 and 3.34, and said that it was his opinion that, if Unesco were deprived of all its activities with the exception of those, it would still be left with its most important.
(141) The crucial question was the one of publications and of how information, factual and other, should be printed to reach everyone in the world. Publications should be made in every language in which it was desired they should be read, and should be available in cheap form. He suggested that Unesco, or even better, a committee of experts connected with Unesco, should choose the material for publication, choose the authors and the publishers in the various countries and the form in which the publications would appear. Unesco could assist in the work of translation.
(142) The scheme he had suggested should be self-supporting and, to enable that to be the case, Unesco could approa publishers, book clubs, humanitarian societies, etc. who were willing to co-operate in the field, and ask them not only to publish, but to distribute booklets approved by the Committee.
(143) He asked the Secretariat to consider his suggestion and thanked Mrs. Myrdal and the Chairman for all they had done

(144) The Swiss delegate's proposal was supported by the delegates of Egypt, Uruguay and France.

(145) In answer to a question from the delegate of Canada why there had been an increase in the budget appropriation for project 3.12, paragraph 55, Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that a series of projects which had previously appeared under separate headings had been merged into the clearing house project. In addition, there was a slight increase due to the number of enquiries which had poured into the Department.

(146) Mr. VITO (Italy) supported the resolution. He suggested that contributions to the Social Science Bulletin should be requested from social science experts, even if such experts came from countries having relatively unknown languages.

(147) The draft amendment proposed by the Swiss delegate was approved.

(148) Resolutions 3.121 and 3.122 (amended) were approved

Project 3.13: Improvement of social science documentation and terminology (paragraphs 71-90)

(149) Mr. ARSENAULT (Canada) asked why the estimate for 1955-56 for the improvement of social science documentation and terminology represented

a substantial increase over that for 1953-54. He noticed that approximately half of the amount was for the project on the International Bibliography of Anthropology, and asked whether such a bibliography was necessary and why it would take so much money to prepare.

(150) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that there had been no very substantial increase in the budget, which had moved only from $22,891 in 1954 to $28,668 in 1955. The increase proposed would be justified by the increased number of bibliographies. Paragraph 83 referred not only to the Bibliography of anthropology but to the five bibliographies mentioned in paragraphs 78-82.

(151) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the different countries were called upon to communicate data to the Secretariat to assist in compiling the bibliographies.

(152) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied in the affirmative. The technical work was being organized by the International Committee for Social Science Documentation, and the international professional associations advised on the content to be covered.
(153) In countries such as France and the United Kingdom, which had well-established bibliographical services, the work of compilation was done for Unesco by those institutes. Unesco was trying to find national correspondents in all countries to help with the work, relying largely on specialized librarians and documentalists.
(154) Replying to an earlier remark by the delegate of Poland concerning the absence of coverage in the bibliographies of publications in Eastern European languages, Mrs. Myrdal pointed out that coverage was being gradually extended to all linguistic areas. She had already mentioned the possibility that coverage of the Eastern European linguistic area might be considered for the period 1957-58.

(155) Paragraphs 71-90 were approved.

Project 3.2: Statistics relating to education, science and culture

Paragraphs 91-95

(156) Mr. PRATT (Australia) stressed the importance of project 3.2 and urged that attention should be given to the initial stages of the work prior to collation, in order that classification, analysis and definitions should be as effective as possible.

(157) Replying to a question from the delegate of the United Kingdom, the CHAIRMAN said that document 8C/PRG/2 would be examined at the same time as paragraph 107.

(158) Paragraphs 91-95 were approved.

Project 3.22: Collection and publication of statistics (paragraphs 96-102)

(159) Approved without discussion.

Project 3.23: Improvement of international comparability of statistics (paragraphs 103-112)

(160) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) had four comments to make on the standardization of educational statistics (document 8C/PRG/2, Annex III).
(161) In the first place, the United Kingdom delegation was not enthusiastic about standardization of statistics on literacy or on routine schooling. It was not possible to measure literacy accurately and he doubted the value of undertaking elaborate exercises in an attempt to do so.
(162) Secondly, the principal methods suggested for obtaining information on routine schooling were by asking direct or indirect questions. In his opinion, indirect questioning was worthless.
(163) Thirdly, the Director-General had proposed that schools should be defined under categories different from those proposed by the committee of experts. In his opinion, the committee of experts' definition was the right one.
(164) Lastly, he thought that classification of pupils and students by sex and grade was unsatisfactory.
(165) He hoped that the Director-General would reconsider his proposals in the light of the recommendations of the committee of experts.

(166) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) pointed out that, although the United States delegation was interested in the standardization of educational statistics and would co-operate in the project, it was in a difficult position with regard to the procedure proposed for obtaining statistics. The United States of America was a Federal Republic and had no central educational authority. The Government would be willing to co-operate in the proposed work, but was not in a position to compel States to undertake it. He hoped that, if results from the United States of America were incomplete, the reason would be understood by other countries.

(167) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that to abstain from attempting to define measures for illiteracy would be fatal. Even if the standards were not perfect, the very considerable advances made in literacy constituted one of the outstanding cultural conquests of our era, and must be registered.
(168) In answer to the delegate of the United Kingdom, she intimated that the Director-General had made proposals at variance with those of the committee of experts as a result of comments made to him by Member States.
(169) She pointed out that in document 8C/PRG/2, the Director-General was only asking for authorization to send a report with annexes to Member States for their comments. The question would have to appear before a General Conference a second time, under the existing rules of procedure.

(170) Mr. STEWART (Canada), while agreeing with the remarks made by the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, supported the resolution and, on behalf of his Government, expressed willingness to co-operate in the work.

Section II

Project 3.3: Development of social science teaching (paragraphs 113-134)

(171) Mr. SEDES (France) noted the use of the phrase "at all levels", in resolution 3.31, in referring to the teaching of the social sciences. The same expression occurred again in resolution 3.33. The French delegate asked for further details about the teaching of the social sciences at secondary school level.

(172) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that the heading for resolution 3.3 was inclusive. Teaching of the social sciences at all levels was referred to in the paragraphs of the work plans under that heading. Elements of social science teaching existed in secondary school education and an analysis was being made with the co-operation of the International Federation of Secondary School Teachers.

(173) Mr. SEDES (France) proposed that, to avoid confusion, resolution 3.31 be amended as follows: "Member States are invited to encourage, develop and improve the teaching of the social sciences, as such, and the use of knowledge acquired from the social sciences at all levels of teaching"

(174) The amendment was put to the vote and approved.

(175) The CHAIRMAN put before the Commission a draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Iran, to launch a scheme for setting up an international institute for the training of international civil servants (document 8C/DR/62).

(176) Mr. RAADI (Iran) first made the point that the draft resolution had no budgetary implications. It related to a preliminary study to determine whether it would be desirable to set up an institute, under the auspices of Unesco, to train candidates for the international civil service. The idea was not a new one. The two basic factors taken into account in the recruitment of international civil servants were professional competence and geographical distribution In practice, it was often difficult to combine those two factors and in many cases geographical representation could be achieved only at the expense of professional competence, or vice versa. The Iranian delegation therefore felt that it would be wise to seek a rational solution to the problem, even if it could not be put into effect until later.
(177) What was in mind was merely a study of the question in co-operation with the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies. The Director-General could then report to the Conference at its next session on the results of his consultation, and it would lie with the Conference to decide whether any such body should be set up. If the institute were set up, a student who had attended the course and been awarded a diploma would not, ipso facto, be entitled to a post in an international organization.
(178) He thought, however, that such a system would enable the underdeveloped countries to put up candidates for the international civil service.

(179) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) mentioned the statement of the delegate of Iran that no budgetary charge would be made for undertaking the proposed work. In his opinion, however, if the work was to be done properly, it would take the Secretariat a very long time and involve it in much additional work The problem was highly controversial and it was not known whether other agencies would be willing to co-operate in its solution.

(180) In answer to a question from the delegate of the United States of America, Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that both the United Nations and Unesco kept track of information on that subject As a project subsidiary to that for carrying out fact-finding surveys (paragraph 121) on the teaching of several disciplines, such as public administration, Unesco could undertake the necessary work.
(181) The delegate of the United Kingdom had been correct in saying that extra work would fall upon the Secretariat, but the difficulties here would be political rather than technical.

(182) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) was impressed by the importance of the problem raised by the delegate of Iran. He suggested that the Commission agree to the collection of information during the period 1955-56 and leave consideration of a resolution until the ninth session of the General Conference.

(183) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had not discussed the resolution.

(184) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) recognized the problem, but being anxious not to throw the burden of planning onto the Secretariat, asked the delegate of Iran if he would be willing to accept the suggestion made by the delegate of the United States of America.
(185) He suggested that paragraph (1) of the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/62 might then read: "to study, jointly with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, the information which might be used in the future for the establishment of an international centre or institute.. ".

(186) Mr. RAADI (Iran) said that, in view of the explanations given by Mrs. Myrdal, he accepted the point of view of the United States delegate. He also accepted the suggestion of the delegate of the United Kingdom, subject to possible rewording.

(187) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Iranian and the United Kingdom delegates should together decide on the new wording, which would be submitted to the Commission at its next meeting.

(188) Approved.

(189) Mr. SANCHEZ REULET (Organization of American States) wished to make a suggestion to Unesco's Department of Social Sciences concerning the teaching of statistics. He asked, that were Latin America was concerned, account should be taken of the work of the Inter-American Institute of

Statistics in improving teaching and in training specialists. The Institute had a special centre dealing with such activities and represented the most important current project in connexion with statistics.

(190) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), raising a point of order, pointed out that the question of public administration had been dealt with at Chicago. In addition, he considered that, as the question of industrial relations was very involved and extensive, it would be better if the project outlined in paragraph 121 were limited to fact-finding surveys in the fields of statistics and demography.

(191) In reply, Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the studies which had been undertaken by the public administration clearing house in Chicago were not complete. They did not cover all countries nor all branches of administration. The work Unesco proposed to undertake on teaching of public administration was in accord with the United Nations Technical Assistance Board.

(192) For the survey of the teaching of statistics, Unesco could rely on the International Statistical Institute and the Inter-American Statistical Institute, which would greatly facilitate the execution of that part of the project.

(193) She admitted that the question of the teaching of industrial relations was a difficult one and suggested that it might be deferred until a later programme. A survey on the teaching of criminology could take its place.

(194) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) moved that the resolution should be adopted with the suggested amendments.

(195) The Commission adopted resolution 3.31 with the French amendment, and resolutions 3.32 and 3.33 with the Swiss amendments.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

# NINETEENTH MEETING

*30 November 1954 at 9.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: NATURAL SCIENCES (continued)**

DR/110: Rational exploitation of natural resources (submitted jointly by the French, Belgian and Uruguayan delegations)

(1) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) submitted draft resolution 2.222, together with the work plan and budget estimates for 1955-56 and explained that the document submitted to the Commission was intended to replace draft resolutions 8C/DR/35, 54 and 60.

(2) Draft resolution 2.222 stated:

"The Director-General is authorized to promote the co-ordination of research on the conservation and utilization of natural resources, with reference more particularly to the repercussions of hydro-electrical works on the natural environment".

(3) Mr. Florkin drew attention to the serious effect which the construction of a big dam and other plant or hydro-electrical works might have on the natural surroundings of an area when man's interference was divorced from the enlightenment of expert opinion on natural conditions.

(4) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) announced that the Advisory Committee, after examining the very interesting proposals contained in draft resolutions 35, 54 and 60, now included in draft resolution 110, had recommended that they should be submitted by the Director-General again for the 1957-58 programme.

(5) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the idea was to bring engineers and naturalists together so that the needs of industry could be weighed against those of nature. The result would be that constructors of dams would take into account the effect of their schemes upon natural resources.

(6) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) reminded members of the unfortunate results that had followed the hydro-electrical development of the semi-arid region of North East Brazil. That immense area was now faced with serious difficulties, the water that had accumulated above the dams had dissolved the salines in the soil and had become more harmful to surrounding vegetation and animal life than the former aridity had been.

(7) He therefore warmly supported the draft resolution.

(8) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) viewed the proposal with much sympathy, but proposed that the Commission should accept the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

(9) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) asked whether it would not be possible to include it in the humid tropical zone project for the 1957-58 budget.

(10) Mr. PAGE (Canada) supported the United Kingdom's proposal, adding that a good deal of work had already been done nationally and internationally on the conservation and utilization of natural resources and that the project would suffer no great damage through delay.

(11) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) enquired whether co-ordination with the International Union for the Protection of Nature, and other bodies, had been considered.

(12) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the proposal was submitted in agreement with the International Union for the Protection of Nature and the International Commission on Large Dams, two non-governmental organizations which consisted of qualified representatives of two bodies with widely divergent interests and which would be glad to state and compare their points of view. A meeting of that kind would be most useful.

(13) In reply to Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece), Mr. AUGER said that agronomic engineers and, in particular, specialists in soil study should take part in the work. The co-operation of pedologists was particularly important, as the Brazilian delegate had pointed out.

(14) Mr. Auger explained that, provided the subject appeared in the programme, even with a reduced budget or no budget at all, the Director-General would be able to initiate consultations with specialists. But, if the project were postponed until 1957-58 he would not even be able to start consultations.

(15) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) wished to make it clear that in making its recommendation the Advisory Committee had been fully conscious of the interest of the project contained in draft resolution 110. One of its reasons for proposing the delay had been precisely to allow for more detailed consultation with the international organizations mentioned by the Australian delegate. Those organizations, though they agreed with the proposal in principle, had not yet had the opportunity of commenting fully on it.

(16) The Director-General he added, would need some textual basis on which to start the necessary preliminary consultations.

(17) Mrs. PECSON (Representative of the Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had recommended the proposals contained in draft resolutions 35 and 54, but had asked that draft resolution No. 60 be deferred until the next General Conference, as it was a very important one, which should be studied in detail first. She noted that the proposal in question was not included in draft resolution 110, and therefore the draft resolution was in line with the Executive Board's recommendation.

(18) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there were three proposals before the Commission: (a) the draft resolution submitted by the French, Belgian and Uruguayan delegations (document 8C/DR/110); (b) the amendment moved by the United Kingdom delegation for adopting the conclusions of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, and urging that the project be postponed until 1957-58; (c) the proposal that the Director-General be instructed to study the question while avoiding any budgetary implications.

(19) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) considered that there were no technical or budgetary reasons for postponing the project, which was within clearly defined limits and carefully planned, and which would be very beneficial to all the semi-arid zones.

(20) Put to the vote, the United Kingdom amendment for deferring the project until 1957-58 was adopted by 13 votes to 9, with 11 abstentions.

(21) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) remarked that the project, although postponed, had not been dropped entirely, as the Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research would be able to draft recommendations for the General Conference's ninth session.

(22) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), explaining the impact of the decision just taken, said that, in the absence of funds, the Secretariat could not undertake a really exhaustive analysis of the project. The idea would be explored with a view to its inclusion in the draft programme and budget for 1957-58.

(23) The CHAIRMAN then read out draft resolution 42 submitted by the Uruguayan delegation on the teaching of the principles of the conservation of natural resources:

"The General Conference,

Authorizes the Director-General to promote the teaching of the basic principles of the conservation of natural resources, to assist, by the use of the media of mass communication, in making the public aware of these problems and to encourage research on subjects connected with the principles of conservation".

(24) The Chairman thought that that text, which had been approved by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, would keep the question of the rational utilization of natural resources in the programme without entailing any appropriations.

(25) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) believed a simple verbal change in one paragraph of the proposed programme and budget, with no budgetary implications, would suffice.

(26) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) asked the Uruguayan delegation to abide by the general idea of the draft joint resolution (document 8C/DR/110). Obviously there was no need in that resolution to refer explicitly to teaching of the principles of the conservation of natural resources, as the proposed measures could not be envisaged unless teaching formed part of them.

(27) He suggested that the Uruguayan delegation should withdraw DR/42, just as he had himself withdrawn DR/58, and should accept his proposal to add to the beginning of DR/110 the text submitted in paragraph 23 above.

(28) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) indicated that the Advisory Committee had reached the same conclusion with regard to draft resolutions 42 and 58 as on the project previously discussed. Consultation with other organizations was necessary, and the Director-General should have the opportunity of studying the proposals for inclusion in the 1957-58 programme.

(29) Mr. VILLAR (Uruguay) indicated his assent to the Belgian draft resolution.

(30) Draft resolution 8C/DR/110 was approved.

Technical aid to Member States

Resolution 2.321: The Director-General is authorized to provide technical aid for Member States in connexion with science teaching at university level and for the practical teaching of science in secondary schools.

Paragraphs 136 and 137

(31) Mr. JOHANNES (Indonesia) warmly defended the project contained in paragraph 136. Indonesia was in great need of expert aid in training for all the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, about which the Commission had passed a resolution that morning.

(32) Paragraphs 136 and 137 were approved.

Paragraphs 138 and 139

(33) Mr. PRASAD (India) proposed that, as the allocation for the teaching of science in secondary schools was so small, it should be suppressed in favour of other projects.

(34) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) asked whether, in the event of paragraphs 138 and 139 being rejected, Mr. Auger could consider using the $40,000 thus saved for the nuclear physics and cosmic rays project.

(35) The CHAIRMAN reminded delegates that the Commission had already voted large supplementary funds and that it might very well not have the sum mentioned at its disposal.

(36) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that sums made available by cancelling projects or postponing them to 1957-58 should be counted as remaining in a general fund, so that after the budget had been reviewed in detail the Director-General could submit to the Commission overall proposals for final budgetary adjustments.

(37) Put to the vote, the cancellation of the appropriations referred to in paragraphs 138 and 139 was rejected by 18 votes to 13, with 3 abstentions.

DR/109: Quito Observatory

(38) Mr. MONTALVO (Ecuador) proposed that the sum of $3,000 be added to the end of the chapter to pay for part of the technical aid needed by the Government of his country for modernizing the equipment at the Astronomical Observatory in Quito. His Government had frequently spoken to Unesco officials on that important matter.
(39) The insignificant sum requested would only cover part of the expert's cost, the major part being borne by the Government of Ecuador. The principal object of that request was to be sure of an efficient technician, to be recommended by Unesco.

(40) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) repeated a protest he had made at an earlier meeting against the flood of last-minute draft resolutions, submitted far too late for their discussion by delegates, let alone by National Commissions. He raised a tentative point of order: could a new draft resolution on a particular question be handed round while the question was actually being discussed?

(41) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) remarked that, according to Rule 78 on page 22 of the Rules of Procedure, new draft resolutions could not be submitted later than the end of the seventh day of the session.

(42) The CHAIRMAN reminded delegates that the Commission had decided to consider draft resolutions, originally rejected because of failure to submit them within the time limit, when a delegation insisted upon submitting them afresh in the form of oral proposals. He noted further that the proposal to reject the Ecuadorian suggestion on the Quito Observatory had not been seconded.

(43) Speaking on a point of order, Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said that the project submitted by the Ecuadorian delegation had rightly been declared non-receivable as a draft resolution, but it could take the form of a request for technical assistance, i.e. for the services of an expert, as had happened in the case of an observatory in Brazil.

(44) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought the Technical Assistance Board would not accede to a request of that kind; it had already stated that projects connected with astronomy did not come within its normal programme.
(45) He would suggest, however, that the project might be brought within the programme by extending the provisions of resolution 2.321 on technical aid to Member States so as to cover astronomy.

(46) Mr. VILLAR (Uruguay) said that, having listened to Mr. Auger's statement, the Uruguayan delegation supported the new version of the Ecuadorian proposal.

(47) Mr. PAGE (Canada) protested against the manner in which the proposal of the delegate of

Ecuador had been presented, and felt he could not participate in the discussion of it in that form.

(48) The CHAIRMAN said that, should the Commission so wish, it could revoke its previous decision to receive oral proposals. Declaring that the discussion could be reopened, he recalled that protests had been lodged by delegates who had asserted that the Commission's powers were unduly limited by the automatic rejection of oral proposals on the ground that that was required by the rules of debate.

(49) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) thought that the General Conference at its seventh session had laid down clearly the procedure for the consideration of new proposals. The Commission should normally have before it, in connexion with each proposal, the recommendation of the Executive Board and that of the Advisory Committee. If the Commission intended to upset that procedure, he failed to see what the rôle of the two Advisory Committees was.

(50) The CHAIRMAN asked once more whether the Commission was in favour of or against considering oral proposals.

(51) Speaking on a point of order, Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) urged that a distinction be made between proposals with and those without budgetary implications.

(52) The CHAIRMAN reminded members that they had decided to receive oral proposals even when they had budgetary implications.

(53) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) said that every General Conference had consistently followed the practice of refusing to consider any proposal not previously approved by the Executive Board.

(54) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) felt that a fair balance should be maintained between flexibility in discussion and the rejection outright of any unwarranted extempore proposal. The Ecuadorian proposal came within the normal procedure and was therefore receivable in equity, if not within the strict letter of the law.

(55) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) was led by the very confusion of the meeting at that moment to support the protests made by the delegates of New Zealand and Canada.

(56) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) suggested that on the basis of resolution 2.321 the Commission would be in order in mentioning astronomy in paragraph 136 side by side with nuclear physics and cosmic rays. That solution was entirely feasible and had no budgetary implications. It involved neither a new draft resolution nor a new proposal, but only a textual amendment.

(57) After the New Zealand delegate had reiterated his point of view, the CHAIRMAN replied that he did not feel that his decisions amounted to a departure from the motion adopted at the beginning of the Commission's work.

(58) According to the strict letter of the rules, a draft resolution tabled after document 8C/DR/61 was not receivable as such. The Commission had decided that, if any delegation so demanded, it might submit a project in the form of an oral proposal and, if the latter had any budgetary implications, the Commission would be free to accept or reject such implications, or even the whole proposal.

(59) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that Mr. Auger had given the correct explanation of the proposal under discussion. It was merely an amendment to the work plan, and so entirely receivable.

(60) For the rest, the references to astronomy, nuclear physics and cosmic rays served only as illustrative example. The Director-General was free to arrange the details according to requirements, for the work plans accompanying the draft programme and budget were not a legal document, with limitative or exclusive effect.

(61) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) shared the perturbation of other delegates at the inclusion of the request presented by the delegate of Ecuador in paragraph 136. Was it a suitable time, and even a suitable place in the budget for it? The renovation of an astronomical observatory had little to do with the development of university education in nuclear physics. Mr. Linkson considered it a dangerous precedent to make such amendments in a programme which ought to be homogeneous. One word, one syllable had divided Christianity.

(62) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) said that, in view of the explanations of the Director of the Natural Sciences Department, and of the fact that the Ecuadorian proposal had no budgetary implications, a solution would be to insert the word "astronomy" in paragraph 136 and include Ecuador in the list of countries in question.

(63) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) observed that the point under discussion was one of procedure and did not affect the substantive question, i.e. Ecuador's request for technical aid, which was really the subject under consideration.

(64) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) wished to know how the figures under paragraph 137 had been arrived at, and whether they could be reduced by the rejection of the proposal submitted by the delegation of Ecuador.

(65) The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the difficulties entailed by his proposal, the delegate of Ecuador might be willing to refer it to the next General Conference.

(66) Mr. MONTALVO (Ecuador) said that, provided the situation could be cleared up at the meeting that day, his delegation would not object to withdrawing its proposal for the time being. But he did not wish the subject to be regarded as closed, since, in his opinion, it was of paramount importance both to his

own country as to the rest of the American continent, the Observatory rendering the most valuable services owing to its geographical position.

(67) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) saw no relation between the proposal of the Director-General under project 2.321 and that of the delegation of Ecuador.

(68) Mr. PRASAD (India) said that paragraphs 136 and 137 had been adopted. Before it could go any further with the discussion the meeting would have to decide whether it would take up the subject again or not.

(69) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Commission wished to revert to paragraphs 136 and 137 in order to include the word "astronomy".

(70) The reconsideration of paragraphs 136 and 137 was put to the vote and approved by 11 votes to 9.

(71) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought that the Commission would be straying very far from the truth in supposing that astronomy was not a subject of university education. In France, for instance, the observatories were regarded as an integral part of the universities, making it possible to give practical application to the theoretical teaching of the lecture room.
(72) As the Assistant Director-General had explained, even if the Commission took no decision, the proposal represented a measure on which it was open to the Director-General to take action. But it would be better that the Commission approve the inclusion of astronomy in the paragraph and so recognize the existence of a very real need.

(73) Put to the vote, the amendment to paragraph 136 was adopted by 23 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

(74) Mr. PRASAD (India) said that it had been agreed to include the word "astronomy" in paragraph 136. It was now necessary to vote on the required subvention.

(75) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the decision just taken did not cover the $3,000 requested, but merely authorized the Director-General to take action within the limits of the present budget appropriations.
(76) Further, resolution 2.231 should be amended by deleting the last part of the sentence on the practical teaching of science in secondary schools.

"The Director-General is authorized to provide technical aid for Member States in connexion with science teaching at university level".

(77) That amendment was approved without discussion.

Project 2.41: Science Co-operation Offices

(78) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) having stated that the Advisory Committee had recommended that the project be referred to the Working Party on Decentralization, the SECRETARY read out the passage dealing with the matter in the report of the Working Party:

"Having heard the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director of the Natural Sciences Department on this subject, the Working Party recommends that:

(a) the science co-operation offices should be maintained as proposed by the Director-General in the draft programme and budget (document 8C/5) for the next two years. Consideration of the special case of the Delhi Office was, however, left to the Programme and Budget Commission,

(b) the Director-General should be asked to study carefully the development of the science co-operation offices with a view to establishing how the funds at the disposal of these offices could be most efficiently expended". (Document 8C/PRG/25 (rev.), page 2 of English version.)

(79) Mr. IBANEZ GOMEZ (Chile) said that the regional science co-operation offices had always received highest priority at the instigation of the Anglo-Saxon delegations, which had in fact been the driving force behind them. Chile, which had just joined Unesco, wished to be associated with that policy and pressed for the highest priority for those activities.
(80) He emphasized the importance of the regional offices and recalled the work achieved by the Montevideo Office, which had been responsible for Chile's entry into Unesco.
(81) The one tangible achievement of Unesco in the South American continent was the direct action taken by the Co-operation Office for Latin America, and for that reason he was dismayed at reading in document 8C/PRG/25 (rev.) that "the Director-General should be asked to study carefully the development of the science co-operation offices with a view to establishing how the funds at the disposal of these offices could be most efficiently expended". That sentence, if approved, would imply a criticism, for it almost asked whether the Director-General was watching carefully over the development of those offices.
(82) Further, looking at the sentence from a wider angle, it implied placing in the Director-General's hands an instrument which would enable him to veto any future agreements on co-operation offices. That was to say, a personal decision by the Director-General would suffice to modify or cancel a decision taken by a sovereign body such as the General Conference.
(83) He therefore asked that document 8C/PRG/25 (rev.) be approved with the deletion of paragraph (b) in Point II.

(84) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, said that the proposal was unacceptable unless the Working Party's report were included in the discussion.

(85) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) asked for the Assistant Director-General's views on the budgetary implications of the recommendation.

(86) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the report, though not actually included

in the discussion, might be used as a source of information to assist members in the debate.
(87) The Secretariat's opinion was that paragraph (b) did not imply any criticism, at most a suggestion to facilitate further progress.

(88) Mr. PRASAD (India) expressed the surprise of his delegation at the proposal contained in paragraph 145 of the proposed programme and budget to transform the office for South Asia into a branch office. That was the only retrograde step in the whole of the Natural Sciences chapter, and it was in contradiction to resolution 2.41 authorizing the Director-General to develop the activities of science co-operation offices in South Asia among other parts.
(89) The reason given was that of budgetary limitations, but $40,000 had been released under paragraph 139; and in studying paragraphs 182 and 196-197, he found the only result of the reduction was the suppression of one P-5 post.
(90) On account of the importance of the science co-operation offices, the delegation of India proposed that paragraph 145 should be replaced by the following:

"Past experience of the work of the science co-operation offices has shown that there is urgent need to expand their activities in South and South East Asia and bring them more into consonance with the requirements of the region with a view to encouraging the spread of scientific education and knowledge and providing facilities for the greater utilization of science in raising the standard of living of the people. The Conference therefore authorizes the Director-General to maintain the existing science co-operation office at Jakarta at its present level, and, on the basis of the offer of the Government of India made in consultation with, and with the support of the delegations of Indonesia,, Burma and Ceylon, to develop the Delhi Science Co-operation Office into a Nucleus Office in terms of resolution 8C/DR/14, of which notice has already been given.

"The Conference further authorizes the Director-General to make consequential changes in paragraphs 172-184 (pages 70-71) and paragraphs 191 and 192 (page 71) of the Draft Programme and Budget for 1955-56, and to carry out necessary alterations in the budget provision for the effective implementation of this proposal".

(91) The delegate of India drew attention to draft resolution 8C/DR/14, in which his Government offered free office facilities and guidance over residential accommodation to members of the regional office.

(92) Mr. VILLAR (Uruguay) said that the Science Co-operation Office in Latin America played an invaluable part in spreading scientific knowledge in that part of the world, both by arousing the interest of governments and peoples and by facilitating and stimulating scientific development and research.

(93) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Uruguayan delegate had any concrete proposal to formulate.

(94) Mr. VILLAR (Uruguay) replied that his delegation shared the concern expressed by the Chilean delegate, but had suppressed his feelings in the matter, on the understanding that their remarks would be noted in the records.

(95) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) supported the delegate of India. Why should the Office in India be singled out for reduction? That Office served a very useful purpose in an area with a population exceeding 400,000,000 Moreover, library facilities etc. in the area were still inadequate.

(96) Mr. PAGE (Canada) fully supported the delegate of India. The budgetary implication was small and the need of the service in that area was a vital one.

(97) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) was sorry to oppose the delegate of India in saying that the Director-General's proposal was a tribute to his country. The development of science in India had attained such a high standard that it could now carry on without a full-scale office.

(98) In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that in its draft resolutions on the decentralization of Unesco's activities and the establishment of a regional office in South and South East Asia (documents 8C/DR/7 and 8C/DR/14), the Indian delegation had asked for a regional office to be opened for co-operation with Unesco, and had been supported by the delegations of Ceylon, Indonesia and Burma. That proposal would come up for discussion in connexion with Point V of the Working Party's report on decentralization (8C/PRG/25 (rev.), page 5 of the English version) and the general resolutions, none of which documents were at present under discussion.
(99) The question under examination at the moment was the retention or abolition of the Delhi Office under the present system. Its retention would cost Unesco $60,000 for the two years.

(100) The Liberian delegate having supported the Indian proposal to retain the Delhi Office at its present level with an expenditure of $60,000 for 1955-56, the proposal was adopted by 19 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions.

(101) The CHAIRMAN said that the question would be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(102) The provisions relating to project 2.41: Regional Science Co-operation Offices, were adopted as far as paragraph 149 with the amendment proposed by the Indian delegation.

(103) The provisions relating to the Science Co-operation Office in Latin America (Montevideo), paragraphs 150-152, were adopted without discussion.

Meetings and scientific research (paragraphs 153-159)

(104) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) proposed an amendment to paragraph 156, the first sentence to be replaced by: "It is proposed to organize in Mexico an international congress on cosmic radiation

under the auspices of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics" The next sentence could remain unaltered, but the last should be amended to read: "the Science Co-operation Office will pay the expenses of some of the participants"
(105) The Mexican delegation's reason for desiring that amendment was that at the International Congress on Cosmic Rays held in France in 1953 the Cosmic Rays Committee of the International Physics Union had agreed that the next congress should be held in Mexico City. Prior to that decision the Mexican National Commission had applied for assistance for a symposium on gravitation and cosmology. But in view of the agreement with the International Physics Union, Mexico had decided to propose the present amendment.

(106) The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Mexican delegate's proposal had no budgetary implications.

(107) Various proposals connected with the science co-operation offices in Latin America and the Middle East, and with meetings and scientific research, were adopted without discussion (paragraphs 153-171).

Science Co-operation for Asia (paragraphs 172-175)

(108) Mr. PRASAD (India) asked that his proposal (document 8C/DR/89) should be taken into account in dealing with that section.

(109) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) apologized for having misled the Commission with regard to the budgetary implications of retaining the Co-operation Office in Delhi. Contrary to what he had said, the figure was not $60,000 for the two years 1955 and 1956, but $60,000 per annum, i.e. $120,000 for the two years. He asked the Commission to hear a statement by the Director of the Natural Sciences Department on the reasons that had led the Director-General to propose cutting down the Delhi Office.

(110) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the regional scientific co-operation offices were not, properly speaking, regional co-operation offices. Members of the Secretariat were sent there but were not officially seconded to one of the regions in the normal sense of the term. That was why the offices were mobile and, in the same way, special branches set up in the Philippines and Shanghai had later been withdrawn.
(111) Furthermore, India had made great strides in scientific research over the last few years. It now possessed excellent research laboratories and full-grown universities attended by many holders of scholarships and staffed by fully-trained scientists. India therefore was not a country in urgent need of scientific aid and the Director-General had preferred to concentrate on Jakarta and the Middle East.
(112) The Delhi Office had not been abolished: a senior member of the Department was remaining there to carry out liaison work and possibly organize symposia and series of lectures.

(113) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) was confused. The delegate of India had first referred to a small adjustment, namely one P-5 post. Then $60,000 had been mentioned and finally $120,000 On the other hand, a whole new field (that of astronomy) had been incorporated into a project "at no cost". Mr. Spilhaus was beginning to doubt the validity of the budget document.

(114) Mr. PRASAD (India) was also confused after the explanations of the Director of the Natural Sciences Department. He thanked the delegate of the United Kingdom for his interpretation of the reduction of the office as a tribute to India, but did not find a word of that in the reasons given for that reduction in paragraph 145. The net result of the various changes, as stated in paragraph 192, was the decrease of one P-5 post. Did that amount to $120,000?
(115) If India had developed scientifically, there was all the more reason for maintaining the office at its present level. The delegate of India did not think that the discussion could be reopened again in that manner.

(116) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought it inaccurate to say that the only cut in the Delhi Office was the suppression of a grade P-5 post. In abolishing that post, expenditure on accommodation, travel and the salaries of local staff were also reduced. It was unnecessary to give scientific aid to India, a country where science was already highly developed. If the Commission decided that it was the most advanced countries that needed Unesco's scientific co-operation, offices would have to be set up in the United States of America and Western Europe.
(117) If the Delhi Office were retained at full strength, with no increase in the general budget for the project, the other science co-operation offices would have to revert to their 1952-53 level.

(118) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) recalled the vote passed by a big majority in favour of retaining the Delhi Office. The Commission should not go back on that vote before receiving the report of the Advisory Committee and examining it at leisure. It was unwise to come to a decision in a few minutes near midnight, on the fate of scientific co-operation in a country like India.

(119) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the parliamentary shuttle system was not in use at Unesco's General Conference, moreover, the vote in question being based on erroneous information could not be counted as valid.

(120) With the above reservations regarding the question of the auxiliary office in Delhi, paragraphs 172-175 relating to science co-operation offices in Asia were approved without discussion.

(121) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) referred to the Indian delegation's proposal (document 8C/DR/89), which had been accepted on the basis of erroneous figures. In deferring that question until all the detailed figures were before the meeting, the

$40,000 saved in connexion with paragraphs 138 and 139 should be taken into account.

(122) The Secretariat should not be allowed to dictate to the Commission when obliging it to go back upon its vote. When the Secretariat was favourable to a project, it was disposed to make all necessary alterations, but in the case under discussion an incorrect figure had been given, which showed that the Secretariat did not want India to gain its point.

(123) The CHAIRMAN recalled the Commission's previous decision when voting the provisional budget for the Natural Sciences Department. He urged delegates not to go back on their offer with regard to the Delhi Office before they knew the exact figures:

(a) of the budgetary implications of the Delhi Office;

(b) of the total saving effected in the provisional budget of the Natural Sciences Department.

(124) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) apologized again for his mistake. The late hour no doubt explained his own lapse and certain exaggerated imputations ascribed to him by the Liberian delegate. He regretted his mistake, but to say that it was a calculated manoeuvre in order to defeat a delegation's proposal was an undeserved insult.

(125) Mr. PRASAD (India) requested the Secretariat to provide the figures for maintenance of the Delhi Office at its reduced level, so that the additional expense involved in keeping it at its present level could be estimated

(126) Mr. U-TSUN-CHEN (China) considered that, if the vote on the Delhi Office was invalid, the Commission should disregard it.

(127) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Liberian delegate wished to make for entry in the records a statement on his previous remarks about the Secretariat, to indicate that he agreed with the latter.

(128) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) was sorry he could not then make the statement required of him.

(129) At the request of the delegate of the United Kingdom, the meeting was adjourned just after midnight.

# TWENTIETH MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma)

**STATEMENT BY THE LIBERIAN DELEGATE**

(1) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) referred to a discussion between himself and the representative of the Secretariat at the previous meeting. He had not intended to question the integrity of the Secretariat and in view of the explanation which had been given he was prepared to withdraw his statement.

**ITEM 8.4.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: SOCIAL SCIENCES** (continued)

Paragraphs 124-130

(2) Approved.

Direct aid to Member States in the organization of social science teaching (paragraphs 131-134)

(3) Mr. SANCHEZ REULET (Organization of American States) expressed his satisfaction at the work Unesco was doing to study the position with regard to social science teaching in Latin American universities, he added that OAS was prepared to co-operate in the work by furnishing the services of its own staff and making an appropriation for the purpose in its budget for 1955 and 1956.

Technical aid to Member States (paragraphs 135-139). Resolution 3.34

(4) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that a large sum had been allocated to the project, but not enough information was given on how it would be spent. There were very few highly qualified social scientists available and since, as had been pointed out, social science activities were fairly new to Unesco's programme, it was important not to advance too far without adequate personnel. He asked if the Director of the Department could indicate whether there was sufficient talent available to justify expenditure at the rate of $50,000 in each of the coming two years.

(5) Mr. VITO (Italy) asked whether some of the technical aid budget recommended in resolution 3.34 could be used to assist the establishment of social science teaching institutes, to help in developing research on the social implications of

mass communication. He was not concerned with the technical aspects, but with the kind of research carried out by the Institute of Public Opinion, the BBC Listener Research in the United Kingdom and the Society of Authors in Italy. In the past there had been no attempt to deal with the problem at university level, but if any such initiative were taken by Unesco, the University of Milan would be glad to co-operate.

(6) Mr. BRANDAO CAVALCANTI (Brazil) dwelt on the stimulus Unesco's aid might give to the teaching of the social sciences, which was still in its early days.
(7) Technical aid would be particularly valuable in the formation of research centres, whether teams of students or private institutions.

(8) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) said that his country had made a request for help with a view to founding an Institute of Social Sciences in the Lebanese University The Institute, which would be founded under the joint auspices of the Lebanese, American and French universities, would be widely open to students and highly international. Mgr Maroun assured the Commission that the preparatory work, which had been done on the basis of thorough enquiries carried out over several years by the Beirut Centre for Social Research, was already finished.

(9) Mr. PRATT (Australia) said that the general opinion at the regional conference on teaching of social science in Asia had been that the best results from a limited budget would be achieved by sending social scientists out of the underdeveloped countries for training rather than sending missions into those countries. The Australian delegation supported the resolution, with the proviso that two-way action should be envisaged, and that missions should not be contemplated unless they had been requested.

(10) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) supported the resolution but agreed with the point made by the delegate of Australia. He was particularly interested in paragraph 138, since in his country teaching would have to be given in schools before it could start in universities. With regard to the delegate of Lebanon's statement, the request he had made was a special one and Unesco should grant it.
(11) To sum up, Ceylon would be glad to take advantage of a project for training social scientists; and teaching within the countries should be given first in teacher training colleges, then in secondary schools and lastly in the universities.

(12) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences), replying to the delegate of the United Kingdom, said that, far from having too large a budget, the programme had had to be limited through lack of funds. In the previous year, one mission had been proposed, but twenty-three had been requested from Member States. It had been possible, with the Executive Board's help in making transfers from other parts of the budget, to send four missions (to Costa Rica, Guatemala, Pakistan and Greece), but there were still 19 requests outstanding. Moreover, the project was included on the general ground that when the 1955-56 programme was being planned the Secretariat had been instructed that more attention was to be given to direct aid to Member States. Unesco would be helping Member States not only by advisory missions but also by assistance with teaching aids and by grants for fellowships. (See Exchange of Persons Programme, paragraph 49)
(13) The Italian delegate had suggested certain activities which, Mrs. Myrdal said, might be among the requests from Member States. Selection among requests received would be necessary, but difficult with a limited budget, but suggestions from delegates would be borne in mind at the appropriate time.
(14) With regard to paragraph 138, the Department's share in fellowships under the Exchange of Persons Service was at present concentrated on two fields, the one, at present under discussion, of promoting social science teaching and the other on the social impact of industrialization. The fellowships and mission schemes were planned in conjunction, so that students trained abroad would be able to take over from the foreign experts at the end of their term of work.
(15) The Director-General would shortly be sending a circular letter inviting requests from Member States, but funds were already inadequate for projects which had been submitted with fully detailed plans. Those included a social science institute in Lebanon, social science teaching in Syrian universities and Iraqi secondary schools, the teaching of statistics in Iran, an institute of economics and sociology in Guatemala, and a regional post-graduate institute of economics in Central America.
(16) Thus the project represented a modest start to meet specific needs which had been strongly voiced by Member States.

(17) Mr. SEDES (France) admitted that it was a good thing for students from certain countries to go abroad to foreign universities better organized than their own, but he thought it was equally necessary to arrange courses in the social sciences in universities that lacked them.
(18) It should not be forgotten that social science courses were normally accompanied, and should always be accompanied, by research, and that such research provided the countries in which it was carried out with a considerable body of data likely to help them in understanding their own needs. It was for Unesco to take the lead in organizing social science courses and, their indispensable corollary, research.

(19) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) regretted that the social sciences had not yet been brought within the aegis of the United Nations, since it would be a fine task for Unesco to encourage the study of those sciences, particularly in the underdeveloped countries. She considered that, if Unesco could enlist the aid of Member States and obtain an increase in its revenue, it could carry out that very important work more energetically and on a more lavish scale.

(20) Mr. SIDDIQI (Pakistan) was keenly interested in the activities proposed under resolution 3.34.

A scheme was being worked out in his country for setting up a faculty of social sciences, to include the study of international relations, political science, economics, geography and other related subjects, and the assistance envisaged under the resolution would be most helpful. In his opinion teaching should start at university level, in order to provide personnel equipped to introduce the subjects in secondary schools and training colleges.

(21) Mr. SUNDARAM (India) was sympathetic towards the resolution but disagreed with the argument of the United Kingdom delegate. The very fact that social sciences were less developed than other activities showed that unlimited sums could be used for teaching and training in that field. As he had stated at a previous meeting, the development of the social sciences was essential to the promotion of the attitude to peace which was one of the fundamental ideas of Unesco.

(22) Mr. WALKER LINARES (Chile) said that his delegation fully supported resolution 3.34, although it considered that it would be essential to include instruction about social legislation in the teaching of the social sciences; Unesco might be able to carry out that work in collaboration with ILO

(23) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences), replying to the delegate of Chile, said that, although social legislation was the concern of the International Labour Organization, Unesco was the only agency in the United Nations family dealing with the teaching of social sciences and therefore also with the teaching of law. Many requests had been received for assistance in that field, and there would no doubt be many more if the proposed programme were approved.
(24) With regard to the resolution proposed by the delegation of India (DR/21), asking for assistance in connexion with the School of International Relations at Delhi, the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had recommended that requests of that nature should be dealt with under resolution 3.34 as aid to Member States.

(25) Mr. RAADI (Iran) approved the substance of the resolution, as did most of the delegations.
(26) Iran was one of a group of countries that had experts who, without perhaps being world authorities, could start off the teaching of the social sciences in their own countries. But, lacking proper organization, appropriate help and often the necessary documentation, those experts had to turn to other subjects. Whatever steps they might take towards organizing social science teaching on systematic lines should be supported with all Unesco's authority.

(27) Mr. AWAD (Egypt) supported the project in all its aspects, and mentioned particularly the training of teachers and the teaching of social sciences at university and post-graduate levels. In his view, however, the States concerned should contribute to the cost of projects which affected a limited area.

(28) Mr. DIAZ SAMAYOA (Guatemala) thought that, although the work undertaken by the Department of Social Sciences was worthy of high praise, efforts should be made to leave the greatest possible development of the subjects in question at university level. His delegation therefore thought that Member States should be recommended: (1) to set up, in their universities, special institutes for study and research in the social sciences; (2) to include certain social science subjects in their respective curricula, taking particular account of their influence on the development of man's mind, (3) to increase the funds already allocated to such work.

(29) Mr. BERGSTRAESSER (German Federal Republic) supported the proposals of the delegates of Guatemala and France. A small budget could be used to the greatest advantage by careful cultivation of research and teaching at university level, thus helping underdeveloped countries to train their own staff with the least delay. He proposed - either for inclusion in the resolution, or as a general directive that priority should be given to training of people who would be able to train social science teachers in their own countries.

(30) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the views of the German delegate would be kept in mind.
(31) In reply to the delegate of Egypt, in general the same rules applied as for technical assistance. A round figure of $12,000 per annum was provided for each mission, the total sum thus allowing for four missions in each of the years 1955 and 1956. If, as sometimes occurred, a country needed a mission for more than one year, the number of countries would have to be reduced.

(32) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on resolution 3.34, amended by the deletion of the word "technical".

(33) The resolution was adopted unanimously.

(34) The Commission then voted on project 3.3 as a whole, comprising resolutions 3.31, 3.32, 3.33, and 3.34.

(35) The project was approved unanimously.

Projects 3.4-3.7

(36) Mr. CABOUAT (Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Advisory Committee had tried in its recommendations to select from the many priority fields those most deserving of special attention. Projects 3.5 and 3.6 belonged to that category.
(37) On the other hand, it had had to eliminate - although, of course, only temporarily - projects whose execution seemed of secondary importance, given the available credits. That applied to project 3.4, and especially paragraph 152, relating to public acceptance or rejection of Unesco and United Nations principles.

(38) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) introduced the remainder of the chapter on Social Sciences. The last four projects differed in character from the previous ones, in that

they constituted a programme in which Unesco, on the basis of the machinery established in the previous section, was endeavouring to apply the resources of social science to the solution of certain vital social problems. The ones which had been selected were: human rights, international understanding, social development, and evaluation. They represented, in fact, an adaptation of Unesco's social sciences programme to the concern for practical action expressed by the Executive Board and by Member States. Unesco's means were modest compared with the vastness of the problems involved, and help would be needed from Member States. Unesco could provide the stimulus and strategic aid in marshalling the resources of the various countries, so that research could be carried out internationally instead of bilaterally.

(39) In that connexion she referred to Unesco's more ambitious programme of 1946 and quoted a recommendation stressing the vital need to tackle the problem of tensions. In spite of careful preparation in the Department of Social Sciences, Unesco had never been called upon to implement the recommendations adopted in 1952, 1953 and 1954 calling for research directly in tensions areas. Such a resolution was therefore not included in the present programme. A new stage had been reached, where the study of tensions was being replaced by positive action for the improvement of international understanding.

(40) Mrs. Myrdal described briefly project 3.4, which had two major fields of activity: mediation and public opinion. She read an extract from the report of the recent meeting of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation, welcoming the inclusion of paragraphs 148-160 in Unesco's programme. Public opinion on the ideals of Unesco and the United Nations represented a new venture for Unesco in its studies of the crucial problem of peace and international understanding. A cautious approach was envisaged in the initial stages, and the free assistance offered by several public opinion research institutes represented a valuable contribution. With their help Unesco would be able to discover in what directions it should intensify its work for the enlightenment of the public through education and mass communication.

(41) On the problems of human rights and social development close co-operation would be maintained with the United Nations and the international organizations concerned. At present neither the United Nations nor any of its constituent bodies had research departments in those fields and, while Unesco could not accept full responsibility, it would be possible by mobilizing social scientists in different countries to direct activities to problems of specific value to those bodies which had to make decisions on international problems. Thus the Department of Social Sciences was endeavouring to serve the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies and to promote wider public interest in them. There was full co-operation within the United Nations family, a good division of labour and no risk of overlapping.

(42) In the field of human rights (project 3.5) activities were devoted to ethnical groups, women's rights and migrants; racial problems were of particular importance. A certain amount of success had attended the campaign for enlightening the public on race problems. In 1955-56 a great part of the resources of the Department would be devoted to problems of social changes, under project 3.6, with special attention to those caused by rapid economic development. It was also proposed to establish a centre of applied social science for use as a task force in the service of Member States to help them in their planning of economic and social development. Finally, in project 3.7, a series of evaluation projects was envisaged to serve international action programmes and also to assist other departments of Unesco and the United Nations. Unesco's function would be to establish techniques which could later be included in the routine administration of such programmes as libraries, fundamental education, fellowships and seminars, in order to test their efficiency.

(43) The applied social sciences programme was concentrated on a few problems where an acute need was manifested. Since it was to be carried out in many regions and with the co-operation of local personnel, it would indirectly also lead to increased training and the promotion of internationalism.

(44) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) said that he had intended to submit a proposal on race relations combining the resolutions of the Indian and Czechoslovak delegations (DR/5 and DR/72) together with an addition on behalf of his own delegation (DR/105 rev.). In the circumstances, he proposed that the three resolutions should be discussed together, or that discussion should be deferred until he had prepared the combined resolution, or that the matter should be referred to a plenary meeting.

(45) Mr. RAO (representing the Director-General) proposed that the matter should be submitted to the General Committee for decision.

(46) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) asked that the motion put forward by India (document 8C/DR/5) be discussed immediately by the Commission, since she could see no reason for postponing its consideration.

(47) Mr. SUNDARAM (India) said that it would be appropriate to discuss the resolutions in the Commission because of their budgetary implications.

(48) At the suggestion of Mr. RAO, it was decided to postpone discussion until the night meeting.

(49) Mr. STEINIG (United Nations) proposed, in order to save time, to speak on a number of connected projects. Confirming a statement made by the Director of the Department of Social Sciences, ever closer co-operation was developing between that department and the corresponding divisions of the United Nations Secretariat, and the United Nations was relying more and more on the Department of Social Sciences for basic research into the many complex problems with which it had to deal.

(50) With regard to the integration of ethnic groups in Africa, the United Nations was interested in the project and looked forward to receiving systematic

information on its development and preliminary results.
(51) An important part of Unesco's work and one of particular interest to the United Nations was the section dealing with social sciences and the problems of social development, and social sciences and evaluation techniques; both subjects had a bearing on the programme of technical assistance to under-developed countries. From the history of the industrialized West it was known how high - considering the human factor - was the price paid for industrialization and how deep were the structural changes brought about by it in Western society. Unesco's research should help to avoid the repetition of that experience in lands to be newly developed. He hoped that special attention would be paid to research on methods to promote successful transition from traditional to modern society, including the problem of changing from rural to urban life.
(52) Other fields of common interest to the United Nations and Unesco were the project on the social problems of industrialization in South Asia and the proposed symposium in Latin America. In connexion with the latter, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America was planning a seminar in 1956 on economic development and he looked forward to co-operation and joint action by Unesco and ECLA.
(53) The United Nations would also welcome information on the relation of local self-government to community development, resulting from the studies proposed under paragraphs 201, 211 and 230. In that connexion, he referred to a resolution passed at the thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council and called attention to the shortage of information on local authorities for social and economic development observed by the United Nations in preparing a report on community welfare centres and community development projects; he was convinced that consultations between Unesco and the United Nations on the selection of areas for surveys would help both organizations in their work.
(54) Finally, in the important study of the social aspects of land reform, the United Nations, after consultation with Unesco, had welcomed co-operation between that Organization and the competent departments in the United Nations.

Project 3.5: The social sciences and problems of human rights and minorities

(55) Mr. SCOTT (United States of America), who said that he was a member of the United States Congress, claimed to represent a nation which had found that persistent and courageous facing of problems brought about substantial results.
(56) Freedom and non-discrimination were linked with the search for security and peace in the world, and non-discrimination as it was understood in the United States of America implied freedom to speak, think, meet together, write and publish.
(57) The section of Unesco's programme dealing with human rights and non-discrimination was important, and continued work was needed to improve conditions in many parts of the world. Much still remained to be done concerning the position of the negro in the United States of America. A recent study sponsored by Unesco had indicated that a difference still existed between the standing of the negro citizen and the white citizen, but that in almost every significant economic, political, educational and social aspect there had been rapid improvement.
(58) At the present time ten per cent of Americans were negroes, but negroes represented eleven per cent of industrial workers, and the high proportion in industry was an indication of the negro's progress, for he now commanded a wage four times higher than in 1940, while the rise for the average population was only two-and-a-half times. Some negroes were now landholders and wealthy business men, they worked in banks, public utilities, insurance companies and retail stores; and followed the professions of physicist, chemist, psychologist, doctor and metallurgist. They were a vital factor in local, State and national government, had been selected to city councils, State legislative bodies and to Congress. They also served as State and Federal judges and held important city, State and Federal government positions, including the post of Assistant Secretary of Labour.
(59) While in 1900 fifty-six per cent of the negro population was illiterate, in 1940 ninety per cent were literate. Nine out of ten attended school and at the present time 128,000 were at college. Negro professors served on the faculties of more than seventy United States colleges.
(60) A significant milestone in negro progress was the Supreme Court decision in May 1954 declaring segregation in public education to be a denial of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the United States Constitution. That declaration was a measure which was truly effective within the meaning of paragraph 167 of Unesco's programme on social sciences, and it illustrated the need for continued progress towards the elimination of discriminatory practices.
(61) In the United States of America, efforts would not cease until all discriminatory practices were eliminated, and his delegation supported the development of a constructive and effective programme for Unesco, to be implemented by Member States as well as by the Secretariat.

(62) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) congratulated the delegate of the United States of America on the cheering and most satisfactory state of affairs he had described; she added that Uruguay would give its support to any move for promoting the campaign against discrimination between human beings, because it believed that the only way of advancing the peace and unification of the world was to open the doors to everyone in the political, social, economic and cultural spheres.

(63) Mr. SUNDARAM (India) introduced a resolution which his Government had submitted in document 8C/DR/8, calling upon Unesco to initiate a world campaign against the evils of race discrimination, as an integral part of its programme. He had been inspired by the account of the progressive reduction of race discrimination in the United States of America, unfortunately, there were still areas in the world where it not only persisted but was being intensified.

(64) There could only be one opinion in Unesco on race discrimination, which was a disaster to humanity, and he submitted his resolution in the conviction that it would receive unanimous approval. No effort or expenditure could be too great for the implementation of the resolution, and Unesco, in impelling action by those who at present merely paid lip service to principles, would be the spokesman of world conscience.

(65) Mr. SEDES (France) gave the French delegation's support to the draft resolution submitted by India (document 8C/DR/8).
(66) In view of what other speakers had said regarding their own countries, he wished to remind the Commission that France had conferred the status of French citizens on all the inhabitants of its overseas territories. They thus enjoyed all the rights and liberties established in the Constitution.

(67) Mr. UMREIKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the Indian resolution and deplored the continuance of racial discrimination despite all efforts to combat it. No government which respected the principles of democracy could permit national persecution in any form, and all races, however small, must have equal legal and moral rights in governmental, social and cultural life. Before the 1917 revolution the Byelorussian SSR had had a low economic and cultural standard of life, with eighty per cent of the population illiterate. Since that date, conditions had improved until at the present time equal rights were enjoyed in every field, and illiteracy was no longer existent. Racial discrimination was one of the most serious threats to human dignity and he hoped that the resolution would receive unanimous approval.

(68) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) supported the Indian resolution but asked if the amendment proposed in document 8C/DR/105 (rev.) would be acceptable.

(69) Mr. SUNDARAM (India) had no objection to the revised and enlarged form of the resolution, but pointed out that his original resolution had been formulated to permit of immediate action by Unesco, since Unesco had not sufficient funds to deal with all aspects of discrimination simultaneously. He accordingly proposed the following addition at the end of the revised version: "beginning with an intensive study of racial discrimination in the next two years".

(70) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) accepted the proposed addition.

(71) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) supported the proposal and the amendment, but stressed that a campaign must be carefully planned and of a practical character, and not limited to propaganda. He welcomed the statement of the Uruguayan delegate on the political position of women.

(72) Mr. STEINBERGER (German Federal Republic) expressed whole-hearted supported for the resolution. His country had experienced a particularly evil form of discrimination which, although deliberately and falsely described as racial, had in fact been the organized murder of a minority. He supported the revised version as amended by the delegate of India.

(73) Mr. AFTALION (Argentina) said that his delegation strongly supported the Indian proposal for undertaking a campaign against racial discrimination, he also asked whether the other types of discrimination mentioned under project 3.5 should not be dealt with at the same time.

(74) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Board had warmly approved the proposed action for eliminating all forms of discrimination. It would also welcome the fact that a member of the United States Congress had come to Unesco to speak of his country's progress in the struggle for freedom and equality. She wished to place on record that the members of the Board considered the Supreme Court decision referred to by the United States delegate as one of the most significant landmarks in the march of humanity. It gave inspiration for further efforts in the prosecution of Unesco's programme for the elimination of discrimination in any form.
(75) In conclusion, the Executive Board had recommended the deletion of the word "racial" from the resolution DR/8.

(76) Mr. VITO (Italy) supported the Indian proposal as revised and amended, but urged that, whatever might be the meaning attached to the word "campaign", any activity undertaken should be scientifically planned. Propaganda and pamphlets alone served no useful purpose.

(77) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom that the approach to the problem of racial discrimination should be methodical, for it deserved very serious study. For that reason, the Indian motion should be most carefully examined. Nor should it be forgotten that there were other kinds of discrimination in the world, equally ugly, though they might be more subtle.

(78) Mr. FLORES AGUIRRE (Mexico) said that his country, with its long and honourable tradition of opposition to racial discrimination, naturally sympathized with the unanimous feeling in favour of the Indian motion, but he, too, thought that the proposed campaign should be soundly planned, in order to achieve practical and satisfactory results.

(79) Mr. BRANDAO CAVALCANTI (Brazil) supported, enthusiastically but not for sentimental reasons, the resolution submitted by the Indian delegation and broadened by the United States amendment.
(80) Brazil had shown long since that it was possible to reach a clear and satisfactory solution to the problem of discrimination in regard to race, sex, and even in the political field.
(81) He added that a law had just been passed in his country instituting penal measures to deal with infractions of the rules of non-discrimination prescribed by the Constitution.

(82) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) was not satisfied with the emphasis placed on racial discrimination in the resolution; a study of the documentation assembled by Unesco on inter-racial tensions showed the operative words to be "scientific study". Several delegates had questioned the use of the word "campaign", and to the South African delegation the proposal appeared to be a deviation from the scientific approach and liable to lead to action in the political field. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting.

(83) Mr. THA MYAT (Union of Burma) read out a paragraph which the Burmese delegation had proposed for addition to paragraph 174. The proposal had been circulated in document 8C/DR/96.

(84) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the plan of work in connexion with the original resolution 8C/DR/8, which it was hoped would apply to the amended resolution if adopted, was as follows:
(85) First, an information campaign through mass media at Unesco's disposal for which no additional budget would be required.
(86) Second, existing pamphlets, which had already had a wide distribution, would be translated into other languages. For that purpose an additional sum of $8,000 would be needed to be made available to National Commissions interested in such translations.
(87) Third, a larger campaign, prepared by social scientists and educationalists, to plan measures for eradicating discrimination through the schools, for which a budget of about $11,000 would be required.
(88) In order to prevent overlapping with the work of the United Nations Sub-Commission on Discrimination and Minorities, she asked if the Indian delegate would accept the following redrafting of his amendment to the revised version of the resolution:
"undertaking in 1955 studies especially on measures for eradication of racial prejudice".
Emphasis would thus be placed on positive measures rather than studies of actual cases of discrimination, which had a political implication.
(89) With regard to the addition to paragraph 174 submitted by the delegate of Burma, she gave an assurance that the Director-General would bear it in mind when executing the programme. A vote was not called for, however, since it concerned only the plan of work.
(90) The delegates of India and the United States of America accepted the redrafting suggested by the Director of the Department of Social Sciences.

(91) The resolution was adopted, the South African delegate abstaining from voting.

(92) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) asked whether the additional budgetary allocation necessitated by the adoption of the resolution would have to be found from other parts of the budget.

(93) Mr. RAO (representing the Director-General) said that the Commission's duty was to approve a project on its merits. It was for the Director-General to discover how the necessary funds could be obtained.

(94) The budgetary implications of the resolution were unanimously approved (DR/8 and paragraphs 174-180)

Women's political rights and political education (paragraphs 181-183)

(95) Miss RAILEY (Liberia) said that the pattern prevailing in West Africa could well fit into the project for the integration of ethnic groups. The impact of industrialization and urbanization on the tribal units resulted in a social evolution which would be of interest to the Department of Social Sciences. The recommendations of the Abidjan Conference and the Stanleyville Report should be implemented, and the Liberian delegation urged that Unesco should give them due attention.
(96) With regard to women's political rights, the Liberian delegation supported whole-heartedly the project in paragraphs 181-183, but hoped that Africa would one day have the benfit of a similar project. It had taken the women of Liberia almost a century to gain their rights, and they had only been granted the vote in 1944. At the present time women held important governmental positions and had an equal participation with men in social and political affairs. There was still, however, considerable need for improvement.

(97) Mrs. LEGARDA (Philippines) said that the project under discussion was of great interest to the women of the Philippine Republic. The Pan-Pacific Women's Association, of which she was President, was preparing an international conference of women in the Pacific area in 1958 with financial support from Unesco. One of the items discussed would be the results of the proposed pilot project in Asia. As representative of half a million women in a country where women held many important positions, she looked forward to the results of the pilot project, which would be of great value in deciding the best methods of improving women's participation in local, civic and political affairs.
(98) In conclusion, she was proud to have a fellow countrywoman on the Executive Board of Unesco, and pointed out that, with the inclusion of two women among the candidates for the Executive Board, Unesco at its eighth session of the General Conference had an opportunity for giving a lead in the elimination of discrimination between the sexes.

(99) Mr. SEDES (France) regretted that there had been no discussion of paragraphs 174-179 before the vote was taken on the budgetary implications.
(100) After apologizing for having to go back to the question, he expressed his astonishment that the problem of the integration of African ethnic groups into a more advanced culture was dealt with in the section on race relations, which was scarcely the proper place for it.

(101) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences), referring to the observations of the delegates of France and Liberia, said that the activities in question could equally well have been included under paragraph 206, and it was only as a matter of presentation that they had been included

separately. T..e projects under paragraph 175 had been started in 1953-54 under Studies on Discrimination. In future work, however, the studies of ethnic groups would have to be considered together with those in paragraph 206.

(102) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), referring to paragraph 176, said that it would be preferable to study the impact of Western culture and economy on the African ethnic group as a whole, rather than the impact of one African group upon another. Whether or not one group was Westernized, the impact came from outside and not from within

(103) A vote was taken on paragraphs 181-183 and they were approved unanimously.

The meeting rose at 1 p. m.

# TWENTY - FIRST MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma)
*later:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: NATURAL SCIENCES (continued)**

Resolution 2.41 (paragraph 145) (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to resume consideration of paragraph 145, which had been discussed at the meeting before the last.

(2) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought he could end the previous day's misunderstanding by clarifying the situation.
(3) He drew delegates' attention to document 8C/DIV/120, which showed a difference of $59,992 between the 1953-54 appropriations for the Science Co-operation Office in New Delhi and the 1955-56 estimates. That figure was very close to the $60,000 on which the vote had been taken.
(4) After briefly recalling the facts, Mr. Maheu said that, as the result of a remark by one of his colleagues on the interpretation which the Indian delegate might have given to the word "present" when asking for the post to be maintained at its present level, he had thought he had made a mistake in quoting the figure of $60,000. He had believed that the Indian delegate had been asking on behalf of the Delhi Office, not the present (1954) appropriation of $95,580 for two years, but those now proposed for 1955-56, i.e. something like $150,000 for the two years. If that had been so, the difference compared with the Director-General's estimate would have been, not $60,000, but around $120,000. He had thought it necessary to inform delegates accordingly.
(5) If the Indian delegation simply wished the Office to be maintained at the 1953-54 level, the sum voted upon was correct, and there was no need to go back on that vote.

(6) The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Maheu for his explanation and informed him that, at the morning meeting, the delegate of Liberia had withdrawn his statement of the previous night. He thought that the Commission could consider the question of the Indian Office settled.

(7) Mr. HOPE (United States of America) asked whether the project had been re-established at the level of the 1953-54 budget, pointing out that if that were so, the amount of money provided would be inadequate for the successful operation of the Office. He had understood that an additional sum of $150,000 over and above the amount provided for in the 1953-54 budget would be required for its successful operation.

(8) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) confirmed that, with $60,000 in addition to the appropriations suggested by the Director-General, the Delhi Office could be maintained at the present level (1953-54).
(9) He recalled that the abolition of the Office had been suggested in order that larger sums might be allocated to the three other science co-operation offices. Though wishing to increase the efficiency of the offices, the Director General and the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences had not felt able to ask for larger appropriations for all of them, and had thought that the best solution would be to close the Office in the most highly developed region.
(10) Mr. Maheu said that the situation resulting from the decisions taken was as follows: three science co-operation offices would receive considerably larger appropriations, while the fourth, the Delhi Office, would be maintained at its present level with the help of the $60,000 to be added to the Director-General's budget estimate.

(11) Mr. HOPE (United States of America) was satisfied with the explanation but not satisfied that the Commission was acting in accordance with the plan for remodelling the programme. He thought that the line taken by the Commission was contrary to the policy of concentrating on fewer projects in

order to be able to give them adequate help.

(12) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) asked whether it was intended to abolish the Science Co-operation Office for Latin America, which had its headquarters in Montevideo.

(13) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the Montevideo Office appeared in the programme with an increased appropriation and that no change was contemplated in regard to it.

(14) Paragraphs 176-184 were approved.

(As the Commission had next to examine the chapter on Cultural Activities, the meeting was suspended for 5 minutes. Mr. Bourgeois took the Chair.)

(15) The CHAIRMAN consulted delegates on the procedure to be adopted to shorten meetings and enable the Commission to complete its examination of the programme within the desired time.

(16) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) proposed that both the number and length of speeches should be limited.
(17) The delegate of Chile suggested that speeches be limited to three minutes while the delegate of Poland proposed a limit of three to five minutes.

(18) Mr. BRICHET (France) thought it would be unfortunate to limit the discussion when questions of substance and not of procedure were under consideration. In his opinion, it would be wise, before taking Draconian measures, to see how delegations used the freedom of speech allowed to them on the Cultural Activities chapter.
(19) The French delegate asked that the maximum length of speeches should not be less than five minutes, adding that his delegation was ready to attend as many evening meetings as might be necessary for a full exchange of views.

(20) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) thought that the Chairman should be left to limit the number and length of speeches as he thought necessary.

(21) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) proposed that the length of speeches should be limited to three minutes unless special permission were given for an extension of that time and that there should be no limitation on the number of speakers.

(22) By 35 votes to 6 it was decided to limit speeches to three minutes.

(23) The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission had to examine a considerable number of draft resolutions, together with the observations made on them by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. The Executive Board had not studied all the drafts as some of them had arrived too late.
(24) As the Commission's chief responsibility was to vote on the proposed resolutions in the programme and draw up a work plan in conformity with them, the Chairman thought it would be wise not to examine draft resolutions bearing reference numbers above DR/61, but to refer them to the Secretariat with a request that they be given as much attention as possible.

(25) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) submitted a proposal to that effect, which was seconded by the delegate of New Zealand and adopted by 31 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

(26) Mr. LALGIER (France) said that, while his delegation approved the decision to limit speeches on the different items in the programme to three minutes, it thought that greater freedom should be left to members of the Commission in the general discussion at the beginning of each chapter. He thought it would be difficult for delegations to expound their views in three minutes.

(27) It was decided that the limit on the length of speeches should not apply to the general discussion.

### ITEM 8.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

(28) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the chapter on Cultural Activities, like the other chapters in the programme, was divided into two sections, the first of which dealt with general, and the second with special, activities.
(29) The activities covered by the first section, designed to develop cultural co-operation between Member States, were planned as a preparation and backing for the work of the second section, and to furnish guidance thereon. By way of example, Mr Thomas mentioned the work undertaken by Unesco to help Member States to develop their libraries, and the exchange of information between museums, which took practical form in the publication of Museum.
(30) The Director of the Department of Cultural Activities emphasized how important the co-operation of international non-governmental organizations was to Unesco's cultural activities. Those organizations offered all specialists in cultural activities an opportunity for contacts and exchanges with other countries. They supported and guided the work of the Secretariat and were the best guarantee of its success. Unesco handed over to reliable non-governmental organizations of that sort certain specialized activities which would call for large funds and staff if the Organization undertook them itself. Finally, in many cases where value judgments were needed, those organizations, which were non-political and consisted of competent people, saved Unesco from taking decisions that might compromise it or cause difficulties.
(31) The Secretariat did not contemplate increasing subventions to the associations; it tended more and more to replace subventions by contracts, in accordance with the directives issued by the General Conference and the Executive Board.
(32) The second section of the chapter comprised three main headings. Under the first, "Preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind", the Secretariat sought to give direct, practical aid to Member States, for instance, by sending them missions of experts. Under the second heading, "Humanistic studies in culture and education", the Secretariat,

convinced that education and cultural activities should not be kept in separate watertight compartments, tried to develop co-operation between teachers and specialists in cultural activities and to bring libraries and museums increasingly into the work of schools. Under the third heading, "Culture and international understanding", were listed thirteen activities for the promotion of international understanding. Mr. Thomas pointed out that one of the best ways of teaching people to know and understand each other was to encourage contacts between different cultures.

(33) The programme also provided for the development of other activities: the use of modern methods of reproducing works of art, translation of representative works of different cultures, and a history of the cultural and scientific development of mankind.

(34) Mr. Thomas explained that the Secretariat, in what might seem an arbitrary classification of activities under three headings, had aimed at clarity and simplicity. The field covered by cultural activities was enormous, reaching on one side to the highest spheres of thought, research and artistic creation and, on the other, to the dissemination among the masses of the products of that thought, knowledge and creation. In drawing up the programme, the main concern had been for greater concentration and better co-ordination of cultural activities with those of other departments.

(35) Mr. Thomas added that the extreme diversity of cultural life should not be forgotten and that Unesco's work in that field had to take into account factors even more complex than those involved in education, science or mass communication, and to be organized with even greater caution and flexibility.

(36) Mr. UNGARETTI (Italy) congratulated Mr. Thomas on the work accomplished by his Department.

(37) He asked that no effort should be spared to spread culture by fundamental education and thus encouraging higher standards in the arts and literature. But he also urged that there should be no pause in the encouragement given to pure research, the source from which culture drew fresh strength.

(38) The Italian delegate was pleased to learn of the proposed collaboration between the Departments of Cultural Activities and Education, especially with regard to the production of reading material for new literates. In that connexion he drew attention to the difficulty of adapting a classic and advocated the publication of selected, annotated excerpts from good authors.

(39) Recalling that the International Association of the Visual Arts had just adopted its Constitution and that the International Conference of Artists had decided that an International Council of Arts and Letters should next be set up, the Italian delegate asked the Department of Cultural Activities to arrange for a study of the question. The International Council of Arts and Letters would ensure that contemporary works of art circulated more easily; it could also bring knowledge and experience to bear in the field of copyright, give general guidance in making works of literature known by broadcasting and study means of reforming the teaching of the arts and literature in the schools. As there was no longer anything to prevent the founding of the Council, consideration should be given to it without delay.

(40) Mr. Ungaretti also asked for an increase in the subvention to the International Association of the Visual Arts, which would be responsible, among other tasks, for considering how copyright should be applied to works of visual art, and which might be commissioned to reform the curricula of fine art schools.

(41) In conclusion, he hoped that a representative of the cinema would be asked to sit on the International Council of Arts and Letters when it was established.

(42) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) said that his Government attached great importance to cultural activities, in which field Ceylon as well as other Asian countries could play an important part.

(43) He offered, on behalf of his Government, to lend experts on archaeological and historical sites to other countries which might like to benefit from the experience gained by work in Ceylon, and asked the Director of the Department of Cultural Activities to note that offer.

(44) The delegation of Ceylon was particularly interested in resolution 4.23, (paragraphs 145-147), but wondered whether the provision made would meet the requirements of Member States. While not suggesting an increase, he would ask that the needs of Asian countries be given greater attention and emphasis when planning the programme for 1957-58

(45) Mr. RIVET (France) was pleased at the amount of the Cultural Activities budget allocated to subventions to international non-governmental organizations.

(46) His delegation believed that those organizations provided an effective and economical means of increasing international co-operation and enlisting the support of intellectual circles, which had shown a tendency to ignore Unesco.
It was therefore advisable to assist the non-governmental organizations by subventions, however small, and to neglect no means of developing them and securing better co-ordination among them.

(47) Mr. Rivet endorsed the Norwegian delegate's request for an increase in the subvention to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies.

(48) Like the Italian delegate, he wished to see the International Council of Arts and Letters brought into existence.

(49) The French delegation was in favour of the project for the translation of representative works of different cultures, but in his opinion the National Commissions should be more closely associated with it.

(50) Mr. Rivet emphasized the importance of museums in education; he thought that all Member States should take steps to make it easier for everyone to visit museums, particularly by opening them in the evening without raising the admission charge.

(51) With regard to the history of the scientific and cultural development of mankind, the French delegate recalled that the idea of such a publication

had been brought up by the French delegation at the Beirut Conference. He was surprised to see, however, that the material collected to date was a meagre basis for a definitive work. Moreover, he had noticed that several publishing houses had announced the publication of similar works.
(52) Mr. Rivet hoped that the States recently admitted to Unesco would be asked to contribute to the history of the scientific and cultural development of mankind and that there would be genuine international collaboration on the subject.

(53) Mr. HOPE (United States of America) indicated that the United States delegation was deeply interested in cultural activities and would support in a general way the programme as outlined. He suggested that the General Conference should invite representatives of the arts, such as composers, actors and painters, to be present at the next General Conference. Concerts and exhibitions by internationally known artists during the session of a General Conference would do much towards teaching foreign culture. He had just read the report received from Paris on the possibilities of teaching international understanding. In his opinion, the best opportunity to achieve that international understanding was through cultural activities. The Director-General might be requested to take that into account when considering his future programmes.
(54) Unesco could contribute through its cultural activities to the technical assistance programme by exchanging exhibitions of art between East and West.

(55) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the development of cultural collaboration was very important and helped to ensure peace.
(56) The Government of the Soviet Union was interested in improving cultural relations between the peoples, and his delegation therefore supported that item in the programme.
(57) The USSR was anxious to take an active part in preparing the cultural and scientific history of mankind. It should be mentioned that, in the Soviet Union, five million people devoted their leisure time to musical activities, ballet, the visual arts, and so on, and their assistance in such work would be of considerable value.
(58) He considered that Unesco should concentrate on: (1) helping underdeveloped countries, (2) making the masterpieces of art better known, by means of reproductions, recordings and films, in that connexion the Soviet delegation was convinced that Soviet music and films would win a high place at international exhibitions; (3) translating representative works of all countries in accordance with resolution 4.44.

(59) Mr. THA MYAT (Union of Burma) congratulated the Director-General on the lucid presentation of the programme. In his opinion the two sections had been integrated in a workable form.
(60) He thought that the highest priority should be given to work which would foster international urderstanding and for that reason he would like to emphasize the importance to Unesco of the co-operation between specialists in Section I.
(61) He welcomed the proposals for technical aid to Member States and the idea of presenting African and Asian culture to the Western world. He considered that international understanding could be obtained through cultural activities as easily as through education and science.
(62) He was disappointed with the small funds which had been made available for the programme activities. Cultural institutes were as important as fundamental education centres for the promotion of international understanding.
(63) He pointed out that in the fundamental education centre in Burma a national museum, national library and national art gallery had been set up. In those centres the modern cultures of various linguistic areas of South East Asia and Burma were presented for comparative study. Up to the present funds had not been sufficient to cover that work. The preser' programme was partly a corrective. He asked the Secretariat to consider an equitable adjustment for future programmes.

(64) Mr. IBANEZ-GOMEZ (Chile) said that cultural activities were of great importance to Latin America, and especially to his country. His delegation was pleased to see the preferential treatment given to those activities in the programme, and hoped the appropriations for them would not be reduced, even in the smallest degree.
(65) He was glad that work had started on the translation of works by Latin American authors, and paid tribute to Unesco's efforts to preserve the cultural, artistic and archaeological heritage of mankind.
(66) He thought that greater assistance should be given to non-governmental organizations such as the International Theatre Institute, the International Union of Architects, the Association of Universities, etc.
(67) Exhibitions should be developed and obstacles to the free flow of books removed: the Organization should also induce Member States to ratify the Copyright Convention, signed in Geneva in 1952.
(68) In conclusion, he proposed that a meeting of outstanding personalities in the fields of science, literature, the visual arts and cultural activities, should be held in New Delhi during the ninth session of the General Conference; such a meeting would mark a considerable advance in the promotion of all those branches of activity.

(69) Miss NEFFA (Lebanon), commenting on the Cultural Activities chapter, said that it was commonly thought that the principal needs of Member States were the extension of education and the development of science teaching. But many countries reveal enormous shortcomings with regard to the dissemination of culture.
(70) It was desirable that Unesco should extend its collaboration to all peoples and not allow the European continent to monopolize cultural associations.
(71) She also criticized the common view of culture as a means rather than as an end and the tendency to use the cultural and artistic heritage of mankind as a tool.

Unesco should be congratulated on its efforts to safeguard and develop all cultures.

(72) Mr. WADIA (India) said that his delegation considered cultural activities closely linked with the peaceful future of the world. Extreme specialization was the tragedy of education. To counteract that tragedy it was necessary to broaden education by including humanistic studies. "Culture" was difficult to define but involved a keenness to know and understand other peoples and their views. The world was in urgent need of such understanding.
(73) Each country contributed something of value to human understanding. Humanism would serve as a check to science but the objectivity present in scientific studies would have to be applied in humanistic studies. To obtain that objectivity, national textbooks needed revising.
(74) He welcomed the international survey of classical studies and the use of radio and television for the diffusion of knowledge.
(75) The Eastern countries looked to Unesco to help them make up for lost time. The Indian Government was in a mood to ask for more assistance although a large amount was already being spent on cultural activities. He hoped that the Commission would be sympathetic if it asked for more.
(76) Referring to the suggestion by the United States delegate concerning the extension of invitations to artists to attend Unesco's General Conferences, he said that he would support that suggestion with pleasure. He himself had made a similar suggestion informally to the Director of the Department of Cultural Activities, who had doubted if enough money could be made available for that purpose. The speaker had not considered inviting a representative of each of the arts from each country, but rather that a careful selection should be made of representatives of all the arts from various countries. He hoped the Secretariat would bear the suggestion in mind

(77) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) congratulated Mr. Thomas on the work embodied in the Cultural Activities programme, which took account of all the suggestions made by Member States at the last session of the Conference.
(78) He drew the Commission's attention to the importance of that part of the programme and asked that it be given priority. In his opinion, Unesco's work could be fully effective only if due use were made of culture.
(79) The Turkish delegate hoped that intellectuals and creative artists in all Member States would do all they could to help in carrying out the programme of Cultural Activities.

(80) Mr. ASTRADA (Argentina) said that Unesco should harmonize the two fundamental aspects of its work: planned action in the technical field and concerted action to spread and foster basic principles relating to the spiritual side of the life of men and communities.
(81) His country was naturally pacific, by principle, conviction and sentiment; it therefore believed in peade through the spirit, by co-operation in creative endeavour. Unesco's fundamental task was to hasten the advent of a new humanism in an atmosphere of harmonious coexistence.
(82) In conformity with those ideas, the Argentine delegation firmly supported the items in the programme dealing with humanistic studies.

(83) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) considered that the Cultural Activities programme was well framed, and she wished to draw special attention to the popularizing of the visual arts and the development of museums. In that connexion, she requested support for draft resolution 8C/DR/46, submitted by Uruguay, which advocated the establishment of an international museum agency under the auspices of the municipality of Montevideo and asked Unesco's aid for that purpose.
(84) She proposed that the Bulletin for Libraries should neither be reduced in size nor altered in character.
(85) In conclusion, she pointed out how extremely important translations of ancient and modern works were for better understanding between the peoples.

(86) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) joined in emphasizing the work of the non-governmental organizations, which were keeping up the standards of value. The maintaining of those standards was of primary importance to Unesco in face of possible depreciation.
(87) He welcomed the words of the delegate of the USSR and his declaration of willingness to co-operate in cultural activities. The association of members of the Soviet Union had been missed and he thought that all would look forward to their co-operation in the future.
(88) Speaking for the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, he said that historians as well as the United Kingdom delegation would look forward to co-operation by the Soviet Union in its work.

(89) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) thought that cultural activities offered the greatest hope for securing the ideals of Unesco. For that reason the Pakistan Government was particularly interested in the programme of cultural activities.
(90) The promotion of cultural activities in each Member State was of primary importance in enriching the life of the citizen. The lack of proper understanding of different cultures was at the root of international misunderstanding. It was necessary to spare no effort in making known to each country the cultures of other countries. He welcomed the comment by the delegate of Argentina that all cultures should live together. Cultural contacts and international co-operation in the field of culture would promote a wider feeling of identity of interests among countries.
(91) His delegation warmly supported the projects which aimed at promoting libraries, museums, translation of the classics, international intellectual co-operation, and the provision of reading material for literates.
(92) He was also interested in the United States proposal and hoped that the Secretariat would find a means of securing its objective.
(93) He suggested that a Secretariat official, an expert in cultural activities, should be appointed and an office set up in Pakistan for the supervision of Unesco work in the field of cultural activities.

The Pakistan Government would offer facilities for such an office, such as a building, equipment and local staff. He would make no specific proposal on the subject at the present stage but would ask the Secretariat to consider his suggestion at its discretion.

(94) Mr. BERGSTRAESSER (German Federal Republic) expressed the gratitude of his delegation to Mr. Thomas for the preparation of the document under discussion, which showed a remarkable degree of unity.
(95) The German delegation would like to emphasize the second and third of the groups of activities proposed by Mr. Thomas and stressed their interconnexion. It was important to secure a solid formation of minds through culture and education by implementing a growth of respect of one nation for another. Exchanges of culture would eventually lead every citizen to realize that mankind had a common basis.
(96) The German delegation was particularly interested in maintaining or increasing the funds for projects 4.31, 4.42 and 4.44, and welcomed the increase for purposes of exchanging culture. He concluded by expressing the hope that the Commission would be united in preserving or increasing the funds for furthering humanistic studies.

(97) Mrs. LEGARDA (Philippines) appreciated the programme prepared by the Director of the Department of Cultural Activities.
(98) She heartily seconded the proposals of the delegates of the United States of America, Pakistan and Argentina concerning cultural exchanges.
(99) She emphasized the value of culture in the education of the young and in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. If the young were kept fully occupied and their minds kept constructively busy, they would keep out of trouble. In her opinion the Uruguayan scheme for teaching all the arts to the young was one which could be usefully followed in other countries.
(100) Secondly, she emphasized that budget limitations prevented more being done in the field of cultural activity. She felt that much could be achieved if the world could be weaned away from the trend of sordid materialism and imbued with a deeper sense of spiritual values.

(101) Mr. NAVRATIL (Czechoslovakia) wished to make two comments.
(102) On behalf of his delegation, he recognized the important place that should be given to the cultural activities programme, on condition that, when carrying it out, the Organization's essential aims (i.e. international understanding and the development of national cultures) were kept in view, and that the Organization's universality was fully maintained.
(103) He also hoped that Unesco's departments would endeavour to collaborate with his country, which had had some experience of the methods of cultural activity proposed in the programme.

(104) Mr. SANCHEZ REULET (Organization of American States) said that there were four items in the Cultural Activities programme which were of particular interest to the States he represented: (1) resolution 4.33, which authorized the planning and production of reading material designed for new literates; (2) the exchange of publications; (3) the mobile microfilming unit, which should be given top priority, and (4) the translation of representative works of Latin America. He considered those activities essential to progress in the American States.

(105) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) had been struck by the unanimity of views expressed in the general discussion, which was most encouraging to the Secretariat.
(106) He thanked the Organization of American States for its offer of collaboration, which the Secretariat would most certainly note. He added that close co-operation had already been established between Unesco and that Organization, and had been strengthened by experience on many occasions.

Paragraphs 1 26

(107) Approved.

Project 4.11: Co-operation with international cultural organizations

Resolutions 4.111 and 4.112

(108) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) remarked that some of the associations belonging to the various councils were members of two or more of them. He wished to know whether the position was not anomalous and whether the associations concerned received a subvention through each of the councils to which they belonged.

(109) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that the principle of multiple affiliation according to the diverse interests of the associations was recognized and legitimate. If an international organization received two subventions by virtue of its membership of two councils, that was not inadvertent, each of the two subventions was intended for different work.

(110) Paragraphs 30 and 31 were approved.

(111) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget for increasing the proposed subvention to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies.

(112) Mr. SYME (Representative of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies) was grateful for the opportunity to address the Commission.
(113) The Commission would find in document 3C/ADM/20 an account of the different federations within the Council. In addition, he expected a report on the work of the Council for the last three years to arrive from Paris. That report would be available to all delegates.
(114) Although the Council received money from Unesco, it was neither controlled nor oppressed by

Unesco. The twelve member organizations of the Council were not oppressed either and worked freely in co-operation.
(115) The money received from Unesco was not used for administrative purposes but for widening the geographical distribution of its member organizations.

(116) In answer to a question from the delegate of Canada as to the resources of the Council outside the Unesco subvention, Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that the member organizations paid a percentage of their income to the Council.
(117) When the organization was founded in 1949, it took up projects formerly undertaken by governments and suspended during the war. As the Council became better known requests were received from all parts of the world and it had been faced with a dilemma. It had to decide whether to drop old projects or reduce subventions to projects. It had chosen to reduce subventions, which was regrettable as it meant that international co-operation was slowed down.
(118) He proposed that the subvention to the Council should be increased by $10,000 per annum in the interests of concentration.

(119) Mr. BRICHET (France) seconded the Norwegian delegate's proposal.
(120) The French delegation, realizing the possible effect of the proposal on the balance of the budget, was thinking of suggesting cuts in other parts of the programme.

(121) Mr THA HLA (Union of Burma) observed that international organizations conformed to the spirit of Unesco but suggested that they should be requested to become more truly international.

(122) Mr HOPE (United States of America) supported the Norwegian proposal.
(123) He stressed the importance of international understanding and suggested that international organizations should be reminded that a subvention from Unesco included an understanding that they would further Unesco aims in that direction.
(124) With regard to the financing of organizations and Unesco's relations to such financing he mentioned that an organization to which he had belonged had received a substantial subvention for three years from an outside body. It had taken three years for the Secretariat of the organization to discover that it had received that subvention. He proposed that the Secretariat should be asked to study carefully the administrative awareness of organizations before granting them subventions.

(125) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) urged that, although all international organizations deserved Unesco's support, additional assistance should be given, in particular, to the PEN clubs.

(126) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) strongly supported the Norwegian proposal. The subvention could be used for the express purpose of carrying out the suggestion of the delegate of Burma. As a member of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, he assured the delegate of the United States of America that a situation similar to that he had mentioned could not arise in the Council.

(127) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) supported the Norwegian delegate's proposal.

(128) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) reminded the Commission that, at the beginning of the meeting, after pointing out the benefits the Secretariat derived from the co-operation of the non-governmental organizations, he had explained the policy adopted with regard to them.
(129) The International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies certainly did excellent work, but if the Commission agreed to increase the funds allotted to it, that might upset the balance of the budget. The additional appropriation voted would have to be taken from some other item.
(130) There were other organizations which also deserved increased grants and, if the Commission embarked upon such a course, it might find itself in a dilemma.

(131) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the gratitude expressed to the Department of Cultural Activities during the discussion should be shown by reposing greater confidence in it.
(132) When the Natural Sciences programme was examined the Commission had decided to leave the Secretariat to go into the details of subventions. It should follow the same procedure with regard to cultural activities instead of taking hasty decisions.

(133) The CHAIRMAN put the Norwegian delegate's proposal to the vote.

(134) Adopted by 16 votes to 7, with 21 abstentions.

Paragraphs 36-41

(135) The CHAIRMAN said that the Advisory Committee had made no comments on those paragraphs.

(136) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) intimated that he had received definite instructions from his National Commission to express its appreciation of the work of the International Council of Museums. The benefit from the Unesco subvention was clearly felt. He hoped that the vote just taken would not result in a cut of the subvention to the International Council of Museums.

(137) Mr. BRICHET (France) drew the Commission's attention to the International Council of Museums, whose work was increasing and which was gaining in authority every day.
(138) His delegation attached especial importance to the work of that organization, which could be particularly helpful to the underdeveloped countries.
(139) Referring to the proposed subvention to the International Music Council, which was $24,000, while that to ICOM was no more than $20,000, the French delegate asked that the two subventions be better balanced.

(140) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) seconded that proposal.

(141) Mr THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) remarked that the International Council of Museums was the only organization in the Cultural Activities chapter to which the Secretariat had proposed an increased subvention.
(142) The International Music Council was growing rapidly and had recently set up numerous national committees as well as regional councils for South Asia, the Far East and America. The Secretariat would be extremely sorry if the proposed subvention to that organization were reduced.
(143) Mr. Thomas added that all the organizations receiving subventions had asked for larger sums than those allotted, but the Secretariat's decisions had been communicated to them.

(144) Mr BRANCA (Italy) observed that the International Music Council included several associations among which the proposed subvention would be divided.

(145) Mrs. LEGARDA (Philippines) stressed the importance of not cutting, but if possible increasing the subvention to the International Music Council.
(146) She reminded the Commission that a regional conference of the Council was being planned next year in Manila That conference was being organized on the understanding that the subvention would not be reduced.

(147) In the light of the information just given, Mr. BRICHET (France) thought it better to withdraw his proposal, but he asked the Secretariat to note his remarks with a view to placing the two associations on an equal footing when future programmes were drawn up.

(148) As there was no discussion on paragraphs 39-41, paragraphs 32-45 were approved.

International Union of Architects (paragraphs 46-48)

(149) Mr. MARDONES RESTAT (Chile) (International Union of Architects) said that the subvention that his organization received from Unesco ($500 a year) was the smallest allotted to any international non-governmental organization. He wished to point out that the history of culture was bound up with the history of architecture, a fact recognized in the Unesco emblem itself, which depicted the façade of a Greek temple.
(150) Mr. Mardones Restat proposed that the Unesco subvention to the International Union of Architects be raised to $5,000 a year.

(151) Mr. BRICHET (France) supported the proposal of the Chilean delegate.
(152) His country had welcomed the foundation of the International Union of Architects with lively satisfaction. For a long time, artists had shown little enthusiasm for taking part in Unesco's work. The Union's membership represented architects throughout the world, irrespective of school, it was arranging a Congress to study problems connected with the training of architects and with travelling exhibitions. The Union should therefore be given whole-hearted encouragement.
(153) The French delegate asked that the proposed subvention to the International Union of Architects be raised to $5,000 for each of the two years.

(154) Mr. BERGSTRAESSER (German Federal Republic) reminded the Commission that every increase voted would necessitate a decrease or cut elsewhere in the programme. Each project had its individual value.
(155) He thought it would be wise to adopt a procedure whereby no increases could be proposed without a statement of where the money was to come from.

(156) The CHAIRMAN felt that the Commission would find itself in a dilemma if it proposed reductions one the one side and increases on the other. Such a course seemed to him dangerous.

(157) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) thought that consideration should be given to the remarks of the delegate of the German Federal Republic. All the organizations deserved all the support which Unesco was able to give them. He thought that the Commission should restrict itself to the means which were known to it and should keep a rational balance. He reminded the Commission that the various subventions had been carefully examined by the Secretariat during the preparation of the budget and programme and since then, by the Advisory Committee. He warned against allowing generous instincts to overcome common sense. It would be unwise to continue voting increases unless the Commission were prepared to accept later cuts in the programme.

(158) The CHAIRMAN thought that, as the Chilean and French delegates maintained their proposal, it would be best to postpone the question until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 7 p. m.

# TWENTY - SECOND MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 9.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.3 OF REVISED AGENDA : SOCIAL SCIENCES (Continued)**

DR/62 (rev. 2): Study preliminary to the establishment of a training centre for international civil servants

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that this draft resolution had been revised in agreement with the Iranian delegation and was supported by the delegations of France, Lebanon, the United States of America, Switzerland and Italy

(2) It was unanimously adopted without discussion.

(3) Mr. MUJEEB (India) remarked that the resolution submitted by his delegation had not been dealt with. Only the amendment had been adopted.

(4) The CHAIRMAN said that consideration of the draft resolutions relating to the peaceful co-operation of different forms of government submitted by India (document 8C/DR/5 (rev.)) and Czechoslovakia (document 8C/DR/72) had been deferred until the end of the discussion on the programme and budget of the Department of Social Sciences.

(5) Mr. RAADI (Iran) asked that a correction be made in the French text of the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and just adopted: the word "information" should be "informations".

Migrants (paragraphs 184-187)

(6) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain), referring to paragraph 186, said that the Conference there mentioned - . although it seemed innocuous - was to deal with very difficult questions which affected the very essence and well-springs of culture and had important repercussions on the political relations between peoples.
(7) From the human point of view, it could not be stated in absolute terms whether assimilation, i.e. the loss of national characteristics, or the preservation of such characteristics, was better. In some cases, assimilation had produced good results, but in others it had emasculated the genius of the assimilated peoples. It therefore seemed unlikely that practical measures for the cultural integration of immigrants, such as those to be indicated in the model handbooks which the Conference was to consider, could be recommended for general use.
(8) For those reasons, it seemed advisable, if specialists from the principal countries of immigration were to be asked to attend the Conference, to invite specialists from the emigration countries as well, in order to obtain a more complete picture of the problem. He would like to hear Mrs. Myrdal's authoritative views on that point.

(9) Mr. VITO (Italy) said firstly that Unesco's task in connexion with migrants was to assure the protection of their cultural characteristics, while keeping them in harmony with the cultural policy of the immigration country. "Integration" he felt, was a preferable word to "assimilation", the latter had a slight flavour of imposition.
(10) Secondly, participants in meetings in the Western Hemisphere should include representatives of countries from which migration took place as well as those which received immigrants.
(11) Lastly, the delegate of Italy was surprised to find that two methods had been combined in the same resolution. The first part referred to discrimination, which everyone could agree to reject, while the second dealt with a real problem, that of migrants, which needed much study and improvement.

(12) Mr. AFTALION (Argentina) said that one of the most difficult and delicate tasks incumbent on Unesco was to investigate the factors either prejudicial to the cultural assimilation of immigrants, or conducive to their integration into the new environment to which they had chosen to move. He thought that the study of the integration of immigrants into their new environment should be based not only on what the laws laid down but also on a practical and realistic study of how the laws were applied and how they affected people. That practical approach to the problem gave cause for thinking that the United Nations were doing all they could, to ensure the success of the future Conference. To do so, it would be necessary above all to bear in mind the point of view of the nations which received immigrants and the ideologies obtaining there. The Argentine Republic had gained much experience in the matter, extending over a hundred years, as it had received a steady influx of immigrants.
(13) Argentina would be very pleased for the Conference to be held in its territory because the experience it had gained might suggest interesting studies in other countries.

(14) Mr. SANCHEZ REULET (Organization of American States) said that OAS viewed with sympathy and interest any activities calculated to solve the migration problem, which was common to many American States. For that reason he repeated the offer already made regarding the possibility of that

Organization's collaborating in the preparations for the Conference.
(15) It should be noted that the Pan American Union's Department of Economic and Social Affairs had already carried out studies, especially in Venezuela, where the problem was of great topical interest. He considered that those studies might be used, and hoped that the Department of Social Sciences would bear that possibility in mind.

(16) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) took note of all the suggestions made by delegates. In particular, she agreed to adopt the word "integration" suggested by the delegate of Italy instead of "assimilation".

(17) The CHAIRMAN recommended delegates to confine their comments to the draft resolutions under consideration and not to stray into the discussion of paragraphs which merely set forth Unesco's work plans.

(18) Paragraphs 184-187 were put to the vote and adopted.

Higher Budgetary Level

Technical aid to Member States (paragraphs 188-190)

(19) Resolution 3.53, was adopted, with 5 abstentions. (The delegates of the USSR and Czechoslovakia pointed out to the Chairman that abstentions should not be left unrecorded.)

Project 3.6: Social sciences and problems of social development (paragraphs 191-210)

(20) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that, during its discussion of the item, the Advisory Committee had been very favourably disposed towards the various projects connected with research into the consequences of industrialization, particularly in South Asia, and had given them high priority.

(21) Mr. BRANDAO CAVALCANTI (Brazil) was particularly interested in the suggested symposium in Latin America (paragraph 208), but wished it to be put forward a year, saying that the Economic Commission for Latin America had agreed to such a change. He asked for the opinion of the Director of the Department of Social Sciences on that point.

(22) Mr. GUTIERREZ PALACIOS (Chile) was surprised at the total omission from paragraph 202 of any reference to workers and their trade unions in relation to such an important subject.
(23) He said that a rapid process of industrialization, such as was taking place in his country, had repercussions peculiar to such transitional periods, which the working class had to endure - poverty and unemployment in many thousands of homes. In that connexion, the Confederation of Free Trade Unions was in a position to give much help.
(24) He therefore proposed that paragraph 202 be amended so to mention the assistance which the international trade union organizations could give in the research and studies referred to in the paragraph.

(25) Mr. MATIC (Yugoslavia) was very interested in the draft resolution on the social sciences and problems of social development in relation to industrial development, and to productivity in particular (paragraph 204). All the same, he thought that a survey of the psychological factors affecting productivity would be incomplete, for it was not psychological factors alone which raised or lowered productivity. There were also sociological factors, whose importance was at present to be seen in Yugoslavia, where economists and sociologists were studying the effect of the handing over of factory management to the workers.

(26) Mr. SEDES (France) thought that the list of bodies which would take part in the research instigated by the International Social Science Council was rather restrictive so far as trade union organizations were concerned. The International Federation of Free Trade Unions was mentioned, but the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions had been forgotten. The French delegate asked that trade union organizations, and in particular, the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions be mentioned in paragraphs 202 and 205.
(27) The French delegate agreed with his Yugoslav colleague that it was not enough to study the effect of psychological factors alone on the development of productivity. He also thought that the contents of paragraph 204 bore little relation to its heading.

(28) Mr. VITO (Italy) supported the delegates of Chile and France with reference to paragraph 195. The resolution on the social impact of technological change should be carried out in close touch with the trade union movements associated with Unesco. The same applied in the case of paragraph 205.

(29) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) referred to paragraphs 202 and 203. Research in connexion with problems arising in Africa South of the Sahara was vital, and all the territories in that area should have the opportunity of participating in it. The delegate of Liberia wished to know to what extent associate members of Unesco would be allowed to participate actively in the work of that office, which might become the nucleus of what would later be an International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization in Africa South of the Sahara.

(30) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) questioned paragraph 201. The world-wide survey proposed here was a big task and the use it was to be put to was not altogether clear.
(31) With reference to paragraph 207, the delegate of New Zealand had some doubts as to how it was proposed to define the "middle classes", whose rôle in economic development was to be studied.

(32) Mr. PAZUR (Czechoslovakia) held views similar to those of the French delegate and asked that the World Federation of Trade Unions be mentioned in connexion with the survey of the psychological factors affecting productivity.

(33) With regard to paragraph 196, which referred to the difficulties experienced by certain countries when they tried to harmonize economic growth with social development, he said that Czechoslovakia was a highly industrialized country, but that one part of it - Slovakia - had been industrialized only since the war. The delegate described the new impetus to cultural life to be observed in that region, mentioning in particular that local folklore, which had previously been considered merely as an amusement, had become one of the most important cultural factors in the social development of the Slovak people.

(34) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) welcomed the proposal in paragraph 203 but, as a budgetary principle was involved, felt that the consultations with the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara should take place before further activities were undertaken.

(35) Mr. PRATT (Australia) raised only two doubts: in connexion with paragraph 205, Unesco should be cautious in embarking on the study of productivity in view of the large number of agencies already active in that field, and it would be preferable to begin with a study of what was being done by other nations. He asked Mrs Myrdal for an indication of the cost of the activities in paragraphs 204 and 205.
(36) With regard to paragraph 211, Mr. Pratt wondered why, since intensive investigations had already been made in the field of community development and were available, the item had been given high priority.

(37) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom), in the absence of the delegates of the Gold Coast and Sierra Leone, felt justified in speaking for them. They would, he said, wish for the opportunity of taking part in the enquiry under paragraphs 202 and 203. On their behalf he expressed agreement with the delegates of Liberia and South Africa.

(38) Mr. BENVENUTO (Uruguay) wished to suggest an addition to paragraphs 196 and 197 concerning the serious disturbances produced by technological change. The proposed addition would read as follows: "It is suggested to the Director-General that it would be well to bring to the notice of Member States, national parliaments and cultural, educational and workers' organs in general, the need to give men and women, as human beings and as workers, the soundest and broadest education or general training possible, firstly in order to give practical activities their due place in human life and, secondly, to enable men and women to assimilate, and adapt themselves more quickly and efficiently to the unexpected technological changes which the incalculable growth of science tends to produce at an increasing speed and with repercussions ever more difficult to predict".

(39) Mr. SANCHEZ REULET (Organization of American States) said that his Organization's Department of Economic Affairs could help in arranging for the seminar on economic progress, referred to in paragraph 208. He repeated the offer to that effect made in a memorandum already communicated to the Director of the Department of Social Sciences.

(40) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied to a number of points raised by delegates.
(41) Czechoslovakia: a number of studies of the effects of industries had been undertaken by Unesco and those effects were not all bad. Mrs. Myrdal quoted the work edited by Margaret Mead, one of Unesco's best sellers.
(42) Chile, France and Uruguay: she agreed with the need for a wider co-operation with trade union groups, pointing out that the work plan suggested was no more than an indication, for later development.
(43) Yugoslavia: Mrs. Myrdal agreed that the title of paragraph 204 should have been wider in scope. The paragraph itself covered the sociological factors indicated by the delegate of Yugoslavia.
(44) Australia: a survey of research accomplished elsewhere had actually been made by Unesco as a preparation for this work plan, and had pointed to the need for a certain type of study which was so far lacking and which Unesco could provide, namely, comparable studies and studies having more of a sociological and cultural than an economic character. Mrs. Myrdal mentioned as an example that several Dutch firms with international branches had placed their shops at the disposal of the Organization as a kind of laboratory, and she proposed a comparative study of that kind, which Unesco might undertake in co-operation with The Hague Institute of Social Sciences.
(45) New Zealand: Mrs. Myrdal referred to the symposium on the rôle of middle classes in the Middle East, paragraph 207. That had been suggested by groups in the countries of that region as important owing to the emergence of a new class of technicians, agronomists etc., the lack of whom was a burning problem in the Middle East.
(46) Mrs. Myrdal then answered a question put by the delegates of Australia and New Zealand on paragraphs 211-13, the study of local self-government. Although intensive studies had been made in some countries, no comparative study existed. There was proposed first to make an extensive mapping of the different forms of local self-government, after which more intensified studies could be carried out in certain countries. The United Nations representative had remarked on the eventual usefulness of such studies for United Nations work on community development.
(47) Finally, replying to the delegate of Brazil, Mrs. Myrdal said that a symposium in Latin America (paragraph 208) had been planned for 1956 but, if it became feasible in 1955, there would be no objection on the part of the Secretariat. She pointed out a small change with reference to paragraph 209: the seminar referred to was to be held mainly under FAO auspices, and another would be organized jointly with ECAFE on problems of urbanization.

(48) Mr. SASSEN (Netherlands) indicated his Government's willingness to collaborate with Unesco in research on any problems presented to The Hague International Institute.

(49) Resolutions 3.61 and 3.62 up to paragraph 210 inclusive were adopted without further comment.

Community development (paragraphs 211-213) (document 8C/DR/55)

(50) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the last part of the draft resolution submitted by the Uruguayan delegation on the subject of teaching about human rights:

"The General Conference,

. . . . . .

Authorizes the Director-General to promote a study:

(a) of the economic, social and political circumstances militating against the establishment of the rule of law and the practice of true political democracy,

(b) of possible national and international measures for ensuring the practical observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms".

(51) The first part of the resolution concerned the Department of Education.

(52) Mr. SEDES (France) proposed an amendment to the draft resolution and wished consideration to be given to a contract with the International Political Science Association, which would be holding its Congress in Stockholm in 1955. The French amendment would add the following paragraph to the end of the document:

"A contract will be concluded in 1955 with the International Political Science Association to enable it to pursue these studies and to extend the recruitment of experts to attend the congress which it is to hold on this question: 1955: $4,000".

(53) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee had considered that studies under (a) were to be recommended but that simultaneous studies under (b) would be technically and scientifically impossible. The French amendment implied a reduction of the contract which might, on the approval of the two bodies, be concluded with the International Association of Political Science, from $5,000 to $4,000.

(54) Mr. BRANDAO CAVALCANTI (Brazil) seconded the amendment proposed by the French delegate.

(55) Mr. MATIC (Yugoslavia) congratulated the Director of the Department of Social Sciences on the clarity and precision with which the global survey of existing forms of local self-government had been planned (paragraph 211). He quoted examples of the development of local self-government in his own country, and added that such instances of communal management had led to an economic democracy embracing the traditional rights of the individual as well as his economic rights. Several surveys on the subject had been published in Yugoslavia, and the Yugoslav National Commission would be happy to collaborate in the project.

(56) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 211, enquired whether the title "community development" was not rather different from the content of the paragraph, which dealt with local self-government. Community development in the United Kingdom had a technical significance as a type of fundamental education.

(57) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) referred back to draft resolution 55. Why could the $4,000 contract not come under paragraph 211 (iii)?

(58) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that the subject, although related to the contents of the draft resolution, did not cover the same territory.

(59) Mrs. Myrdal agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom that a longer heading for paragraph 211 would have been clearer; it was a survey of local self-government which aimed at being of use to community development.

(60) A vote was then taken on draft resolution No. 55 submitted by the Uruguayan delegation and amended by the delegate of France, which was adopted by 12 in favour, 3 against and 8 abstentions.

(61) Paragraphs 211-213 were adopted without comment.

Social aspects of land reform (paragraphs 214 and 215)

(62) Mr. MENCEL (Poland) asked why a very small sum was provided for 1955 and nothing for 1956 (paragraph 2 5). Would a transfer of funds be possible, should the activities in question prove important?

(63) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that the activities begun in the 1953-54 period were not yet concluded. It was further hoped that a meeting for co-ordinating all work in the United Nations family on land reform would be held in the spring of 1955 with the Food and Agriculture Organization. Unesco proposed however to render practical aid in that field under paragraphs 224 and 225.

International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization in South Asia (paragraphs 216-222)

(64) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that conditions were not ripe for the establishment of an Institute of Social Science in South Asia. Was it wise to spend $67,000 in one year on a hypothetical project, and how could results be obtained so quickly as to be used to advise governments? He hoped it would not mean the reduction of the International Research Office in Paris.

(65) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said there would be no change in the Paris Office nor would any permanent or general kind of institute be set up in South Asia. Under Aid to Member States, there was, however, room for a normal extension of the work of the Paris Office, offering aid in applying social sciences to government planning. A work plan had been prepared in great detail and had been discussed with the Government of India. The International Social

Science Council was fully in agreement with Unesco on the point.

(66) Mr. W/ (India) regretted that the delegate of the Unite... ...ngdom was not sympathetic to the creation of a Social Science Institute in South Asia. A great many developments had taken place in that part of the world, and such an institute would help it to avoid the errors made in the West during its own development. India, as the country industrially most advanced, was indicated for such a centre, and all its neighbours wished a centre to be started there.

(67) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) did not share the pessimism expressed by the United Kingdom delegation, but was not satisfied by Mrs. Myrdal's reply. If the Centre was to be a permanent one, he would oppose it, as he would oppose any permanent Unesco centre on the subject.

(68) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that he had not opposed the project but merely the way it had been presented. Mrs. Myrdal had removed most of his fears. He agreed with the delegate of the United States of America that as a temporary project it could be of advantage to all concerned.

(69) Mr. SIDDIQI (Pakistan) supported the proposal for establishment of the centre in South Asia and announced that his Government would extend its whole-hearted co-operation.

(70) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that there were two parts to the centre. The documentation centre would remain in the host country, but the research centre (which took up the bulk of the funds) was a temporary one. The Government of India planned to meet one-third of the costs.

(71) Paragraphs 216-222 were adopted.

(72) Paragraphs 233-235 were adopted without comment.

Project 3.7: The social sciences and evaluation techniques (paragraphs 226-242)

(73) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) had three points to make. Firstly Unesco had a great need for evaluation in many aspects of its work. Secondly, evaluation meant more than an appraisal or measurement of the degree of achievement of an activity, however useful that might be. Unesco wanted to know what means produced good results, and that required comparison. Thirdly, there were four proposals in the project. The first, on libraries, was good but did not include the element of comparison. He suggested research should be carried out in an area with a library and in an area without one, to provide comparison. The second part of the project suffered from the same lack; Mr. Angell suggested that in the next two-year period further similar research be undertaken to provide a comparison with the current one. The last two parts of the project met his requirements, and the delegate of the United States of America commended them.

(74) Baron VAN DER STRAETEN WAILLET (Belgium) proposed the addition at the end of resolution 3.7, of the words: "as well as the non-governmental organizations".

(75) Miss RAILEY (Liberia) strongly supported the evaluation of literacy campaigns and of the long-range effects of international seminars. The complex rôle played by literacy campaigns in fundamental education in underdeveloped countries needed close study. With regard to the second evaluation, it would only be fully effective if carried out at the same time as a series of follow-up activities.

(76) Mr. PRATT (Australia) agreed with the excellent remarks made by the delegate of the United States of America on the evaluation project. The sum of money allocated to it seemed a very reasonable one. Mr. Pratt remarked that the cost of an evaluation should bear some relation to the cost of the project. He agreed with the importance given to the development of techniques as well as to the actual evaluation, and he also supported the delegate of Belgium in suggesting that in the case of a large-scale evaluation it would be a good idea for a totally unconnected organization to undertake it.

(77) Mr. GANNON (International Sociological Association) said that project 3.7 was especially interesting to all concerned with the study and practical application of the social sciences, as it dealt not only with the investigation of a practical subject but with the discovery of a series of techniques to enable the effectiveness and success of a programme to be determined.

(78) He believed that no science and no branch of study could be considered systematized unless its techniques included processes for the quantitative statement of results. Evaluation techniques were also methods of assessing the factors which were taken into account during the execution of a programme, such as nationality, occupation, social standing, age, mentality, etc.

(79) For the reasons set forth in paragraphs 231 and 241, he was not aware what evaluation techniques were to be used in 1955-56 but, from the terms employed in the budgetary justification, he took it that they were to be those appropriate to the experimental method, the principal forms of which seemed suitable for the proposed operation of measurement and assessment.

(80) He thought that the results of the work would be fruitful, and as a sociologist, he personally looked forward to having an instrument for precise control and evaluation in social theory and practice.

(81) The Belgian amendment was seconded by France and was approved.

(82) Paragraphs 226-242 were approved.

Higher Budgetary Level

Technical aid to Member States for evaluation of development projects (paragraphs 243-246)

(83) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Committee favoured more thorough study of the question before action was taken upon it, and had decided to recommend that the appropriation of $12,000 for 1955 be deleted and that the project appear in the programme for 1956 only.

(84) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) informed the Commission that the budget estimates in question had been made on the basis of requests received and which had had to be refused in previous years (e.g. the Ceylon rural development scheme). She suggested that, if any cuts were to be made in the evaluation project, the Secretariat should be left free to make them wherever it thought best. The budget for evaluation of literacy campaigns, for instance, was included under the Education chapter.

(85) Mr. PRATT (Australia) and Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) moved the suggestion made by Mrs. Myrdal, which was adopted.

Amendment to draft resolution of India (8C/DR/5 rev.) and amendment of Czechoslovakia (8C/DR/72)

(86) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the text of these amendments (document 8C/DIV/131).

(87) Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the amendment proposed by the United States of America was presented as an amendment to his delegation's amendment (document 8C/DR/72). But the United States delegation's text entirely ignored the idea of peaceful coexistence and its application as proposed in the Czechoslovak amendment.

(88) Mr. Hajek therefore did not regard the United States amendment as an amendment to his own resolution but considered it a new resolution. If the Commission took the American text as the basis for discussion, the Czechoslovak delegation would propose a new amendment to restore the essential part of the contents of its own resolution.

(89) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) said that his delegation's amendment was less detailed than the Czechoslovak one. The Commission could choose between the two.

(90) Mr. MUJEEB (India) hoped that the Commission would be able to agree on one resolution in order that it might be adopted unanimously.

(91) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) suggested that, as there was still some difference of opinion on the resolution, the delegates of India, Czechoslovakia and the United States of America should prepare a new text together, and submit it to the Commission in the next day or two.

(92) Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the question be discussed at the next meeting, when his delegation would all be present.

(93) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) requested the three delegates in preparing their text, to bear budgetary implications in mind.

(94) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) supported that request.

(95) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) announced that the decision of the Executive Board on draft resolution No. 5 had been unfavourable.

(96) It was agreed to postpone the discussion until a new draft amendment had been prepared by the three delegations concerned.

The meeting rose at 11.45 p.m.

# TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

*2 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

ITEM 8.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CULTURAL ACTIVITIES (continued)

International Union of Architects (paragraphs 46-48) (continued)

(1) Mr. BRICHET (France) said, that in view of the Secretariat's observations, the French delegation was withdrawing its proposal to increase the subvention to $5,000.
(2) However, he again affirmed that the International Union of Architects was inadequately endowed to carry out the research and general enquiries implied in its programme, and he asked the Secretariat, in the form of a proposal, not to lose sight of the necessity of increasing that subvention, as far as credits allowed, in 1956 if possible, and to bear those indications in mind when future programmes were being drawn up.

(3) Mr. MARDONES RESTAT (Chile) pointed out that it was the Chilean and not the French delegation which had asked for the budget of the International Union of Architects to be increased.
(4) It appeared that Unesco considered libraries, museums and archives to be more important than the work of creative artists. It was however true that town planners had a heavy task before them; the World Population Conference, held in Rome, had stated that in the next 25 years the world population would increase by a thousand million; which meant that within that time-limit, nine new cities the size of Montevideo would have to be built.
(5) The International Union of Architects was certainly not begging for a subvention for its own existence, but because it hoped to serve Unesco aims better.

(6) As many speakers had asked for the time-limit on speeches to be extended beyond three minutes, the CHAIRMAN put the question to the vote.

(7) Rejected by 14 votes against 14, with 20 abstentions.

(8) The Chilean delegate having asked for another vote to be taken, that proposal was also voted upon, according to the usual procedure, and was rejected by 20 votes against 17.

(9) The French proposal, seconded by the delegations of Italy and the United Kingdom, was approved by 33 votes against 1, with 3 abstentions.

International PEN Club (paragraphs 49-51)

(10) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) voiced her country's hope that the PEN Clubs would be encouraged as far as possible in their very important work by a larger subvention than that granted in the draft Programme and Budget for 1955-56.

(11) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) was diametrically opposed to that course. The International PEN Club grouped a small number of persons whose literary fame and success ensured them against hardship.
(12) He would be in favour of a subvention of one dollar as a token of the respect that body deserved, but he thought that the $4,000 a year could be devoted to more important tasks.

(13) Mr. WADIA (India) regretted that there was opposition to renewing the subvention for the International PEN Club, as he had intended to propose that it should be increased.
(14) With regard to the proposed meetings, while he agreed that the autonomy of international organizations must be respected, he considered that Unesco, in providing subventions, had the right to make suggestions. He accordingly proposed that the next meeting of the International PEN Club should be held in Asia, and extended an invitation on behalf of his Government. He urged that the subvention should be continued; conferences were costly and leading intellectuals were not always wealthy.

(15) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) asked whether Ceylon was included among the six Asian countries mentioned in paragraph 49 as possessing PEN Clubs. If not, he would oppose the subvention, and support the Canadian delegate's proposal.

(16) Mr. DE SALIS (Switzerland) was of the same opinion as the Canadian delegate. Although he did not wish to pass judgment on the value of the International PEN Club, he wondered whether it was really necessary for Unesco to subsidize a body which had been functioning so satisfactorily for over thirty years.

(17) Miss NEFFA (Lebanon) thought that Unesco should exercise greater influence over the activities of PEN Clubs, so as to make them really international. She suggested that the proposed subvention for 1955 and 1956 should be used to achieve a wider distribution of the Bulletin in various languages and to obtain, geographically, better cultural representation.

(18) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) appreciated the interesting proposal by the Indian delegate, although he thought it was perhaps for the International PEN Club to decide where it would meet.

(19) Mr. FLORES AGUIRRE (Mexico) thought it would be more useful to use the subvention proposed for 1955 and 1956 for instituting an international prize to reward the work that PEN Clubs did in forwarding Unesco's aims.

(20) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) drew the Commission's attention to document 8C/ADM/20 on the employment of subventions granted to international non-governmental organizations (quadrennial review by the Executive Board).
(21) In reply to the question from the delegate of Ceylon, Mr. Thomas explained that Ceylon did not figure in the list of countries in which the International PEN Club was represented by national centres. Although there were not PEN Club committees in every country, they were spread very widely over the earth's surface.
(22) With regard to the purposes of the subvention, Mr. Thomas gave the following information: in the main, it helped with the publication of a quarterly bulletin which provided information on books that had come out in a great number of countries, especially those in languages that were not widely spoken, it also defrayed some of the expenses incurred by the meeting of the PEN Club's annual congress.
(23) In addition, the PEN Club collaborated with Unesco in selecting contemporary works of various countries that it would be highly desirable to translate into widely spoken languages.

(24) Mr. PAIK (Korea) said that a PEN Club now existed in his country, but it was possible that a report had not yet been made to headquarters. He accordingly supported the continuance of the subvention.

(25) A vote was taken on the resolution of the Canadian delegate, supported by the delegates of Switzerland, the German Federal Republic and Spain.

(26) The resolution was rejected by 13 votes to 25 with 12 abstentions.

International Association of the Visual Arts (paragraphs 52-54) and document 8C/DR/30

(27) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) informed the Commission that the Advisory Committee did not recommend approving DR/30, submitted by the Italian delegation.

(28) Mr. UNGARETTI (Italy) emphasized the necessity of giving that recently created organization all the help it needed to carry through the difficult tasks incumbent upon it and which were already well under way.
(29) Although the Italian delegation considered that the annual subvention should be double what had been provided for, it only proposed an increase of $2,000 a year and recommended that offices should be made available to the International Association of the Visual Arts in Unesco House.

(30) Mr. BRICHET (France) pointed out to the Commission that the Association could offer Unesco very useful collaboration.
(31) When future programmes were drawn up, not only an increase in subventions, but more contracts, should be provided for.
(32) Travelling exhibitions had shown the cultural importance of colour reproductions, for instance. Previously that field had been reserved to private publishers, who naturally concentrated on reproducing works that were readily saleable. The Association of the Visual Arts could do something towards getting certain periods and schools of pictorial art better represented than they were and toward bringing artists to collaborate more directly in the making of reproductions. It could also help to lower prices, which were still far too high.

(33) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) was of the same opinion as the Italian and French delegates.
(34) The International Association of the Visual Arts had managed in a very short time to gain the support of a great number of Member States. Its congress had had very practical results. The vitality of the Association and its carefully worked out plan of activities amply justified the aid proposed for it, which would enable it to reach artists, often working in isolation, in many parts of the world.

(35) Mr. MATIC (Yugoslavia) was of the same opinion as the three preceding speakers. The Association had filled a gap and it was Unesco's duty to help it in its early stages.
(36) Mr. Matic then informed the Commission that a committee had been set up in Yugoslavia grouping most Yugoslav artists.

(37) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Association had already been granted a subvention and the proposal therefore had no budgetary implications. The Executive Board had discussed the merits of the proposal and, since its object appeared to be to strengthen support for the Director-General's programme and budget, had decided to recommend its adoption.

(38) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) supported the Italian proposal.

(39) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that there was insufficient evidence to justify support for such a new association. Two observers from the United Kingdom had attended the Association's last meeting, but had not been sent any report on it. The subvention was already a large one, and Unesco should be cautious in increasing subventions without adequate justification.

(40) Mr. HOPE (United States of America) said that the National Commission in his country believed in the importance for Unesco of securing the active support of creative artists. As an art historian, he reminded the Commission that artists were judged not as human or political beings but by the quality of

their work. The problem facing Unesco was, therefore, whether the setting up of an international organization would ensure the co-operation of the best artists from every country In the opinion of the United States Government the organization being discussed was a worthy experiment, and he hoped Unesco would be able to find the means to encourage the best artists to participate, so that it would not become one more bureaucracy.

(41) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) disagreed with the United Kingdom delegate; he thought that IAVA had already proved its worth.
(42) The Belgian delegation strongly endorsed the Italian delegate's proposal, particularly in regard to the granting of offices so that IAVA's secretariat could function.

(43) Mr. BARRENECHEA PINO (Chile) said that his delegation warmly supported not only the proposed subvention to the International Association of the Visual Arts, but a larger one, as he believed that in that way an effective stimulus would be given to heroes of culture who, more often than not, were struggling to create alone and in poverty.

(44) Seconded by various countries, the Italian proposal to increase IAVA's annual subvention from $6,000 to $8,000, was rejected by 20 votes against 20, with 8 abstentions.

(45) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) informed the Italian and Belgian delegates that the IAVA secretariat had long had offices at Unesco House.

(46) Mr. BRICHET (France) wanted to know what the Unesco Secretariat's policy was as regarded contracts with IAVA.

(47) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) assured Mr. Brichet that the Secretariat was anxious to collaborate with IAVA and had noted what the French delegation had said. However, one could not forecast the tendency of future programmes.
(48) For the rest, there was already collaboration between Unesco and IAVA, which had been consulted on the setting up of a committee of experts for the selection of colour reproductions for the two catalogues.

(49) DR/30, submitted by the Italian delegation, was approved, as regards the work plan, by 24 votes against 0, with 13 abstentions.

International Federation of Library Associations (paragraphs 55-57)

(50) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland), speaking as observer and chairman of that body reminded the Commission that the Federation had existed for a quarter of a century, that its activity had never relaxed and that its work was of benefit to everyone.
(51) The credits granted were of course much smaller than the amount requested - especially as $1,500 of the $2,400 were for the purpose of organizing a joint congress with other institutions. But the Federation was well aware that Unesco had done what it could.
(52) However, Mr. Bourgeois wanted two observations to be recorded:

1. The basic rôle of libraries in the functioning of any scientific and cultural organization was not sufficiently stressed in the programme.
2. When committees were convened and when international organizations met, the Federation would like to be represented by an observer - at its own expense of course.

(53) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) wished to endorse Mr. Bourgeois' remarks; the Italian delegation was conscious of the extremely important part libraries played in the intellectual life of the whole world.

(54) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) asked whether Burma was a member of the International Federation of Library Associations. The Federation was of great interest to his country, where two important libraries were being built: an international Buddhist library, which would be of value to the whole world, and a national library, which would be of use to South East and South Asian countries. He was strongly in favour of Unesco's support for the Federation.

(55) The CHAIRMAN said that no library association in the Burmese Union was affiliated with the International Federation, which intended, however, to extend its action to many countries not yet in its ranks.
(56) As for the other questions, they did not come within the discussion of the programme, but Mr. Bourgeois expressed his willingness to answer them at the end of the meeting.

(57) Mr. BRICHET (France) agreed with what Mr. Bourgeois had said as chairman of the International Federation of Library Associations.
(58) He insisted that Unesco must collaborate with that Federation, and wanted to know by what criteria the International Association of Music Libraries was being granted a subvention of $3,000 while the Federation was to have only $2,400.

(59) Mr. MATIC (Yugoslavia) said that the Yugoslav delegation endorsed the observations made by Mr. Bourgeois and the delegates of Italy and France.

(60) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) said that his delegation was in agreement with Mr. Bourgeois' wishes and with the support he gave to the petition for the International Federation of Library Associations; Argentina would vote in favour of any increase designed to encourage artistic and literary activities.

(61) Mr. GUTIERREZ PALACIOS (Chile) warmly supported Mr. Bourgeois' point of view and hoped that library associations in Spanish America would also as far as possible be admitted to membership of the International Federation; the work of those associations had gained greatly in importance in the last ten years.

(62) Mr. TVETERAS (Norway) supported the statement made by the representative of the

International Federation of Library Associations, the work of which was of importance to librarians all over the world. Although it was not appropriate to increase the subvention at the present time, he hoped that it would be possible to do so at the next General Conference so that co-operation between the Federation and Unesco could be extended and intensified.

(63) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) said that his delegation not only supported the French motion to maintain the proposed subvention to the International Federation of Library Associations but would like to see it increased as far as possible.

(64) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) stated that Uruguay also gave its warm support to what Mr. Bourgeois had said.

(65) Mrs. PECSON, speaking as observer for the International Federation of University Women, said that the members of the Federation looked on the library movement as an important element in the work for peace through education, science and culture, especially in war-devastated countries, where so much cultural material had been destroyed. It was also an important factor in the successful collaboration of the intellectual élite. Libraries were not only an essential aid to fundamental education; they were the depositories of man's thought for future generations, and the means of disseminating knowledge of the culture and inherited traditions which were the pride of each nation. She urged that the International Federation of Library Associations should be given its proper status and that Unesco should grant it a subvention of not less than $5,000 yearly.

(66) The CHAIRMAN said that three countries of Latin America (including Uruguay) were represented in the International Federation of Library Associations.
(67) For the 1955 congress, the Federation had sent out 3,000 invitations, including many to non-members, for it was ever anxious to extend its action in all directions.
(68) Returning to the question of subventions, the Chairman reaffirmed his conviction that the Secretariat had distributed credits in the best possible way. He was sure that the Director-General would bear the Federation's needs in mind when future programmes were being drawn up, and he hoped that contracts would be concluded that would allow the Federation to undertake work of great value to Unesco.

(69) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL regretted that he was unable to speak as an observer, since he was no longer a member of any of the organizations in question. As Director-General, however, he assured Mr. Bourgeois in his capacities of Chairman of the Commission and observer for the Federation that every effort would be made to recognize the quality and significance of IFLA's work and that he would keep in mind what had been said during the discussion.

(70) Paragraphs 55-57 were adopted unanimously.

International Federation for Documentation (paragraphs 58-60)

(71) Adopted unanimously.

International Council on Archives (paragraphs 61-63)

(72) Adopted unanimously.

International Association of Music Libraries (paragraphs 64-66)

(73) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) regretted that, through no fault of their own, international organizations were not always completely international, since many underdeveloped countries were not able to participate in their activities. On behalf of those less fortunate countries, he urged that ways should be found of satisfying their interest in the work of international organizations and their wish to be informed of activities, receive publications and send observers to meetings. It was important for Unesco to use every endeavour to see that the work and the representation of international organizations extended to the whole world.

(74) Mr. BRICHET (France) again asked for an explanation of the difference between the subventions granted to the International Federation of Library Associations and to the International Association of Music Libraries. What criteria had been adopted?

(75) The CHAIRMAN replied that the International Association of Music Libraries had undertaken a very big task of musical research - the preparation and publication of an international directory of musical sources.
(76) He added in passing that the Association had been invited to become a section of the Federation - while retaining its autonomy - in the same way as other library associations, such as those in the fields of the medical and agricultural sciences.

(77) With regard to the criteria on which the amount of subventions was based, Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) supplied the following data: the Secretariat did not take the requests as a basis, even though they might be very well founded; the main consideration was thoroughly worked out plans for particular projects, such as that for the publication of an international directory of musical sources being undertaken jointly by the International Association of Music Libraries and the International Society for Musical Research.
(78) The Secretariat was also guided by decisions made by the General Conference at earlier sessions.
(79) Finally, the liaison between different international organizations, referred to in paragraph 68, and the meetings Unesco convened each year and which enabled the international organizations and Unesco to acquaint themselves with each other's programmes were also determining factors.

(80) Mr. DE SALIS (Switzerland) was surprised that the International Society for Musical Research should receive credits under three different heads. He realized that those subventions were granted for

different projects, but he thought there was a disproportion in the allocations, particularly if one remembered the regrets expressed at the small share that had fallen to the International Union of Architects.

(81) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) corrected the facts as put by the Swiss delegate.
(82) The International Society for Musical Research received only two subventions - one through the International Council for Philosophy and Human'stic Studies, for collaborating in the publication of the International Directory of Musical Sources, which would take several years; and one small subvention of $500 through the International Music Council for the regular publication of the bulletin Acta Musicológica.

(83) In reply to the Chinese delegate's suggestion that Unesco should concern itself with securing wide usage for a uniform system of musical notation, the CHAIRMAN recommended that the delegate submit that question directly to the Secretariat, for it lay outside the programme.

(84) (A) International Organizations was unanimously approved.

(B) and (C), paragraphs 67-71

(85) Mr UNGARETTI (Italy) said that the Conference of Artists held in Venice in 1952 had decided that an International Council of Arts and Letters would be set up after the International Association of the Visual Arts had been founded. The Italian delegation saw no reason for that council not being set up.

(86) Mr. THOMAS (Director of Cultural Activities) reminded the Italian delegate that the proposal to set up the Council had given rise to confused and contradictory votes.
(87) Moreover, the consultations the Secretariat had had with Member States had revealed the scepticism with which many of them viewed the idea. The international non-governmental organizations were on the whole more sympathetic, but one or two of them had expressed great reserve. On that account the Secretariat had not ventured to submit the project in 1954 and only suggested a grant for the setting up of a provisional liaison committee.

(88) Mr. UNGARETTI (Italy) then asked for the proposal to set up an International Council of Arts and Letters to be submitted to the General Conference at the following session.

(89) Sections (B) and (C) were unanimously approved.

Project 4.12: Co-ordination of bibliographical services and exchanges of information (paragraphs 72-83)

(90) Mr. GUTIERREZ PALACIOS (Chile) said that both the Unesco Libraries Division and Mr. Penna, the expert at the Regional Office in Havana, deserved to be warmly congratulated on the work they had done. Further, in view of the very great importance for Latin American countries of the information contained in the Unesco Bulletin for Libraries, his delegation considered that the budgetary estimate for that publication should be maintained, if not increased.

(91) Mr. BRICHET (France) said that any interruption of the Index Translationum was unacceptable. That work, which had a vital rôle to play, had aroused keen interest in intellectual circles. Subventions should be maintained at a level adequate to keep the undertaking going in 1955 and 1956.

(92) The CHAIRMAN said that the International Federation of Library Associations had said the same thing to the Secretariat.

(93) Mr. GOMEZ HOYOS (Colombia) seconded the delegation of Chile in their congratulations and also requested that the publication and credits of the Unesco Bulletin for Libraries should not be reduced.

(94) Mr. BARDALES (Honduras) also praised the Bulletin and asked that the credits for its publication should be maintained.

(95) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) supported the request put forward by Chile, Colombia and Honduras that the Bulletin should continue to be published exactly as before.

(96) Mr. MONTALVO (Ecuador) was in complete agreement with what the preceding speakers had said and asked that the budgetary level for the Bulletin for 1955-56 should be raised.

(97) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that, in order to keep on publishing the Unesco Bulletin for Libraries in its present form, the Libraries Division would require another $1,500.
(98) The Secretariat, when it had proposed a reduction, had counted on the development of national bodies able to take over a part of the contents of the Bulletin.
(99) It was not impossible that the Organization of American States might give the Bulletin the aid it had offered for the Handbook on the International Exchanges of Publications.

(100) The proposal to maintain the credits necessary for the publication of the Unesco Bulletin for Libraries was approved by 24 votes against 6, with 13 abstentions.

(101) Resolution 4.12, as amended, was then unanimously approved.

Project 4.13: Implementation of international conventions and preparation of international agreements (paragraphs 84-100) and documents 8C/PRG/4, DR/45, DR/49 and DR/26

(102) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee recommended the adoption of draft resolution DR/45 with the

$3,000 increase in credits they involved.

(103) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) recalled that, on the basis of the recommendation which the Provisional Copyright Committee had made to the Director-General in May 1954, his country had offered to collaborate very closely with Unesco in publishing a compilation of copyright laws of the world in Spanish, consequently he hoped that there would be no opposition to the request to increase the credits required by $3,000.

DR/26: Index Translationum

(104) The draft resolution which had been submitted by the Italian delegation and which had been favourably recommended by the Executive Board, was unanimously approved, after being warmly seconded by the delegations of France, Lebanon, Chile, the German Federal Republic, Ecuador and the United Kingdom.

(105) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) emphasized the importance of the Index Translationum; her country wanted new translations to be made both of ancient and of modern famous works, amongst them, of the works of Rodo and Vaz Ferreira.

(106) Resolution 4.132, amended to conform with document 8C/DR/45 and seconded by the Italian delegation, was approved.

DR/49. Right of creative workers and research workers

(107) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had asked for clarification before taking a decision on that proposed by the Uruguayan delegation.

(108) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had not been in favour of the resolution in its existing form but was prepared to reconsider it if amended or redrafted.

(109) There being no seconder, the resolution was not put to the vote.

(110) Mr. UNGARETTI (Italy) explained the Italian delegation's position on three points concerning copyright:

(a) Unesco must draw Member States attention to the matter of "double taxation", so that a general convention might be adopted regarding it;

(b) Italy was prepared to take part in a wide exchange of television programmes provided copyrights were respected;

(c) A beginning had yet to be made in the matter of copyrights in the field of the visual arts.

(111) Mrs. SCHLUETER-HERMKES (German Federal Republic) congratulated the Department of Cultural Activities, and the Copyright Division in particular, on the work it had done for the universal convention.

(112) That work had to be successfully completed. The various texts of the law on copyright would have to be published not only in English, French and Spanish, but in each national language, since in legal texts shades of meaning were very important.

(113) Paragraphs 85-100 were unanimously approved.

(114) The CHAIRMAN informed the Commission of the sudden death of Mr. César Bolaña, Director of Administrative Services at the Legislative Palace, who was responsible for getting the meeting rooms ready for the Conference.

(115) Mr. Bolaña, by his untiring efforts, had made it possible for Unesco's General Conference to meet under the best possible conditions.

(116) The Chairman, on behalf of the Commission, expressed his sympathy with Mr. Bolaña's family in their bereavement and his gratitude to the deceased.

(The meeting stood and observed a minute's silence.)

(117) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Secretariat, even more than the members of the Commission or Conference delegates, knew of the intensive efforts which had been needed to adapt the Palacio Legislativo to the purposes of the Unesco General Conference. He wished to associate himself with the tribute paid to Señor Bolaña.

(118) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay), in the name of her country, thanked the Commission for their condolences upon the death of Mr. Julio César Bolaña.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

# TWENTY - FOURTH MEETING

*2 December 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

Document 8C/DR/115: Peaceful co-operation

(1) The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of India, Czechoslovakia and the United States of America had reached agreement on the text of a joint draft resolution on peaceful co-operation. He read the text.
(2) The Chairman added that the text read was the outcome of discussions among the three delegations on the Indian draft resolution (document 8C/DR/5 (rev.)), the amendment submitted by the delegation of Czechoslovakia (document 8C/DR/72) and the amendment submitted by the United States delegation (document 8C/DIV/131).
(3) The Chairman asked the Commission if it was prepared to discuss the document immediately or if it wished to wait until copies had been distributed.

(4) The United Kingdom delegation, seconded by the delegations of Chile and Ceylon, proposed that it be discussed forthwith.

(5) Agreed.

(6) Mr. MUJEEB (India) was happy to introduce the joint draft resolution. There was no need to stress its importance. The whole world now wished to move in the direction of peaceful coexistence. The current session of the Conference, which was more widely representative than any previous one, was the proper occasion for the adoption of such a resolution. The Government of India offered all the assistance it could dispose of in the forwarding of the aims it set forth.

(7) Mr. BARRENECHEA PINO (Chile) expressed his agreement with the proposal and the lofty ideals inspiring it. He thought, however, that the wording of the text was too involved, with too much repetition, and that it should be revised. It was important that the resolution should be comprehensible to the general public throughout the world.

(8) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) was sure every one understood that the drafting of the revised resolution had not been simple. In the present troubled times it was difficult for people with different points of view to agree. A representative text had been composed, and the delegate of the United States of America hoped it would not be found necessary to tamper with it.

(9) Mr. HEYEK (Czechoslovakia) emphasized the importance of the discussion that had been held on the problem, which bore on the basic principles underlying all Unesco's work. His delegation had supported the Indian proposal, made its own contribution and participated in the drafting of the final text.
(10) The Czechoslovak delegation would have preferred a clearer form of wording, particularly as far as the idea of peaceful coexistence was concerned. The current session of the Commission showed that peaceful coexistence was the foundation of all Unesco's projects, and also that it was possible to reach agreement on essential principles, even if they were imperfectly expressed.
(11) Mr. Hayek thought that the agreement reached by the three delegations was a hopeful sign that peaceful coexistence would increasingly influence international relations.

(12) Mr. BARRENECHEA PINO (Chile) explained that he had not made a request but merely a suggestion. If, however, the Commission considered that he had made a proposal, he would withdraw it in order not to confuse the discussion.

(13) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the major part of that resolution was a solemn appeal to Member States, but the last part also requested the Director-General to make an objective study. As a beginning, she suggested that the Secretariat might collect all possible information on the research already undertaken in that domain (history, political science, etc.) and further, it might ask those scientific organizations which held congresses during the next programme period, to establish small working parties and discuss how in their own branch it was possible to go forward along the lines proposed in the resolution. Mrs. Myrdal mentioned the tentative figure of $10,000 in that connexion.

(14) In submitting the joint resolution to the vote, the CHAIRMAN said that he felt very moved by it. It was a fine example of tolerance, moderation and understanding, and was of a completely different kind from the resolutions which the Commission adopted, with or without a vote, in the course of an ordinary day's work. He hoped that, if the rules permitted, the document would be adopted unanimously by acclamation.

(15) The delegate of Colombia having put the Chairman's suggestion in the form of a motion, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously by acclamation.

(16) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that it was clear in all minds that the new resolution

represented a very important development in the history of Unesco. The Organization would do all in its power to carry it out and to obtain the best possible results from the work it would undertake in that field.

ITEM 8.4.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: SOCIAL SCIENCES (continued)

Project 3.4: Social science and problems of international understanding and tensions (paragraphs 140-163)

(17) Mr. BRICHET (France) was unconditionally in favour of sections (A) Roads to agreement: mediation and other techniques for avoiding conflict, and (C) Improved information on foreign cultures. He felt some doubts, however, about section (B) Public acceptance or rejection of Unesco and United Nations principles. He wondered whether public opinion was sufficiently alive to such questions and stated that, in French country districts, for example, those principles were generally unknown, although they awakened great interest in all who were informed about them.
(18) The French delegate also pointed out that there were contradictions in the dates and thought that a stricter order should be observed for the activities concerned. In conclusion, he took the view that it was not yet possible to enter into the active phase and that section (B) of the project required additional study. He proposed that the relevant appropriations be deleted and transferred to some other part of the programme, where they would be more useful.

(19) At the CHAIRMAN's request, Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) pointed out that the activities under section (B) had been classed by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget in Category 3 (document 8C/BUD/1, page 12).

(20) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) wondered if Mrs. Myrdal had talked the subject over with the scientific groups.

(21) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) felt that the chapter in question was the weakest in the programme of Social Sciences, which was generally excellent. It was an intractable subject for practical measures. Sections (A), (B) and (C) were inadequate and could not be carried out without a stand being taken on controversial matters. Documents showing the failure of the techniques in question would have to contain critical remarks about governments, which Unesco could not publish. On (B) the delegate of the United Kingdom agreed with the French delegate. On (C) he remarked that education through seminars was part of Unesco's normal work. Sir Charles hoped that Mrs. Myrdal would study and prepare the section further before there was any question of its implementation.

(22) Mr. KABIR (India) agreed that the project should be postponed.

(23) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that, before reaching a decision on section (A), draft resolution 21 should be discussed.
(24) With regard to (C), there was a great need for experts on technical assistance missions to have an understanding of foreign cultures. The pamphlets were intended to counteract the stereotyped information that was so abundant on foreign countries. The idea had won support from many quarters, and the United States National Commission had asked Unesco to be more active in that field.
(25) On (B) views were divided and, in view of the budget increase, Mrs. Myrdal was willing to reduce the figure under paragraph 155 and defer the implementation of paragraph 156.

(26) Mr. TOROCHESNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the whole of project 3.4 and made some general remarks on the Social Sciences chapter as a whole.
(27) It was recognized in the USSR that differences of opinion did not prevent co-operation between scientists. Such co-operation was rendered still more necessary by the coexistence of different social and economic systems. Sociologists, economists, statisticians, demographers, etc., all working in the field of the social sciences, should join forces in the battle for peace and against the threat of a new war, for the peaceful coexistence of the two systems, the expansion of economic and cultural relations between all nations on a basis of equality and mutual interest, against all forms of discrimination and for all democratic rights and freedoms, for the raising of the living standard of the masses and aid to the economically underdeveloped countries.
(28) The Soviet delegate congratulated Unesco on having included in its social science programme, and particularly in project 3.4, a question as important as international co-operation and the elimination of tensions in international relations.
(29) In conclusion, he stated that the Soviet delegation would vote for the Social Sciences chapter in the hope that the fight for a lasting peace and the improvement of the living conditions of mankind would in future be a guiding principle in the work of Unesco and the organizations co-operating with it. At the same time the Soviet delegate made it clear that the application of those resolutions should in no way run counter to the national laws of the various countries concerned.

(30) Mrs. JOBORU (Hungary) considered that any effort to reduce international tension was at the heart of Unesco's work, and that not only should all items in that part of the programme be maintained, but further items added to it, such as the proposal of an international conference of outstanding social scientists from countries with different social systems, and the issuing of a high-level publication in which leading scientists and statesmen could express their outlook on tensions, as explained in the motion of the Indian delegation.

(31) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) referred to section (C). He enquired how an objective picture could be obtained. Would not much more harm be done in the country that was written about than good to the scientists visiting it?

(32) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) moved a resolution that the whole section be referred back to the Director-General for further study. He would like the section kept in the programme, and suggested that the Director-General might produce a broad outline to be submitted to a small meeting on Monday or Tuesday.

(33) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) wished to make it clear that he had not intended his earlier intervention as a criticism. He did not wish Mrs. Myrdal to receive the impression that her programme was not approved of. He would agree to minor changes, but it should not be reduced, in view of the resolution just voted by the meeting.

(34) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegate, supported by the delegate of Hungary, to refer project 3.4 back to the Director-General was put to the vote and adopted by 32 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions.

**ITEM 8.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CULTURAL ACTIVITIES** (continued)

(35) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) explained his delegation's attitude towards the budget for the Department of Cultural Activities. While recognizing the major importance of the Department's programme, he protested against the unexpected increases in its budget, which were in danger of upsetting a balance which the Secretariat had had great difficulty in attaining.
(36) Mr. Panneton could detect little sign of efforts to achieve concentration, although concentration was supposed to be the keynote of the current session. For example, the number of organizations to be granted subventions had increased from 7 to 15. He expressed regret that the directives issued by the General Conference at its seventh session had not been better followed and had not inspired greater moderation in the various delegations.

Project 4.13: Implementation of international conventions and preparation of international agreements (continued)

(B) International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (paragraphs 101-110) and document 8C/PRG/23

(37) Mr. LORENTZ (Poland) drew the Commission's attention to the restrictions contained in the Convention signed at The Hague. For example, under paragraph 2 of Article 11, it was possible, in exceptional cases of unavoidable military necessity during an armed conflict, for immunity to be withdrawn from cultural property under special protection upon the order of the officer commanding a force the equivalent of a division in size or larger.
(38) The Polish delegate pointed out that the world had seen many instances of the destruction of cultural treasures, but never in the past had those held responsible for such destruction been excused or their acts legalized; on the contrary, they had been considered unpardonable acts of vandalism.

(39) Invoking paragraph 5 of the Protocol to The Hague Convention, Mr. Lorentz claimed the restoration of Polish cultural treasures deposited in other countries during the war.
(40) The delegate of Poland declared that his Government had signed the Convention and Protocol to demonstrate Poland's firm desire for cultural co-operation with all nations and to show its will to reach common agreement, even with those whose outlook and opinions were entirely different from its own.
(41) The Polish delegation accepted the whole of section (B) of project 4.13, in the hope that the national advisory committees set up under resolution II annexed to The Hague Convention would know how to interpret the articles and induce the different nations to take action in accordance with the spirit rather than the letter of the Convention.
(42) The Polish delegate expressed the hope that the various documents would ensure lasting protection, not only of the cultural property of nations, but also of the cultural heritage of mankind as a whole.

(43) Miss NEFFA (Lebanon) stated that the Lebanese Government attached special importance to the International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. It hoped that the Secretariat would give priority to that part of the programme, and that it would, in particular, ensure wider dissemination of information on problems relating to monuments to all countries interested, such as those of the Middle East.
(44) She suggested that, in order to ensure wider circulation of information, the Manual mentioned in paragraph 109 should be distributed not only to fine arts ministries, but also to National Commissions and to all the museums of the Middle East.

(45) Mr. NAVRATIL (Czechoslovakia) reminded the Commission that his delegation was represented on the Working Party on International Regulations, and had voted for the resolution concerning the Report on the Results of the Intergovernmental Conference on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. With the object of recalling Unesco's basic aims, it had moved an amendment to that resolution, consisting of the insertion of the following words before paragraph 3:

"While pursuing the aim, prescribed in the Constitution, of strengthening the defences of a peace founded on the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind .....".

(46) The Czechoslovak delegate regretted that that idealistic clause had not been accepted, for it would have strengthened Unesco's moral standing with the public.
(47) As it had voted for the draft resolution, the Czechoslovak delegation would not propose the amendment a second time, but would content itself with the foregoing statement of principle made before the Commission.

(48) Mrs. REINOSO DE RODRIGUEZ (Philippines) was strongly in favour of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. The smallest piece of cultural

property was a link between the past and the future. The amount budgeted in paragraph 110 was fully justified.

(49) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) seconded the suggestion made by the Lebanese delegate with a view to obtaining the widest possible circulation for the Manual on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

(50) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) approved document 8C/PRG/4, but wished to substitute, in paragraph 4 of the resolution, the word "recommends" for the word "requests". The resolution has been seconded by the delegate of the United States of America and adopted, without opposition, with one abstention.

(51) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) wished to clarify the position of his Government: Australia's signing of the final act and Convention adopted by the Conference should not be understood to prejudge its final decision with regard to becoming a party to the Convention. That question was at present under consideration.

(52) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) had certain reservations to make in respect of the International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

(53) In reply to a remark by Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities), Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) said that, while it was true that Greece had signed the Convention, his Government had instructed him to put forward certain reservations relating to the application of its provisions.

(54) Paragraphs 101-110 were then put to the vote and adopted, with one abstention.

(55) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the Commission's decisions applied to the Report of the Working Party on International Regulations (document 8C/PRG/23) and not to the Report on the Results of the Intergovernmental Conference on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (document 8C/PRG/4).

(56) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) then read the draft resolution on page 7 of the Report (document 8C/PRG/4), which had been adopted by the Working Party without opposition abstention (document 8C/PRG/23, pages 1 and 2).

(57) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) suggested a change of one word in paragraph 5: "to ensure application of the provisions" should be replaced by "to request application of the provisions".

(58) Mr. BRICHET (France) pointed out that The Hague Convention could hardly be modified, even if it were only a question of a single word, since that Convention had been signed by government representatives in May.

(59) The draft resolution submitted by the Working Party on International Regulations and relating to the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict was adopted, with 3 abstentions.

(C) International agreements on the exchange of publications and the microfilm reproduction of documents (paragraphs 111-113)

(60) Adopted without discussion.

(D) International regulations with regard to archaeological excavations (paragraphs 114-117)

(61) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) drew attention to the report on the desirability of establishing international regulations with regard to archaeological excavations (document 8C/PRG/5). The Working Party also submitted to the Commission a draft resolution appearing on page 3 of its report (document 8C/PRG/23).

(62) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) supported the proposals for international regulations with regard to archaeological excavations.

(63) Speaking not as a delegate but in a private capacity, Mr. Estelrich wished to draw the attention of those responsible for the preparation of the preliminary draft regulations to the fact that there were archaeological zones of great prehistoric and historical importance, such as Tangiers, which were at the same time, politically speaking, international zones.

(64) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) pointed out that, in his country, there were real archaeological treasures which had a valuable contribution to make to knowledge of ancient cultures. For that reason, his delegation would support the establishment of international regulations with regard to archaeological excavations.

(65) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) represented a country with cultural values rooted in prehistory. Its experience of excavations that had not been carried out on a scientific basis had led it to believe that rules were very valuable, and that where they were not followed it was better to leave antiquities untouched. His country would be glad to co-operate with any committee that might be established with a view to setting up such regulations. Egyptian non-governmental organizations offered their support.

(66) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) stated that his Government would prefer a fairly flexible system of protection by means of an international convention containing only the bare principles on which it would be easy to reach agreement. Such a convention would be supplemented by recommendations, and experience would show which were the countries determined to conform to the convention.

(67) Mr. LORENTZ (Poland) recalled the statement which he had made in the Working Party on the subject of archaeological excavations. In Poland, archaeological excavations had shown marked expansion during recent years and had aroused keen

interest both in government circles and among the public.
(68) Poland would gladly take part in excavations undertaken on an international scale and in the preparation of a convention relating thereto.
(69) The Polish delegate expressed his approval of the project and his willingness to co-operate in the drafting of international regulations with regard to excavations.

(70) Mrs. ZUEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the Soviet delegation had no objection to resolution 4.132, but would like to make some comments on the proposal to establish international regulations with regard to archaeological excavations.
(71) The Soviet Government attached great importance to the scientific value of archaeological excavations and to the preservation of historic monuments. All archaeological monuments in the USSR were classified by the Government in accordance with the laws in force. Archaeologists had the right to declare a particular area important, after which there could be no further building in it until it had been inspected by the State, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, or those of the Federated Republics. Excavations were conducted in accordance with a State plan and under the supervision of the academies.
(72) Every year, scores of scientific missions carried out excavations and drew up reports, describing the archaeological monuments in scientific terms. Cultural treasures were preserved where found or transferred to museums. The Moscow History Museum contained more than 900,000 objects discovered by archaeologists.
(73) Soviet archaeologists had acquired a great deal of experience in the organization and utilization of archaeological excavations and were ready to share their experience with archaeologists of other countries.

(74) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) drew the Commission's attention to the fourth paragraph of the resolution on the regulations with regard to archaeological excavations, referring to excavations in occupied territory. In his opinion, the rights of an occupied territory where excavations were being carried out should be fully safeguarded, and its position in relation to the occupying power strengthened.

(75) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) shared the Belgian delegate's opinion and thought that what had started as a recommendation, and had already begun to be implemented, might later be incorporated in an international agreement.
(76) He added that it would be interesting one day to write a history of the objects of archaeological value scattered throughout the museums of the world, including a description of the road they had travelled before coming to rest in the museums.

(77) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) observed that the Working Party had advocated international regulations in the form of a recommendation to Member States, in accordance with procedure laid down by the General Conference.

(78) The Working Party's proposal under item 8.4.4.3 of the agenda concerning the international regulation of archaeological excavations was adopted, together with its resolution relating to draft regulations for international competitions in architecture (document 8C/PRG/23).

Project 4.14: Unesco library and reference services (paragraphs 118-121)

(79) Mr. KABIR (India) felt that, however valuable the services rendered under that project, the provision of $53,000 a year for staff and $13,000 other costs was somewhat high, and ought to be justified by making the library available to Member States upon request, in the form of mimeographic copies, for example.

(80) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) informed the Commission that the Unesco library was chiefly stocked with reference works, collections of reviews and periodicals, and other publications necessary to the proper functioning of the different sections of the Secretariat. The library also had a service responsible for documentation and the checking of bibliographies included in Unesco publications. At present, it included 12,500 reference works, and 13,000 volumes necessary for the carrying out of Unesco's ordinary and technical assistance programmes. It received about 2,000 requests per month. Further, the Unesco library availed itself of the lending services of all the Paris libraries.
(81) Apart from the services which it rendered to the Secretariat, the library, in spite of its limited means, placed its services as far as possible at the disposal of Member States.

(82) Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur), speaking as delegate of the United States of America, had no objection to the project but questioned its being placed in the chapter on Cultural Activities.

(83) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that it was really as well placed there as anywhere else. He was reluctant to add to the units working directly under the Director-General's office.

(84) Project 4.14 was adopted.

(85) The CHAIRMAN, observing that the Commission was behindhand with its work, urged delegates, in examining the programme resolutions, to leave the Secretariat a certain amount of freedom in carrying them out.

(86) No objections having been raised, the above procedure was approved.

(87) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) reiterated the proposal of the Italian delegation to increase the subvention granted by Unesco to the International Association of the Visual Arts by $2,000, thereby bringing it up to $8,000 per annum. He reminded the Commission that the result of the vote on the proposal had been divided, 20 for and 20 against, and he therefore requested the Commission to vote a second time, in

accordance with Rule 90 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference.

(88) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) having observed that the taking of the second vote should appear on the Commission's agenda, the CHAIRMAN read Rule 90 and Mr. BRANCA (Italy), referring to certain precedents, requested that his proposal be included on the agenda of the next meeting, should the Commission decide against taking an immediate vote.

(89) The delegates of France and Greece having moved that a vote be taken immediately on the proposed increase, it was approved by 25 votes to 15, with 4 abstentions.

Project 4.2: Preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind

Paragraphs 122-131

(90) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) remarked that the Secretariat had studied the possibility of setting up the centre proposed under (A) either in Brussels or in Rome. The cultural co-operation existing between his country and Italy was a source of great satisfaction to him and he had no desire to create competition; he therefore proposed that the Director-General be asked to decide on the choice of the town in consultation with the Executive Board. He hoped that the Italian delegation would agree to that proposal. (Mr. Branca indicated his assent.)

(91) Dr. KEKHIA (Libya) begged leave to present his delegation's draft resolution on archaeological research in Libya (document 8C/DR/111). He observed that the proposal fitted into the project under discussion and entailed no additional expense.

(92) Mr. BRICHET (France) believed that many countries had needs similar to those of Libya and expressed the hope that the Libyan proposal would be submitted to the International Committee on Monuments. He moved adjournment of the debate on the proposal.

(93) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) strongly supported the delegate of Libya. The case of Libya was a very special one and deserved all the encouragement and useful service the establishment of an institute in that area would provide.

(94) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) seconded the proposal.

(95) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) requested the Libyan delegate to confirm that his proposal had no budgetary implications.

(96) Dr. KEKHIA (Libya) having given the assurance requested, his proposal was put to the vote and adopted by 43 votes, with 4 abstentions.

(97) Mr. BRICHET (France), returning to the subject of the budget estimates for the establishment of the centre, noted that it was proposed to spend most of the money on the remuneration of a legal expert to draw up the centre's statutes. In his opinion, Unesco's Legal Adviser was perfectly capable of doing the work and he proposed the deletion of the estimates in paragraph 131.

(98) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) had been about to make the same point. It was an item which might lead to large expenditure at a later date. It was possible today to get a good deal of advice at the big museums, and it was doubtful if an international centre would be able to provide anything as good.

(99) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Switzerland, emphasized the importance of setting up an international study centre. The International Council of Museums and the International Committee on Monuments were both responsible bodies and perfectly capable of establishing such a centre. Some of the large museums in different parts of the world had developed techniques leaving little to be desired, but small museums still made many mistakes. He was therefore in favour of maintaining the amounts proposed in paragraph 131.

(100) After the representative of the Executive Board had stated that the Board was in favour of the project, Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) drew the Commission's attention to the fact that the estimate for 1955 was divided into two parts, namely contract ($900) and staff travel ($120). He requested the French delegate to rely on the judgment of the Director-General as far as travel was concerned. He recalled, moreover, that the Italian delegate had expressed approval of the project. The only object of Mr. Thomas' explanation was to make it clear why the proposed sums were necessary.

(101) Mr. BRICHET (France) having pressed for the deletion of the sum of $900, Mr. BRANCA (Italy) seconded the proposal that the centre's statutes should be drawn up by specialists in the Secretariat, without the help of an outside expert.

(102) The French proposal, seconded by the United Kingdom delegation, was put to the vote and adopted by 25 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

(103) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) then read the last two paragraphs of the Indian draft resolution contained in document 8C/DR/17.

(104) The Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had advised rejection of the project and the Executive Board had considered it premature.

(105) Mr. KABIR (India), speaking on the last paragraph of DR/17, was very keen to promote that activity. His Government would be prepared to sacrifice the proposed museum in Chandigarh, the new capital of East Punjab, for the sake of having the museum in New Delhi.

(106) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that, if it were a question of exploring the possibilities of establishing such a laboratory, Unesco would have no need to call

on outside experts and there would be no budgetary implications. If, on the other hand, a mission of experts were proposed, that would not be possible within the present programme. As far as fellowships were concerned, two additional fellowships, totalling $5,800, would have to be provided for out of the budget of the Exchange of Persons Service.
(107) Mr. Thomas believed that the Executive Board had drawn the Indian delegation's attention to the desirability of establishing an international centre before a regional one for South and South East Asia.

(108) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) thought that the Indian Government might establish the laboratory.

(109) In the light of all the comments made, the Indian delegation withdrew its proposal.

(B) Centre of photographic documentation on Egyptian antiquities (paragraphs 132-134)

(110) Adopted without discussion.

(C) International Committee on Monuments (paragraphs 135 and 136)

(111) Adopted without discussion.

(D) Cataloguing and preservation of Middle Eastern manuscripts (paragraphs 137-144)

(112) Miss NEFFA (Lebanon) fully supported the project, since the importance of the manuscripts was universally recognized. She hoped that Unesco would attach to the inventory all the importance which it deserved and that the work would be carried on even after the two-year period covered by the draft programme. She therefore suggested inserting in the work plan, not only that the Secretariat would consult the States concerned, but also that it would take advantage of the forthcoming congress of orientalists to consult experts on the choice of manuscripts to be catalogued.

(113) The project was approved.

(E) Technical aid to Member States (paragraphs 145-147)

(114) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon), referring to paragraph 146, enquired whether the allocation provided here would be sufficient to cover at least the six requests that had been received from Member States and, if not, what additional provision could be made for the purpose.

(115) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that mention had been made only of requests already received. Since the publication of document 8C/5, however, other requests had come in and, if they were to be met, a marked increase in the budget would be necessary.

(116) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) made a general observation on the technical aid programme. The work plans, architectural designs etc., he felt, should be very broadly stated in order that the requests of Member States could be met with the required flexibility. The Secretariat should give preference to those national projects for which national authorities had already provided the major part of the cost. He insisted that, since the requests submitted by his Government and that of Libya had been made as early as 1950, the mission proposed should at least include those two requests.

(117) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) proposed that the budget in paragraph 147 should be doubled.

(118) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) reminded the Commission that the Brazilian and Egyptian delegations had originally been responsible for the inclusion of the project. When it had been drawn up in 1950 it had been realized that it meant imposing a heavy burden on Unesco, since, to carry it out successfully, enormous sums would be needed. In order to raise the necessary money, various methods had been employed, including a tourist tax.
(119) Unesco was at present in a difficult position, for the aid which it was able to give, although necessary, was more or less symbolic. The Brazilian delegate concluded by seconding the proposal of the delegate of Ceylon, which was also supported by the delegates of Liberia and Egypt.

(120) The CHAIRMAN warned the Commission against unforeseen or disproportionate increases in the budget. He recalled that it had already agreed to important increases in the budgets of the Departments of Education and Natural Sciences.

(121) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) claimed that it would be an irresponsible decision to double the amount so suddenly for an item which the Secretariat had considered at great length. He felt, too, that Member States ought to show their need of a project by themselves offering to pay a large part of the expense.

(122) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand), with all respect for the position of those who had put up the proposal, felt that the living (in such things as fundamental education in particular) came before dead monuments, given Unesco's limited budget.

(123) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) warmly supported the delegate of Ceylon. Replying to the United Kingdom delegate's remark, he said that such missions were followed up by very considerable expenditure in the carrying out of advice given. To the delegate of New Zealand he replied that museums were a powerful source of education. The increase of expenditure could surely be taken into consideration by the Advisory Committee with all similar increases, without affecting the budget ceiling.

(124) Mr. SHARIF commended the remarks of the delegate of Burma.

(125) A vote was then taken on the proposal of the delegate of Ceylon, which was adopted by 25 in favour, 13 against and 9 abstentions.

Project 4.31: Humanistic studies in culture and education

(126) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) approved the estimates and also the Italian draft amendment to resolution 4.31 (B), paragraph 159 (document 8C/DR/78 (rev.)).
(127) He thought that the rôle of the humanities in contemporary culture was one of the major cultural problems of the last thirty years. To disregard their importance in the Western world was to disregard the past, present and future of Western civilization. The humanities at the present time, in order to be relevant and operative, had to provide a satisfactory answer to the aspirations and needs of the modern world.
(128) Spain, in conformity with its humanistic traditions, wished to take part in Unesco's surveys and was ready to organize the necessary activities in Spain, where a Society of Classical Studies existed and had recently been admitted to membership of the International Federation of Societies of Classical Studies at its Congress in Copenhagen.

(129) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) approved the estimates for project 4.31, but wished to make certain reservations, for the project seemed to him to indicate a tendency in the department concerned to identify the concept of the humanities with the study of the classical literature of East and West alike.
(130) Did not all human achievements throughout the ages in the various artistic, literary, scientific and technical fields belong to the entire world, and should they not therefore be integrated in a wider and more modern humanism? Was it perhaps that the training of a "man" was incompatible with the training of a "factory hand", and literary education incompatible with practical, technical education?
(131) In Mr. Zamorano Hernandez's opinion, the notion of humanism developed in time with the course of the social revolution and the evolution of man's interests, including his "scientific" interests, without identification of the latter with any occupational purpose.
(132) On those grounds, the delegation of Chile could not subscribe unreservedly to the point of view emerging from the two paragraphs under consideration.

(133) The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the slowness with which the discussion was proceeding. He would be compelled to ask the General Committee whether the Commission should be allowed to hold such long discussions, which might make it necessary to prolong the eighth session of the General Conference.

(134) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) proposed that, in starting a new chapter, the general debate should be omitted except for its introduction by the Chief of the department.

(135) The CHAIRMAN proposed that, if the Rules of Procedure permitted it, and if the Commission were prepared to accept it, the number of speeches on each subject be limited.

(136) After further discussion, the various proposals, aiming at limiting the number of speeches, were rejected.

The rôle of the humanities in contemporary culture (paragraphs 153-156)

(137) Mrs. SCHLUSTER-HERMKES (German Federal Republic), disagreeing with the opinion expressed by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, proposed that the project be given high priority.
(138) She thought that the appropriations proposed were insufficient.
(139) She was surprised that the results of sociological research should have shown that the importance attached to classical and humanistic studies was on the decrease, while, on the other hand, interest in classical and humanistic culture was increasing among the masses. She concluded by saying that letters must be saved if human values were to survive.

(140) Mrs. PATRONETTO VALIER (Italy) drew the Commission's attention to the draft amendment submitted by the Italian delegation on the subject of humanistic studies in education (document 8C/DR/78 (rev.)), which had no budgetary implications.

(141) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) proposed deletion of the estimates under paragraphs 156, 160 and 164. Those were important items but could not be covered by the present budget.

(142) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) drew the Commission's attention to the wording of paragraph 153, with particular reference to the listing of "intellectual traditions, art and religion, and cultural values in general". In his opinion, they were of unequal value and should not be grouped together. He thought that the Secretariat had made a mistake there.

(143) Miss MONTERO SAPRIZA (Pax Romana) said that the international movement of Catholic intellectuals which she represented favoured investigating the amount of importance attaching to classical and humanistic studies in the cultural development of communities, since, in view of the exigencies of ultra-specialized modern life, when man was in danger of being increasingly dominated by technology, the need was felt to awaken interest in all forms of culture, and more particularly in philosophy and art.
(144) In her view, it was not a matter of preparing the individual exclusively for a particular branch of technical work, but for fuller understanding of the problems of his environment. It was not only important to the individual that his mental horizon should be enlarged by humanistic studies; for international understanding and co-operation, those studies had a real contribution to make.
(145) She reminded the Commission that one of Unesco's aims was to encourage the development of the means of disseminating works of art, affording man the chance of enjoying the works which constituted humanity's artistic heritage. That being so, she suggested that steps be taken to facilitate free

access to museums, art galleries, etc., for the largest possible number of persons, especially art students and students in general; the ideal would be for all, whatever their station, to have free access, as was the case in almost all parts of the Americas.

(146) Mr. GOMEZ HOYOS (Colombia) thought that the considerations advanced by the Advisory Committee were a trifle inconsistent in that matter, since they began by recognizing explicitly the value of the Director-General's recommendations and proposals in that part of the programme and ended by expressing the view that they should be given a different priority.
(147) He wished to make it quite clear that his delegation most warmly supported the proposal of the German Federal Republic that either the programme and budget submitted in that section be retained as it stood, or that it be increased; the latter would have the effect of stimulating that particular work a little more.

(148) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) supported the delegate of Norway. The case in point, he said, was one of the clearest examples of neglect of the principle of concentration approved by the Commission.

(149) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) did not intend to go into details regarding the substance of the project; as far as wording was concerned, the Secretariat was in agreement with the proposals made. The estimates were modest and fitted in exactly with the work plan. The point was, firstly, to stimulate the activities of National Commissions and, secondly, to hand over work to non-governmental organizations, against remuneration in the form of contracts which did not greatly increase the budget.

(150) The proposal of the Norwegian delegation to delete the estimates in paragraph 156 was rejected by 20 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.

(151) The German proposal to increase the estimates in paragraph 156 by $12,000 for the two years 1955 and 1956 was also rejected by 25 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

(B) Enquiry into the teaching of the humanities (paragraphs 157-160)

(152) Mrs. PATRONETTO VALIER (Italy) requested that her delegation's amendment (document 8C/DR/78 (rev.)) be incorporated in the work plan without any additional budgetary provision.

(153) Mr. CASSANI (Argentina) stated that his delegation was much in favour of the Italian amendment, but it introduced a concept - that of cultural regions - which Argentina could not accept. If that part of the amendment could be modified, his delegation would support it.

(154) The estimates for paragraphs 157-160 were approved.

(155) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) asked the Secretariat to incorporate the Italian proposal in its working plans. It did not affect the budget.

(156) Agreed.

(C) The use of radio and television in cultural programmes (paragraphs 161-164) (Joint project with the Department of Mass Communication)

(157) Mr. BRICHET (France) drew the Commission's attention to the importance of the relations between radio and television organizations, on the one hand, and the public on the other. He proposed that the estimate in paragraph 164 be maintained, despite the opinion expressed by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(158) His proposal was adopted.

(D) A study of traditional cultures in communities of South East Asia undergoing rapid technological changes (paragraphs 165-171)

(159) Adopted without discussion.

Project 4.32: Education through the arts and the crafts (paragraphs 172-184)

(A) Production of study materials and teaching aids (paragraphs 177 and 178)

(160) Mr. BRICHET (France) drew the Commission's attention to the need for close contact between the Departments of Cultural Activities and Education in carrying out the project under discussion.

(161) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) on paragraphs 177 and 178, suggested that the study was important but could be improved if carried out through the International Society for Education through Art, which had at one time received a subvention from Unesco, and ought still to receive one.

(162) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that the Secretariat shared the view of the United Kingdom delegate. That was why contracts had been chosen instead of subventions for the production of study materials and teaching aids. He assured the French delegate that close contact existed between his Department and other Unesco services for the execution of joint projects.

(163) Miss NEFFA (Lebanon) did not think that the publication of the proposed technical handbook would be a sure method of achieving the end desired, namely the development of education through the arts and the crafts.
(164) It was understandable that, in science teaching, for example, a technical manual and materials for practical work should be needed, in art teaching, however, it was doubtful whether such a text would be widely used.
(165) She realized that she was dealing with a rather delicate subject, but wished to draw the attention of the Commission to it and to state that, while she certainly approved the intentions underlying the

project, she was not very pleased with the work plans as they stood.

(166) Paragraphs 172-178 were adopted.

(B) Promotion of adult education through the arts (paragraphs 179-181)

(167) The Indian delegation having agreed to submit its draft resolution to the Secretariat in the form of a directive, the section was adopted without discussion.

(C) Technical aid to Member States (paragraphs 182-184)

(168) Adopted without discussion.

The meeting rose at 7 p. m.

# TWENTY - FIFTH MEETING

*2 December 1954 at 9.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)
*later* Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur) (United States of America)

(1) The CHAIRMAN, noting that there was no quorum, suspended the meeting for ten minutes.
(2) When the meeting had reassembled, the Chairman suggested that, as he would be unable to remain for the whole meeting, and as the three Vice-Chairmen were detained elsewhere, the Rapporteur be invited, in accordance with the rules, to preside over the debates.

(3) Agreed.

(Mr. Hope, Rapporteur, took the Chair.)

**ITEM 8.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA : CULTURAL ACTIVITIES (continued)**

Project 4.33: Contribution to fundamental education (paragraphs 186-201)

(4) Mr. MUJEEB (India) observed that, if the project for the planning and production of reading material for new literates were adopted, it would mean immediate and enormous benefit for millions of people. With regard to paragraphs 189 and 190, the Indian delegation was of opinion that it would be better if, in the first place, the Member States and National Commissions concerned were asked to collect, study, and evaluate all the material that already existed, and examine the methods used in the production of literature for new literates and for its assessment through field workers. Then Unesco should organize regional conferences, with its experts as conveners, to make a study of the material and the reports of Member States, and to compare methods and experience. The findings of those conferences would serve as a basis for further action by Member States, in consultation and collaboration with Unesco.
(5) Referring to paragraphs 191-199, the delegate of India thought that the proposal that Unesco should prepare a set of 24 books to form a nucleus of a series of reading material for new literates was most attractive. Experience in India, however, suggested that it would be advisable to have a larger number of books, of 16 pages on an average, and the Director-General might consider whether it would be possible to have 50 books instead of 24 within the proposed budget. The books should be written in the language of the people for whom they were meant or in a language whose idiom was not too different.
(6) With regard to the distribution of the books referred to in paragraph 197, it would be better if Unesco specified the subjects, the number and type of illustrations for each book and the quality of the printing, and offered to pay a reasonable percentage of the cost to the Member States concerned. Arrangements along those lines had been made by the Delhi public library in India for the 25 booklets produced by it.
(7) In preparing reading material for new literates, the cost of production was of great importance. The Indian delegation therefore especially welcomed the proposal of assistance to Member States in printing and distribution facilities. Further, it would suggest that the offer of prizes made in paragraph 197 should be made both to individuals and to organizations engaged in literacy work, and that each organization should be asked, when it sent in its scripts, to name the person or persons to whom the preparation of the scripts was entrusted and to whom it would give the travelling fellowship or prize if its scripts were considered the best.

(8) Mr. CHARYAVIBHAJ (Thailand) had read the project with great interest and was sure that it would be very much appreciated by the Member States concerned. In his delegation's view, the chief problem was the choice of experts, and the greatest care should be taken in selecting them.
(9) With regard to choice of subjects, he suggested the addition of very elementary textbooks on such subjects as farming, poultry-keeping etc., since

new literates would first be interested in their vocations and the things which they saw around them. Immediate interest would lead to further interest in scientific and cultural subjects.
(10) In conclusion, the delegate of Thailand agreed with the delegate of India that the Member States and National Commissions concerned should be consulted before any books were produced. Subject to those comments, he moved approval of the budget estimates in paragraph 201.

(11) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) strongly supported the project and the motion to approve the budget estimates. Adding to the points already raised by the delegates of India and Thailand, he pointed out that, although the project was a new one for Unesco, it was an old one for certain countries which had already acquired a great deal of experience in the field of fundamental education. Unesco's Arab States Fundamental Education Centre (ASFEC) existed in Egypt, but there were also a great many national projects of the same kind. Strenuous efforts were being made, for example, to produce primers. He therefore suggested that Unesco make full use of the experience acquired by those working in the field. A number of non-governmental organizations would certainly wish to participate in the project.
(12) As regarded experts, it was essential to have experts who spoke the language of the people concerned and had the cultural background of that language.
(13) With regard to choice of subjects, they should be in conformity with the cultural pattern of the area.
(14) In conclusion, the delegate of Egypt considered the project to be worthy of full support and hoped that it would be approved by the General Conference unanimously.

(15) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) had two points to raise. Firstly, he hoped that in the proposed Unesco experiment, which would have advantages over most national projects, some study would be made of the layout of books, types of pictures and forms of print. Secondly, among the excellent subjects listed, he hoped that some literature, other than purely utilitarian literature, would be included. People should be taught to read for their amusement. In his own experience, a story of tribal history had sold far better than the usual didactic material. New literates might be introduced, for example, to Plato's Republic.

(16) Mr. BRICHET (France) stated that his delegation approved the principle embodied in resolution 4.33 and would vote for the proposed financial provisions.
(17) He felt doubtful, however, about the usefulness of the procedure proposed in paragraph 189. He urged that National Commissions and the administrative authorities of the States concerned be more closely associated with Unesco's activities in that field.

(18) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq) explained that he had worked on the project with Unesco experts in 1951, when the Organization had carried out a three months' experimental project in Egypt and the Dujaila project in Iraq, lasting two months and twenty days. On the basis of his experience, he wished to draw attention to two main points. Firstly new literates needed primers; secondly, they needed follow-up materials, including very short books dealing with various subjects. He hoped that full use would be made of the material resulting from the 1951 experiments. Iraq would be very happy to transmit to Unesco the books already produced.

(19) Mr. BERGSTRAESSER (German Federal Republic) asked the Secretariat what was meant in paragraph 193 by "world's classics". Secondly, he wondered if the Secretariat felt that, after only one year of investigation by experts, the field would have been sufficiently explored for the project to be launched.

(20) Mr. BARDALES (Honduras) emphasized the importance of careful preparation of texts designed for new literates. The persisting lack of suitable texts for that purpose had already caused some literacy campaigns to fail. He recommended that the experiments and achievements of the Education Section of the Organization of American States be taken into account. The Public Library which that Organization had established included three sections: science, arts and civics. Unesco should not go ahead with that part of its programme without having first examined and profited by experience gained in American countries.

(21) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) had been specially instructed by his Government to say how interested it was in the activities referred to in paragraph 189. Mexico was carrying out intense literacy campaigns of its own. All classes of society, including the ordinary people and even soldiers, were taking part in them. Such campaigns were suffering from a lack of suitable reading material. The Literacy Commission, which was an official government organ, was responsible for the study of that important problem. Teachers were afraid that classical texts would be chosen for the purpose, experience had taught them that the reading of selections from the classics did not produce the results desired. He recommended that Unesco send an expert to Mexico to study that problem and the experiments in teaching people to read and write that were being conducted there.

(22) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Secretariat would do its best to carry out the suggestions made during the debate.
(23) He noted that there were three suggestions on which there appeared to be general agreement:

1. Greater account should be taken of the experience gained by Member States and intergovernmental organizations and the results which they had obtained.
2. The contents of books and pamphlets distributed by Unesco should be based on suggestions made by the States concerned, instead of being imposed from outside.
3. The Secretariat should work in close cooperation with National Commissions and national or local administrative authorities.

(24) Mr. Thomas explained that the Secretariat, realizing that the work plans should be kept fairly flexible, had already considered the possibility of basing its activities on those three principles.
(25) In reply to the question raised by the delegate of the German Federal Republic, Mr. Thomas suggested that the quotation marks before and after "world's classics" might be deleted, thus making the text clearer.
(26) He regretted that he was unable to reply to the remark of the Mexican delegate concerning translations of classical works in his country, as the Secretariat had not as yet acquired much experience in that field.

(27) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) wished to be assured that consideration would be given to the proposal made by his delegation in document 8C/DR/83.
(28) He was somewhat concerned about the word "adaptation", which suggested to him a summary in a few pages. He wondered whether that method would convey the author's thought faithfully and said that he would prefer "adapted presentation" or a similar expression.

(29) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) assured the delegate of Italy that the Secretariat would take the suggestions made in document 8C/DR/83 into consideration. He observed that some of them concerned projects which would be discussed later.
(30) In connexion with the word "adaptation", there was no cause for misgiving, for, in the Secretariat's view, that word had no dishonest implications; it had entered into current speech and was used by the best contemporary authors.

(31) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) thoroughly agreed with what the Italian delegate had said. The word "adaptation" of the world's classics filled her with horror. The consequences of that process would be disastrous. Such adaptations were causing great harm in the theatre, the cinema and in literature. They gave a wretched impression of the great authors who had been lights of the world in their several generations. It was as if the reader were directed down paths unlit by the true originality and greatness of the authors.

(32) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) agreed with the Mexican delegate. He urged that the words "subject to revision in the light of information to be gathered in 1955", be given all due importance and, to that end, asked the Secretariat to consult the Organization of American States. He was dissatisfied with the subjects proposed in paragraphs 193-196 as material for new literates. He recommended that such texts should bear on the everyday surroundings of readers. For example health was mentioned, but there was no reference to nutrition or domestic and family life. He would prefer such subjects to be dealt with first, and later there would be time to pass on to the classics.

(33) The motion of the delegate of Thailand, recommending approval of the budget estimates in paragraph 201, was seconded by several delegations.

Project 4.34: Development of libraries (paragraphs 203-218)

(34) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) proposed that the paragraphs under resolution 4.34 be studied separately when new questions affecting different parts or areas of the world were discussed. Further, some speakers might wish to touch upon more than one of those items and, on that account, they should be allowed to speak for 5 minutes rather than 3.

(35) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) asked whether a Japanese librarian or educator could be included amongst those taking part in the Seminar on Public Library Development in Asia.

(36) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that the Secretariat would take the wish expressed by the Japanese delegate into consideration.

(37) Paragraphs 203-218 were approved.

Pilot project for the development of public libraries in Africa (paragraphs 219-223)

(38) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) recalled that Miss Summers, of Unesco's Libraries Division, had visited West Africa early in 1954. As a result of her visit, many countries of the area had expressed interest in having the project established in their territory.
(39) As Mr. Massaquoi had already pointed out at a meeting of the Executive Board, the sum of $15,000 was inadequate for a pilot project designed to meet the needs of the vast area South of the Sahara. Many of the countries concerned had expressed a desire to have travelling library vans to serve rural areas. He therefore proposed that the budget for the project be increased in order to enable a real library network to be established, covering the whole area South of the Sahara.

(40) Mr. BRICHET (France) announced that France would forgo Unesco aid in that sphere, in order that the needs of Liberia might be met.

(41) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) was in favour of the project, but considered that, before undertaking it, the agreement of the authorities concerned should be obtained. Otherwise, plans would be unrealistic.

(42) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) observed that the project not only had intrinsic worth, but would also be of value to Unesco in bringing it nearer to the great multitudes in Africa. He agreed with the delegate of Liberia that the budget estimate was inadequate, especially if travelling library vans and special equipment were to be used. He hoped that the sum would be increased to a figure which would guarantee the success of the project.

(43) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) wished that his delegation could emulate the French delegation's sacrifice, but that was unfortunately impossible. However, he was sure that, wherever the project was

held, people would come to see it from other countries in the region, so that it would have widespread effects.

(44) Referring to the remark by the delegate of the Union of South Africa, Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) stated that Miss Summers had negotiated with the respective governments.

(45) Paragraphs 219-223 were approved.

Regional Conference on the Exchange of Publications in Latin America (paragraphs 224-229)

(46) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) believed that everybody considered the regional conference to be very important. It would not be possible, however, to organize a suitable exchange of publications without taking account of past and present production. He referred to the Unesco Clearing House for Publications, which dealt with that question. In his view, such exchanges should be perfected at the international level before any attempt was made to improve national services. International schemes would be hindered and retarded if Unesco waited until national exchanges had gained momentum.

(47) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) observed that, probably as a result of an oversight, no mention was made of the Organization of American States, which should certainly be asked to participate in the planning.

(48) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) informed the Commission that he was a member of the Department of Cultural Activities of the Organization of American States and that he would be the Rapporteur of the Congress on the Exchange of Publications to be held the following March; in that capacity, he asked if the project in Unesco's programme was to be associated with that of OAS. He recommended that the work should be divided between Unesco and OAS.

(49) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Secretariat would take account of the comments made by the delegate of Chile.
(50) With regard to the point raised by the delegates of the United States of America and Mexico, he explained that it was an omission on the part of the Secretariat, which had always intended to co-operate with the Organization of American States in organizing the conference concerned.

(51) Paragraphs 224-229 were unanimously approved.

Development of associated projects (paragraphs 230-243)

(52) Unanimously approved.

Education for librarianship in the Arab States (paragraphs 244-251)

(53) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) thought that, in the remodelled programme designed to meet the needs of Member States, the project under consideration was most timely and appropriate. Libraries played an important part in linking education with culture and the project would be very helpful in promoting the parallel development of education and culture.

(54) Paragraphs 244-251 were unanimously approved.

Paragraphs 252-267

(55) Approved without comment.

Mobile microfilming unit (paragraphs 268-277)

(56) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) congratulated the Secretariat upon the magnificent way in which that section of the programme had been prepared. In Latin American countries, microfilms had first been used in trade and industry, and later in libraries. There was wide scope for action. The rich store of collections held by many nations should be assembled. As far as Chile was concerned, it was imperative to microfilm the works of the great writer José Toribio Medina. It was not easy to estimate what influence the new technique would have on the life of peoples and governments. It would bring the cultural heritage, which had so far been accessible only to the privileged few, within range of all those wishing to study it.

(57) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) pointed out that his country had always considered microfilming as a very important activity which ought to be developed.
(58) He asked the Secretariat to study the possibility of forming two or three mobile microfilming units.
(59) Furthermore, he thought that those archives and libraries most exposed to damage, should be the first to benefit from the new process.

(60) Paragraphs 268-277 were approved.

Project 4.35: Development of museums (paragraphs 278-317)

(61) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the project be placed in Category I.

(62) Mr. LORENTZ (Poland) stated that his country was very much in favour of all projects designed to encourage the dissemination of culture through museums and exhibitions, and was prepared to take an active part in carrying them out. He pointed out how necessary it was to make museums accessible to all - workmen and country folk, as well as intellectuals.

(63) Miss NEFFA (Lebanon) hoped that the projects included in paragraphs 287-301 would be approved. Lebanon had taken part in the courses organized in Athens on the educational rôle of museums; it was an idea which was gradually penetrating Lebanese schools. She recommended the conducting of a campaign on the subject of museums and school education. The best campaign would certainly be one for the proper organization of museums. She was speaking from personal experience, for Unesco

had recently organized the Damascus Museum and, comparing it with other museums in the country, she had been struck by its superiority. The question was one of great importance. The speaker then praised the pilot project for an educational museum, at present being carried out at Patzcuaro, and expressed the hope that regional seminars, similar to the one to be held in Patzcuaro in 1956, would be arranged subsequently in other parts of the world, such as the Middle East.

(64) Mr. BRICHET (France) drew attention to the importance of the campaign for museums.
(65) Recalling that, during the Middle Ages, monuments and works of art had been the "poor man's Bible", he expressed the opinion that, in underdeveloped countries at the present time, museums could become the best means of furthering education and culture.
(66) The number of visitors to museums increased daily, but they were a mere handful compared to the thousands of people who might benefit from them, or to the huge crowds drawn by sporting and other events.
(67) The delegate of France considered that action was imperative, and that it was for Unesco to take the lead. He emphasized the fact that museums should be accessible to all, irrespective of social background.

(68) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) spoke of the pilot project for an educational museum at CREFAL, where a Unesco expert was already working. Although he believed that the project would be a success, he thought that, from the budgetary and administrative points of view, it should be kept separate from the Fundamental Education Centre at Patzcuaro.

(69) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) agreed with the Mexican delegate's point of view. His country thought the pilot project for an educational museum important, because Unesco techniques were used in dealing with schools; moreover, Mexico was a suitable place for the experiment, since its people were already co-operating in the main Patzcuaro project, which was of such great interest to Latin America; lastly, use could be made of experience gained by CREFAL, which in turn could benefit from the new project.

(70) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) agreed with the remarks made by the delegates of France and Mexico.
(71) He asked if a date was to be fixed for International Museums Day. In his view, it might be wisest to let each government decide upon a date for its own country, as it could thus be made to coincide with a national holiday.
(72) Lastly, he thought it desirable that the International Association of Art Critics and the International Association of the Visual Arts should co-operate in international exchanges of exhibitions.

(73) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that no decision had been taken about a date for holding an International Museums Day. The International Council of Museums had suggested that it might be held on the tenth anniversary of the first session of the General Conference of Unesco.
(74) Mr. Thomas welcomed the Italian delegate's suggestion with regard to the help which certain associations might give in international exchanges of exhibitions.

(75) In reply to a question from Mr. ANGELL (United States of America), the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the comments of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget were limited to Section E. It had not commented on the other sections.

(76) Mr. OTERO MENDOZA (Uruguay) commented on the draft resolution presented by his delegation (document 8C/DR/46). It would be impossible to develop musuems without borrowing original works possessed by many centres and countries. Reproductions were not enough, and could not constitute a museum's main exhibits. Certain nations were richly endowed with works of art, and an effort should be made to put them to good use. The Executive Board had recommended that the draft resolution be referred to the International Council of Museums; Uruguay, however, wanted it to be included in Unesco's programme. He therefore hoped that the Conference would vote in favour of the resolution and that the Secretariat would include it in the Organization's programme for 1957-58.

(77) Mr. BRICHET (France) thought that the Uruguayan draft resolution was interesting. In his view, however, the proposal raised a difficult technical problem and it would be wise to refer it to the International Council of Museums, as suggested by the Executive Board.

(78) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that, while his delegation felt every sympathy with the Uruguayan proposal, it considered that the General Conference was not qualified to invite the Director-General to select the Arts Centre at Montevideo as the first of such agencies. The United Kingdom delegation therefore seconded the Executive Board's proposal to refer the matter to ICOM.

(79) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Board, in discussing the project, had felt that the question was a technical one which should be referred to a specialized body like ICOM. The Uruguayan member of the Board, Mr. Secco Ellauri, had himself seconded the motion to refer the proposal to ICOM.

(80) It was agreed to refer document 8C/DR/46 to ICOM.

(81) Sections A, B and C (paragraphs 287-303) were approved.

D. Seminar workshop on the building of travelling exhibitions and a mobile museum for South East Asia (paragraphs 304-311)

(82) Mr. NEVINSON (United Kingdom) stated that the project had been very carefully considered by his

National Commission. Although South East Asia was thought to be a suitable site, it was felt that the project needed thinking over. Travelling exhibitions outside Europe had not yet been studied to any great extent; the transport of museum exhibits in hot climates raised problems which required further study. He therefore proposed that the project be rearranged, providing for consultations in 1956 before the mobile museum itself was set up.

(83) Mr. WADIA (India), referring to paragraph 306, stated that his country would prefer the workshop to be located in Delhi, rather than at Chandigarh.

(84) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegation to request the Secretariat to reword section D was seconded by Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa).

(85) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) had noted, among the comments made by the United Kingdom delegate, an allusion to museum objects which might deteriorate if transported to a hot climate.
(86) He explained that the idea was not to create a museum of works of art, but a mobile museum in the form of a lorry with film and radio apparatus. That mobile museum would be used for health education and instruction on the conservation of natural resources in fundamental education campaigns. A three weeks' seminar workshop would be organized for South East Asian experts, in order to teach them how to build up such exhibitions.
(87) In reply to the delegate of India, Mr. Thomas said that the question of museums in India would be studied under another heading.

(88) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(89) The proposal was rejected by 9 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

(90) Section D (paragraphs 304-311) was approved.

E. Technical aid to Member States (paragraphs 312-317)

(91) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the fourth paragraph of the resolution presented by the Indian delegation in document 8C/DR/17, and observed that the Advisory Committee had not recommended the adoption of the project, which would represent a charge of $48,000 on the budget.

(92) Mr. WADIA (India) announced that the Indian delegation withdrew its proposal in document 8C/DR/17.

(93) The budget estimates in paragraph 317 were approved.

Project 4.41: History of the scientific and cultural history of mankind (paragraphs 318-325)

(94) Mr. LORENTZ (Poland) stated that his country was very interested in the project for the publication of a History of the Scientific and Cultural Developmnent of Mankind.

(95) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil), speaking, not for the Brazilian delegation, but as Chairman of the International Commission for the preparation of a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, requested the Chairman to make an exception to the procedure adopted for the debates, and to allow him ten minutes to present his report.

(96) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought it impossible to open a discussion in the Commission on such a vast subject and one involving such a large sum of money.
(97) He proposed the establishment of a working party, under the chairmanship of Professor Carneiro, which would meet the following morning and go into the matter thoroughly.

(98) The CHAIRMAN took a vote on the proposal of the delegate of France.

(99) Adopted.

(100) In reply to a question from Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil), the CHAIRMAN said that he would ask the Secretariat to prepare a list of delegates to form the Working Party on the History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind.

Project 4.42: Study of cultural relations (paragraphs 327-340)

(101) Miss NEFFA (Lebanon) observed that museum activities usually interested only certain groups, but that the project under consideration was of interest to everyone, including the general public. The Arab States maintained important cultural and other relations with the peoples of Latin America, and she therefore requested that an invitation be addressed in good time to the Arab States, so that they might take part in the international discussion referred to in paragraph 335.

(102) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) read a draft resolution (document 8C/DR/31) presented by his delegation and proposing an addition to paragraph 327.
(103) In support of the draft resolution, he explained that the Japanese Academy had started work on reproducing historical documents relating not only to Japan but also to other Asian countries, its aim being to retrace the history of relations between Asia and Europe. He hoped that Unesco would encourage that research by giving financial assistance.
(104) The Advisory Committee had recommended that the draft resolution be taken into consideration when the programme for 1957-58 was being prepared. The Japanese delegate wondered, however, if it would not be possible for the Secretariat to submit the question, as the Executive Board had recommended, to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, with a request that it prepare a work plan.

(105) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) announced that the Board had already recommended that the Japanese proposal be referred to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, with a view to the submission of a report to the General Conference at its ninth session.

(106) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) stated that his delegation was very interested in the project concerning manuscripts in Europe relating to the history of Latin America (Section C). As Mexico had once been a colony, many extremely valuable documents relating to its history were to be found in Europe. The "Archivo de Indias de España" (Archives of the Spanish Indies) had given valuable help in that field. However, there were many historical documents of interest to Mexico in Austria, France and, especially, in the Vatican. In that connexion, Mexico requested Unesco to give it appropriate assistance.

(107) Mr. SLONIMSKI (Poland) drew attention to the draft resolution presented by the Polish delegation in document 8C/DR/63 and connected with resolution 4.42. The Polish proposal was that Unesco issue a publication to commemorate the centenary of the death of the great Polish poet, Adam Mickiewicz, in 1855. The Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had recommended, instead of the issuing of a book, the publication of a series of articles in the Unesco Courier. The Polish delegation considered that that would not be an adequate substitute for its own proposal.

(108) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) recalled that the Advisory Committee had recommended that, in order to meet the wishes of the Polish delegation, articles on Mickiewicz should be published in the Unesco Courier.
(109) He believed that he was right in assuming that the delegate of Poland was asking for a work to be published, and pointed out that such a project had budgetary implications.

(110) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) shared the views of the Polish delegation. It was desirable to pay tribute to a man so representative of Eastern European culture and what had been done for Balzac and Goethe should also be done for the Polish poet.
(111) He wondered whether a publisher might issue the work at his own expense, under Unesco's auspices.

(112) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) emphasized that, in the field of international relations, emphasis should be laid on the fact that it was right to do homage to a great poet who had come into contact with many foreign countries and to whom Italy, in particular, always felt grateful.
(113) If the Secretariat did not think it could undertake the publication of a volume, as it had done for other writers, would it not be possible to request the Revue de Littérature Comparée to devote a special number to Mickiewicz, as it had done for Balzac? There would thus be no budgetary implications for Unesco.

(114) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) felt that it would be placing an unfair onus on the Secretariat if the proposal were merely referred to it without instructions. The Commission ought either to reject the proposal, or vote the necessary money for it.

(115) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) recalled that, while Mickiewicz had had relations with Italy, he had lived in France. A tribute to him would be a tribute not only to a Pole, but also to a European and to one who had always fought for freedom.

(116) Mr. NAVRATIL (Czechoslovakia) supported the Polish delegation's proposal. He considered that Mickiewicz symbolized international friendship, based on intellectual understanding.

(117) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) also supporting the Polish delegation's proposal, requested that a vote be taken on it, for, if the Commission approved it, the Director-General would be responsible for finding the funds necessary for publishing the volume.

(118) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) felt somewhat overcome by all the different suggestions made: the Advisory Committee recommended the publication of articles in the Courier; the delegate of Poland was asking for a work to be published and that would entail expenditure; the delegate of Brazil had recommended that a publisher be asked to issue the work at his own expense, and that might not be feasible; the delegate of Italy had suggested bringing out a special number of the Revue de Littérature Comparée, and that solution would probably not raise many difficulties.
(119) Mr. Thomas was prepared to study any of those solutions, but he needed specific instructions to do so.

(120) The CHAIRMAN asked the delegate of Poland whether he would be willing to restate his proposal, asking the Director-General to investigate the possibility of publishing such a book, rather than giving him definite instructions to publish it.

(121) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that, on the basis of present standards, the Secretariat estimated the cost of publishing such a volume at $6,420.

(122) Mr. LORENTZ (Poland) maintained his delegation's proposal and requested that the Commission vote on it.

(123) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) recalled that the Commission had decided to increase the subvention granted to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies to $10,000. He wondered whether part of that sum could not be set aside for the publication of a work on Mickiewicz.

(124) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) thought that the Commission was faced with an extremely difficult choice. It had gone through the programme chapters, adding items to the budget. The following

week, the Commission would have a painful meeting, when it would have to cut out a great many of the items which it had put in. Therefore, while very much in sympathy with the Polish proposal, and hoping that its attitude would not be misinterpreted, the United Kingdom delegation would very reluctantly vote against the project and would support the suggestion that a series of articles on Mickiewicz be published in the Unesco Courier.

(125) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) considered that the solution suggested by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget was inacceptable.
(126) He proposed that the Director-General be invited:

(1) to study the possibility of publishing a volume at Unesco's expense;

(2) if the necessary funds could not be found, to ask the Revue de Littérature Comparée to devote a special number to Mickiewicz.

(127) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) moved approval of the original Polish draft resolution.

(128) He considered not only that it was Unesco's duty to pay tribute to the Polish poet, but that it would be an honour for Unesco to have done so.

(129) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) moved, as an amendment to the Polish motion, that the possibility of having the book published by a commercial publisher under Unesco's sponsorship be explored.

(130) The motion was seconded by Mr. PANNETON (Canada).

(131) The Australian amendment was rejected by 14 votes to 12, with 5 abstentions.

(132) The Polish motion, as set out in document 8C/DR/64, was adopted by 20 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

(133) Project 4.42 was approved.

The meeting rose at 12.30 a.m.

# TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

*3 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma)

**ITEM 8.4.5 OF REVISED AGENDA: MASS COMMUNICATION**

(1) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) stated that in the light of the different projects described in the chapter on Mass Communication the working party had arrived at a definition of the Department's main objectives and had drawn up a scheme which not only corresponded clearly to those objectives but also fitted in exactly with the Director-General's programme.
(2) A close examination of the different projects showed that activities fell into two separate groups:

(a) those under items 5.1 and 5.2, relating to public information and the promotion of international understanding by Member States and Unesco;

(b) those under items 5.3 to 5.6, covering projects relating to assistance to Member States in the development of Mass Communication services for educational, scientific and cultural uses.

(3) In carrying out the activities in the first group, the Department employed the following methods:

(a) co-operation with the press and press agencies, both international and national, for whom the Department prepared press releases, newsletters, photo stories, articles, leaflets and folders;

(b) co-operation with the radio: the Department distributed the Unesco World Review, weekly to over 1,600 radio organizations in nearly 120 countries and territories; it made recordings of talks, commentaries and interviews; it arranged for the production of documentary and cultural broadcasts; and it invited guest producers from radio organizations in Member States to make a series of broadcasts;

(c) production of visual aids, consisting of newsreel items, "shorts", and filmstrips, and organization of travelling exhibitions for circulation among the various States in turn.

(4) All the projects under items 5.1 and 5.2 represented services rendered by the Secretariat, not only to Unesco, but to the family of nations as a whole.
(5) Turning next to the second category, Mr. Desjardins described the activities concerned in detail.
(6) With regard to item 5.3 (Free Flow of Information), the methods employed by the Secretariat were threefold:

(1) Encouragement of Member States to conclude agreements and make administrative arrangements, and formulation of recommendations with a view to the establishment of international standards.

(2) Co-operation with the United Nations, the Specialized Agencies and appropriate international organizations, in order to encourage the adoption of practical measures for the reduction of obstacles

to the free flow of ideas from country to country.
(3) Enlistment of professional and governmental support by the supply of publications designed to encourage them to take remedial action.
(7) Referring to item 5.4 Mr. Desjardins explained that the basic task of the Clearing House was to collect and disseminate information on mass communication questions and to comply with requests from governments, national and international organizations, professional organizations and specialists.
(8) The Clearing House issued roneotyped copies of a bulletin for those engaged in mass communication work, and kept a register of specialists, through which experts could be recruited to undertake direct aid missions to Member States.
(9) Once collected, such information enabled the Secretariat to reply to requests from the Economic and Social Council and the other Specialized Agencies of the United Nations.
(10) The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations had moreover recommended, at its seventeenth session, that Unesco continue with its work of research and documentation.
(11) The projects included under item 5.5 were intended to stimulate exploration of new fields of knowledge, which might help Member States in their use of the different means of communication for fundamental and workers' education. Practical experiments, conducted in co-operation with a Member State and on its territory, were not only a help to that country, but also provided an opportunity to try out new methods which might benefit many other countries.
(12) The main purpose of item 5.6 was to give direct aid to Member States, at their request, in the form of expert missions and regional seminars organized with a view to speeding up the development of communication services in the beneficiary countries.
(13) Mr. Desjardins went on to emphasize the fact that the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations had asked Unesco to endeavour to increase its aid to governments in the development of their mass communication services, and in particular to send them experts and help them to train specialists. The number of requests might accordingly be expected to increase.
(14) Mr. Desjardins reminded the Commission that item 5.7, "Voluntary International Assistance", had been included in the first group, and added that that item covered the various activities connected with the Unesco Coupon Scheme, which he explained in the following terms.
(15) The coupons were divided into two separate categories: in the first place, there were coupons on sale for books, films and scientific materials and also travel coupons. Thirty-seven Member States were at present taking part in the scheme, and, since 1948, Unesco had issued coupons to the value of over $6,000,000; the Organization had thereby been able to cover administrative and miscellaneous expenses, including salaries. The second group consisted of the gift coupons, which had considerable information and propaganda value, and gave large numbers of people in the different Member States an opportunity to take an active part in Unesco's programme, as well as in those of the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies.
(16) The material results obtained from the Gift Coupon Scheme were encouraging, and the number of donors was steadily increasing.

(17) Mr. DE SALIS (Chairman of the Working Party on Mass Communication) recalled that the Working Party had been instructed to examine the administrative pattern of the Department of Mass Communication, but did not have to take decisions on programme questions.
(18) As the Department's two main duties were to spread knowledge of Unesco's aims and activities, and to promote the development of the means of communication, the Working Party had unanimously agreed that each of those functions should have a corresponding section within the Department.
(19) The Department would thus be headed by a Director, with two assistant directors, one responsible for the group of activities under items 5.1, 5.2 and 5.7 and the other for those under items 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6.
(20) The Working Party had agreed that, in the mass communication budget as a whole, funds should be divided between those two groups of activities in the same proportion as in the previous budget.
(21) The Director-General would be asked to draw up a report on the results of the proposed reorganization for submission to the General Conference at its next session.

(22) On behalf of the Director-General, Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) expressed his entire agreement with the Working Party's resolution which, save for two abstentions, had been adopted unanimously.

(23) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) conveyed to the Chairman of the Working Party, the Director-General's thanks for having studied with such care the problem of the structure of a department whose functions were both difficult and complex.
(24) He stated that the Director-General agreed with the recommendations in the report of the Working Party, which had succeeded in preserving the Department's fundamental unity while at the same time pointing clearly to its dual functions.

Project 5.1: Public information and promotion of international understanding by Member States

Paragraphs 15-20

(25) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew the Commission's attention to the opinion expressed by the Working Party on Decentralization (document 8C/PRG/25 (rev.) page 4, B.2), to the effect that "the assistance to National Commissions" (paragraphs 19 and 20 under resolution 5.1 A) should "be transferred and added to the work plan for resolution 7.12 ($30,000 for the two years)"
(26) The Director-General was in full agreement with that recommendation. The point was not to eliminate such an important activity but to insert it where it could be most effective.
(27) The Assistant Director-General accordingly proposed that discussion of the item be deferred

until resolution 7.12 came up for study.

(28) Mr. HARDY (United States of America), on a point of order, moved that before starting on the discussion a vote should be taken on the appropriate section of the recommendations of the Working Party on Decentralization.

(29) The proposal, duly seconded, was adopted.

(30) The CHAIRMAN accordingly asked for a vote on Section IV B. (2) of document 8C/PRG/25 (rev.).

(31) The paragraph was adopted by 36 votes to nil with 6 abstentions.

(32) Mr. HARDY (United States of America), referring to resolution 5.1, said that the extent to which Member States could co-operate with Unesco by facilitating and encouraging the use of mass communication depended greatly on the kind of information produced by Unesco. Paragraphs 15-20 placed appropriate emphasis on the importance of Unesco's functional news reporting services and left it to the discretion of Member States to transmit news received to their own mass communication services. The nature and objectivity of reporting would depend on the degree to which Member States could translate news and information of a highly technical nature into the common language of the people for whom it was intended.

(33) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) hoped that it would be possible to arrange the future programme so that project 5.7 would follow immediately after projects 5.1 and 5.2, since under the new structure the three activities would be controlled by the same assistant director.

(34) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat would take note of the Egyptian delegate's suggestion.

(35) Mr. SHAHANE (India) was in general agreement with the report of the Working Party on the Administrative Structure of the Department of Mass Communication, but said that the major part of its output was in a language incomprehensible to the masses. In India, for example, Hindi was the only language of about one hundred million people. Unesco's activities, to be effective, must be made available to the masses and not merely to the élite. He hoped that the Director-General and the Secretariat would bear his admonition in mind.

(36) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) disliked the wording of paragraph 14, because it gave the impression that the principal aim of weaving together "information about the Organization's activities and information on educational, scientific and cultural matters in broad terms" was to give publicity to the work of the Department of Mass Communication itself.
(37) It was reasonable to expect the Department to serve Unesco's aims more directly. It should spread knowledge of works of great cultural value and of great scientific discoveries. Shakespeare, Dante and Cervantes would speak better than any radio expert.

(38) Mr. IBANEZ GOMEZ (Chile) considered that information about Unesco's activities should be adapted to local conditions in the different countries; he therefore suggested that the task be entrusted to the respective National Commissions.

National manifestations in support of international understanding (Sections B and C - paragraphs 21-24)

(39) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the Belgian National Commission, suggested that, in organizing public meetings and debates designed to further international understanding, Member States might more often call upon those of their own nationals who were former Unesco fellowship holders, as they might have a valuable contribution to make.
(40) With regard to reports on Member States by Unesco writers (paragraph 23), Mr. Hacquaert thought that they might also be distributed to National Commissions, which were often in a position, by virtue of their press contacts (as was the case in Belgium), to give them wider distribution.

(41) Mr. SHAHANE (India) proposed that the Department of Mass Communication should endeavour through the National Commissions to obtain the services of writers and broadcasters from different countries in order to produce material for use in disseminating information about Unesco. India was well equipped to use any films and exhibitions that Unesco might provide and, indeed, ranked second in world film production.

(42) Mr. RAADI (Iran) was in favour of leaving it to each country to decide how it could best contribute to promoting international understanding, by drawing on the resources of its own history and literature.
(43) In Iran, the National Commission and the United Nations Committee were about to form a working party, whose task would be to select outstanding themes which could be traced back thousands of years and might serve the cause of international understanding.
(44) The delegate of Iran hoped that, when the time came, the Secretariat would help in that undertaking.

(45) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) thought it important that Unesco, in sending the National Commissions publications, films and exhibition material to assist them in organizing national manifestations, should take the special conditions and needs of each Member State into account.

(46) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) pointed out to the Secretariat that, if the National Commissions were chosen as the principal liaison agencies, the result might be to restrict the scope of possible contacts with a country considerably.
(47) To take Egypt as an example, where the National Commission's headquarters were in Cairo, a big international, intellectual centre such as Alexandria was almost completely cut off from manifestations which might spread knowledge of the aims and activities of Unesco.

(48) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) assured the delegates who had spoken that the Secretariat had carefully noted their suggestions and recommendations and would do its best to put them into practice.
(49) Referring especially to the statement of the Egyptian delegate, Mr. Maheu pointed out that most of the National Commissions were administrative bodies, centralized and often understaffed. It was undesirable for the Secretariat to feel obliged to co-operate too strictly and exclusively with National Commissions in the work of mass communication, thereby setting up a barrier between Unesco and the many information centres (particularly in the provinces) which were not closely linked with the National Commission.
(50) While not wishing to minimize what a National Commission could do, he did think it desirable to work out a flexible procedure in each country whereby direct contact with information agencies outside the capital would be made possible. The Secretariat would thus have a wider field of action.

(51) Sections B and C (paragraphs 21-24) were approved unanimously.

D. Direct action by Member States (paragraphs 25-28)

(52) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) informed the Commission that the Advisory Committee (document 8C/BUD/1, page 17) had recommended a reduction of appropriations under that head to $10,000 for the two years and the placing of the entire project in Category 3.

(53) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) drew the attention of Member States represented on the Commission to a Belgian scheme which had proved inexpensive and most effective. He referred to the production of filmstrips from exhibition material supplied by Unesco, which had provided means of reaching hundreds of schools whose pupils were themselves unable to visit the exhibitions.

(54) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) observed that, if Unesco's propaganda were to be effective, simple and economical, it should take advantage of the closest possible contacts with Member States and the maximum strengthening of National Commissions.
(55) To that end, Spain placed her cultural development centres at Unesco's disposal to co-operate in activities which Unesco, even at great expense and difficulty, could not carry out successfully by itself.

(56) Mr. ESTABLE (Uruguay) was of opinion that the Charter of the United Nations and the Constitution of Unesco should be taught in every country, in the same way as the national constitution.
(57) Unesco had a noble and lifelong, but extremely difficult mission, requiring universal understanding and sympathy; it called for the efforts of many and the selfless devotion of the chosen few, fanatical in the cause of justice, education and culture for the good of all mankind.
(58) Unesco undoubtedly had a contribution to make to the blending of human traditions. It would be a sublime achievement, for it was a sign of the noblest form of patriotism to seek to make the best human traditions the strongest traditions in each country, and to ensure that human ideals took precedence over the ideals of individual nations.
(59) Unesco was an expression of the spirit of the New World, in which all traditions and inclinations were happily blended.

(60) Mr. IBANEZ GOMEZ (Chile) remarked that while the Courier was a very useful publication for Latin American countries, information by radio left something to be desired, he would therefore suggest that some of the material for broadcasting should be sent only to cultural bodies with a broadcasting service.

(61) Mr. HARDY (United States of America) strongly supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation on paragraphs 25-28. The reduced budget of $10,000 for the two years would still be an adequate financial basis for the activity envisaged by Unesco, and even a much larger sum could have little effect on action by Member States when divided between seventy countries.

(62) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) drew attention to the recommendations of the Expert Committee for Education on International Understanding and Co-operation. The Committee had noted that many National Commissions were developing valuable techniques for promoting international understanding and had instanced "Unesco Weeks" in Sweden. The Expert Committee had been divided in opinion concerning the activities referred to in paragraph 27, and the Swedish delegation supported the United States delegation in advocating the adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the budgetary allocation should be reduced to $10,000 and used solely for clearing house activities, information services and general collaboration with National Commissions. It was for Member States to take the initiative in such activities as celebrating Unesco's tenth birthday.

(63) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and the views of the delegates of the United States of America and Sweden.
(64) Unesco would serve a more useful purpose by circulating information on the activities of Member States than by trying to stretch a small budget to activities by the Organization. Member States must use their own methods of propaganda, but they would appreciate information from other Members and from the Secretariat.

(65) A vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation to reduce the budgetary allocation to $10,000.

(66) The recommendation was unanimously approved.

Project 5.2: Public information and promotion of international understanding by Unesco and documents 8C/DR/19 and 20

(67) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee did not recommend

the adoption of 8C/DR/19, but recommended that 8C/DR/20 be included as a directive to the Director-General for the 1955-56 programme.

(68) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Board had considered 8C/DR/19 in three parts, and made the following recommendations:

1. Central Educational Films Library: there were neither adequate funds available nor sufficient justification to merit approval of the project at the present time.
2. Scripts: not recommended.
3. Survey of Broadcasting: it was not necessary to take action on the resolution, since the proposed activity was already being performed by Unesco and was provided for in the draft programme for 1955-56.

(69) The Board recommended the adoption of 8C/DR/20 because it involved no additional outlay and would give emphasis to Unesco's work.

(70) Dr. MUDALIAR (India), while not supporting document 8C/DR/19, asked if the Director-General could consider the possibility of circulating to all Member States a list of available educational films and how copies could be obtained. He also proposed that the survey of broadcasting should be continued so that the Director-General could provide additional information for the next General Conference.

(71) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) assured the delegate of India that the Secretariat would act on his two suggestions. The survey of broadcasting was indeed a permanent activity of the Organization. With regard to resolution 8C/DR/20, the Secretariat would see that due emphasis was given wherever possible.

(72) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) withdrew his two resolutions.

(73) Mr. FRIEDMAN (ORT World Union) proposed an addition to the work plans under resolution 5.2, to read as follows:

"I. Co-operation with non-governmental organizations. Non-governmental organizations having consultative arrangements with Unesco will be requested to invite their national associations, using all the means at their disposal, to give publicity to the principles and achievements of Unesco".

A. Co-operation with the Press (paragraphs 37-42)

(74) Mr. DE SALIS (Chairman of the Working Party on Mass Communication) stated that the Working Party had debated whether the Department of Mass Communication was the right place for the Press Analysis Section, and had unanimously decided that it was.

(75) Mr. TERROU (France) asked the Secretariat if it would guarantee that Unesco would not, in implementing that part of the programme, try to compete with national press agencies, but that, on the contrary, it would co-operate with them whenever possible.

(76) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) assured the French delegate that he had no cause for alarm. The Department of Mass Communication had, for over a year, been working in close collaboration with national, and in some cases even with the big international, press agencies.

(77) The aim of the Press Section was to supply information other than that of topical interest to newspapers whose staff writers could not produce enough to fill their general columns.

(78) However, the Department was of course only too glad to provide any national or international agency with topical items when requested to do so.

(79) Section A was unanimously approved.

B. The Unesco Courier (paragraphs 43-46)

(80) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the relevant recommendation of the Advisory Committee (document 8C/BUD/1, page 18).

(81) Mr. DE SALIS (Chairman of the Working Party on Mass Communication) explained that the Working Party had been asked to consider two aspects of the question: first, the usefulness and financial situation of the Courier, and second, the possibility of substituting some other publication for it.

(82) The Working Party had been impressed by the pains that had been taken to improve the appearance and the contents of the Courier, and had unanimously recommended that it be continued, despite the considerable financial burden entailed; it based its views on the following considerations:

(a) the merits of the Courier;

(b) the undesirability of bringing the distribution campaign, which was still in progress, to an abrupt end;

(c) the fact that the substitution of any other publication would probably cost just as much.

(83) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) said that in his country the Courier was considered indispensable. Sales were increasing rapidly and it was used for language teaching in secondary schools. He was, however, shocked by the high cost and asked how many copies were printed annually. He heartily supported the publication and hoped that it would be continued, but urged that efforts should be made to reduce the cost.

(84) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the circulation was now over 25,000, details of which would be found in document 8C/PRG/18.

(85) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) was in agreement with the delegate of the Netherlands. It was true that it could not be considered a commercial success, but it was one of Unesco's finest vehicles of indirect propaganda. It was an invaluable source of information for members of National Commissions, who in lectures and speeches were able to pass on its contents to a wide public. In his opinion, therefore, its commercial losses were in a large measure compensated by its propaganda value.

(86) Mr. KETRZYNSKI (Poland) considered that an organization like Unesco should have its own review.

Even if it were very costly, the Courier had already gained a considerable number of readers, and had proved its worth.
(87) The problem at present was to know how to make it more successful commercially, without pandering to public taste of a certain kind, or lowering its standards. What Unesco required was an instrument for the dissemination of the ideas for which the Organization stood.
(88) The Polish delegation thought that the Courier should devote more space to the international exchange of ideas and the expression of different cultures, and should ask well-known specialists in the various fields to contribute. With that end in view, the Polish delegation would support the Working Party's recommendations.

(89) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) drew attention to the fact that the Courier was arousing increasing interest, owing both to the new ideas underlying it and to its improved layout. It no longer attracted readers almost exclusively from the teaching profession. It should and could, by now, appeal to the general public, and the Swiss delegation would be interested to hear the opinion of the Secretariat on the prospect of such a development.

(90) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) agreed with the remarks of the Polish and Swiss delegates.
(91) He thought, however, that the Courier might well include articles of topical interest, provided that they were presented from an angle different from that in the world press.
(92) He expressed his pleasure at the increase in subscriptions, although he continued to think that the number could be still further increased if the periodical were on sale at bookshops, of a less academic kind, which normally stocked larger numbers of newspapers and periodicals.

(93) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) pointed out that the Courier could not be judged by the same standards as the outside press. Its purpose was clear only when considered in the light of Unesco's own aims.
(94) The Secretariat should, however, set itself the twofold aim of reducing the cost price without lowering the quality, and of securing the widest possible distribution through National Commissions.

(95) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) had paid great attention to the suggestions made, and thought that the Department would be able to use them in the coming months.
(96) With reference to the distribution of the Courier, Mr. Desjardins informed the Commission that the Sales and Distribution Division was engaged in a complete review of the question of agents, concurrently with its endeavours to increase the number of subscriptions.
(97) In reply to the Polish delegate, Mr. Desjardins assured him that, in seeking to increase the sale of the Courier, neither the standard of its contents nor the quality of its presentation would ever be lowered, but that an attempt would be made to make it more alive.

(98) Section B was approved.

(D) Joint information mission (paragraphs 49-50)

(99) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee recommended placing this project in Category 3.

(100) Approved.

(E) Co-operation with radio organizations (paragraphs 51-53)

(101) Unanimously approved.

(F) Production of recorded radio programmes (paragraphs 54-64)

(102) Approved.

(G) Exhibitions (paragraphs 65-67)

(103) Mr. LEFRANC (France), after paying tribute to the quality of past exhibitions, proposed that the Secretariat explore the possibility of making more effective use of visual aids in the production and distribution of exhibition material.
(104) However successful they might be, even travelling exhibitions only reached a relatively small public.
(105) By using filmstrips or short films on the same subjects as those of the exhibitions, an infinitely larger number of people could be reached, whether such visual aids were shown in conjunction with the exhibitions or were circulated independently.
(106) An experiment of the kind had been tried out in France with great success, and Unesco would be well advised to follow that example.

(107) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) asked if the principles set out in the report of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation (page 11 of document 8C/DIV/80), which had been endorsed by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, could be recommended for adoption as general criteria for Unesco in setting up exhibitions.

(108) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) fully endorsed the remarks of the delegate of France.
(109) He added, however, that visual aids played such an important part in spreading Unesco's main themes that more money ought to be set aside for them.

(110) Mr. HARDY (United States of America) supported the proposal of the delegate of Sweden. The criteria would be useful to all departments in Unesco.

(111) The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal had been noted by the Director of the Department.

(112) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked Mr. Branca if he had understood him correctly in assuming that the Italian delegation wished to see the visual aids division reinforced.

(113) Replying in the affirmative, Mr. BRANCA (Italy) advocated that the projects referred to in paragraphs 72 and 74 be given a higher priority than

that recommended by the Advisory Committee, and that they be included at the normal instead of the higher budgetary level.

(114) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that there was no longer any distinction between normal and higher budgetary levels, but that increased staff for the division would obviously entail changes in the budget.
(115) He asked the Commission if it wished for details immediately, or if it would rather the Secretariat first studied the question and then communicated its new suggestions by way of the Advisory Committee when the time came to make the final budgetary adjustments.

(116) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) said that, in considering staffing implications, it would be useful for the Director-General to bear in mind the budgetary reduction under paragraphs 25-28.

(117) Mr. LEFRANC (France) supported the proposal of the delegate of Italy and agreed with the procedure suggested by the Assistant Director-General.

(118) Paragraphs 65-67 were approved unanimously.

(H) Photographs on Unesco themes (paragraphs 68-71)

(119) Approved unanimously.

(I) Production of a film (paragraphs 72 and 73)

(120) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee recommended placing this project in Category 3.

(121) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that "World Without End" was still being shown and there was no urgent need for a new film at th oresent time. He proposed that the project should be placed in Category 4.

(122) The proposal was supported by the delegate of Egypt.

(123) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the proposal to defer the project for consideration by the ninth General Conference.

(124) The proposal was adopted unanimously.

(J) Film showings in Member States (paragraphs 74 and 75)

(125) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee recommended placing this project in Category 3.

(126) The recommendation of the Advisory Committee was adopted.

(K) Prizes for films and film scenarios (paragraphs 76 and 77)

(127) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Advisory Committee recommended placing this project in Category 4. The Committee had come to the conclusion that the activity concerned was not calculated to give effective encouragement to the production of films and scenarios on human rights; it therefore proposed that it be deleted from the proposed programme for 1955-56.

(128) Mr. LEFRANC (France) deplored such a hasty decision. In the field of cinema, as in many other spheres, one of the weaknesses of the Secretariat's action was that it was not in close enough touch with film people. That the project was likely to be of great interest to professional circles was proved by the promise of support received from the Secretary-General of the French Film Producers' Union and by a letter from Mr. Orson Welles, from which the French delegate proceeded to read a number of extracts.

(129) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) said that, if Unesco offered prizes for film scenarios, commercial companies would no doubt be willing to produce the winning ones without cost to Unesco. There would, however, be a serious danger in that Unesco would have no influence on the final form of the film, which might be very different in character from the original scenario. Any films produced as a result of the project would be accepted by the public as Unesco products, and there would be no safeguard for Unesco's reputation. It would be wiser to offer prizes for films which had already been made.

(130) Mr. HARDY (United States of America) supported the sound reasoning of the Advisory Committee and proposed that the project should be deleted from the programme.

(131) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) heartily endorsed the remarks of the delegate of France.
(132) Such prizes would indeed encourage the production of documentary films on Unesco's main themes, and it might also be a good idea for Unesco in the same way to express its approval of big films which, in their time, advanced the cause of peace and international understanding such as "The Great Illusion" and "The Last Chance", to quote only two.

(133) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) supported the French proposal. The objections which had been advanced were not serious and it was worth retaining the allocation in paragraph 77.

(134) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) reminded the Commission that the Advisory Committee had taken its decision

on that point before learning of the conclusions reached by the Working Party on the Reorganization of the Department of Mass Communication; the Advisory Committee's recommendation was thus deprived of a great deal of its weight.

(135) There was a flagrant contradiction between the wish, so often expressed, to broaden the scope of the Department's activities, and the abrupt withdrawal of some of its largest appropriations.

(136) The Italian delegation was in complete agreement with the delegates of France and Switzerland in advocating the retention of the prizes, which could not fail to encourage the production of films likely to direct the public's attention to the main themes and high ideals of the Organization.

(137) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) wished to return to film questions when the Commission had taken a decision on items, I, J and K.

(138) The delegates of the United Kingdom and Egypt heartily supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and vigorously opposed the point of view of the delegate of France, whereas the delegate of Turkey thoroughly endorsed the latter's view and pressed for the award of such prizes in 1958.

(139) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) proposed that the two kinds of prizes referred to in paragraph 76 be considered separately.

(140) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) saw no objection to taking a separate vote on prizes for scenarios, ($7,300) on one hand and for films ($1,200) on the other.

(141) The deletion of appropriations for prizes for film scenarios, recommended by the Advisory Committee, was approved by 27 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

(142) The deletion of appropriations for prizes for films, recommended by the Advisory Committee, was approved by 17 votes to 13.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

*3 December 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.5 OF REVISED AGENDA : MASS COMMUNICATION** (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN stated that, with the agreement of the Soviet delegation, the discussion of the draft resolution it had submitted regarding the Mass Communication programme and budget (document 8C/DR/70) had been postponed until a later meeting.
(2) The Chairman had also informed the General Committee that the Commission wished to refer Project 3.4, under Social Sciences, to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget; the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had demurred, pointing out that his Committee had already discussed the chapter, and that there was every likelihood that a fresh examination would give much the same results as the original one.

Project 5.2 (continued)

(3) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) felt that to postpone the discussion of draft resolution 8C/DR/70 would automatically mean postponing that of draft resolution 8C/DR/117. He asked whether the Commission wished to await that discussion before taking a decision on paragraphs 47 and 48 (Corr.) relating to brochures and folders.
(4) The decision taken that morning on project (J) "Film showings in Member States" was still not clear to the Secretariat; the adoption of the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget to place the project in Category 3 (for implementation once Categories 1 and 2 had been dealt with) no longer had any meaning, for although the Committee had proceeded on the basis of priorities, not having been informed of the budget total, the Commission was not in the same position. It had fixed those totals, and for that reason could and should take firm decisions, not relative or conditional ones.
(5) From the Secretariat's point of view, the Commission's vote would mean postponement of the project until 1957-58.

(6) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) expressed anxiety over the quick decision which had been taken at the morning's meeting in connexion with paragraph 72. He had no wish to reopen the discussion of that item but stressed his Government's view of the importance of producing another film of the type of "World Without End".
(7) Paragraph 72 proposed that a new film should be completed by the end of 1956. If, as he understood the morning's decision to mean, the production of the film were postponed, there would be a gap of two years during which there would be no film available on the work of Unesco. In his view, such films were of very great value in disseminating information about Unesco and he was against any postponement.
(8) He concluded by asking whether the decision of the Commission did, in fact, put that project in Category 3.
(9) The view of the Secretariat was that the Commission's decision would mean a postponement of the project to another financial period.

(10) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that Sections (I) and (J) (paragraphs 72-75) had been the subject of lengthy discussion in the Executive Board. The Board had studied reports from the Secretariat, from Member States, from members of the Executive Board and from the Director-General on all aspects of the film "World without End". In addition, the Chairman and one member of the Executive Board had made an on-the-spot investigation of the film in action in several countries. The consensus of opinion in the Executive Board had been that the activity provided an effective method of bringing together Member States and of publicizing the work of Unesco. The Board had received the impression that many Member States were anxious to show the film for purposes of spreading information about Unesco and for achieving better international understanding.

(11) Mr. BRANCA (Italy) thanked the Secretariat for its explanation. He also had not been very clear about the decision taken at that morning's meeting, for, while the Conference was stressing the importance of visual aids, the Commission was more or less systematically eliminating draft resolutions which called for their development. The delegate asked the Director-General to re-examine the budget for visual aids and to broaden the scope of the programme instead of merely increasing the staff. He proposed taking up the project again and assigning it a high priority, together with the project referred to in paragraph 69: prints and negatives.

(12) The delegate of India protested, on a point of order, against resuming the discussion of an item already decided, and the CHAIRMAN explained in reply that a delegate was always at liberty to propose the reopening of a discussion, but that he did not advise the Commission to follow the suggestion.

(13) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) had not gathered whether the foregoing discussion had referred to paragraph 72 or to the report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. He thought the previous vote should be reviewed, and also advocated the project relating to the production of a film to promote international understanding (paragraphs 72

and 73 of the Programme and Budget). If the question were not discussed at the current meeting there would still be time to return to it in plenary meeting, although that was not very desirable. The Commission was very much better placed to hold such a discussion than the General Conference.

(14) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) pointed out that the current discussion seemed to refer to paragraphs 72 and 73, whereas all that the Assistant Director-General had mentioned in his question had been the section for film showings (paragraphs 74 and 75).

(15) Mr. TERROU (France) remarked on the lack of clarity in the debate and proposed taking a fresh vote.
(16) The delegates of the United States of America, South Africa and the United Kingdom stated that they had voted on paragraphs 72-75 at the morning meeting on the understanding that placing an item in Category 3 was tantamount to suppression.

(17) The delegates of Iran and Italy supported the remarks made by the French delegate.

(18) The Commission agreed by 18 votes in favour, 6 against and 9 abstentions, to suppress item (J) concerning film showings in Member States (paragraphs 74-75).

(19) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) felt that the vote had clarified the position, and he could now deal with the question as a whole.
(20) Referring to the comments of the Italian delegate, he reminded the Commission that it had wished a well-staffed and active section to be set up in the Mass Communication Department to deal with all visual aids, including the cinema. But the staff depended on the programme, and yet the Commission had just struck out all the projects relating to the cinema. How could there be a staff without a programme? And how could there be a visual aids division if there were no film programme? The only way out would seem to be to authorize the Secretariat to submit new proposals on films, dealing with both the programme and staffing. Mr. Maheu suggested that a sum of $50,000 for the two years be set aside for that purpose.

(21) Mr. TERROU (France) asked the Secretariat to let the Commission have technical details: if the Commission saw them in writing, it could proceed to examine them; there was no point in referring to the Advisory Committee a project which could be thoroughly discussed by the Commission with the foremost specialists in Mass Communication present.

(22) Mr. HARDY (United States of America) hoped that his vote would not be construed as an objection to the use of films for Unesco work.
(23) He would object to any suggestion that Unesco should set up a film unit. In his opinion, contracts could be placed with commercial concerns which would allow of much more economic production.

(24) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Assistant Director-General would submit the Secretariat's proposals in 24 hours.

(25) The decision was approved.

(26) Paragraphs 78-80 were adopted without discussion.

Project 5.3: Free flow of information (paragraphs 81-126)

(27) Mr. DUERING (Sweden), referring to paragraphs 90-93, called attention to problems concerning the international exchange of the negatives of educational films.
(28) The international agreement covering the exchange of educational material applied only to the positives of such films, but greater use was made, in the adaptation of films for various purposes, of negatives. He drew the attention of the Secretariat to that point.
(29) He further suggested that reference to the difficulties arising in importing materials for art exhibitions should be added to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee concerning the import of broadcasting and television equipment. The words: "and an enquiry into the conditions governing the temporary import of material for art exhibitions" could be added to the Committee's report (document 8C/BUD/1).

(30) Mr. TERROU (France) remarked that project 5.3 marked the beginning of the section dealing with the second major function of the Department of Mass Communication. The French delegation considered the activities in question to be the most vital part of the Mass Communication programme, for by them people in every walk of life could be won over to the work of Unesco. If Unesco could one day secure the free flow of information on an international scale, and set up clearing houses, the leaders of world opinion would rally to the support of the Organization.

(31) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation attached great importance to resolutions 5.31, 5.32 and 5.33, while reserving the right to make its position clear at a later stage. The recommendations to Member States relating to those resolutions had been formulated at the fifth and seventh sessions of the General Conference before the USSR had joined Unesco. The delegate added that his delegation had received the documents on the Mass Communication budget rather too late to study them thoroughly.
(32) The delegation of the USSR would therefore abstain from voting on the resolutions.

(33) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) stated that the United Kingdom delegation had always been in favour of the fullest and freest flow of information and welcomed any activities by countries which would assist or promote such flow.
(34) With reference to paragraph 94, however, he thought that, as the choice of facilities was so great and the ultimate ability or willingness of countries to co-operate so variable, there was not much

chance of success and he proposed that the project be dropped.
(35) He strongly supported the project outlined in paragraph 99 and saw no objection to extending the principle and system to include such things as objets d'art.

(36) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) was of the opinion that bilateral agreements on the free flow of information were of greater value than multilateral agreements, and were adequate to meet existing needs.
(37) He suggested that the Secretariat should draft a model convention or agreement on a bilateral basis, which would be of great assistance to countries wishing to conclude bilateral agreements.

(38) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication), in reply to the French and Swedish delegates, said that the Department could include in its programme an enquiry into the facilities for the temporary import of artistic material.
(39) Referring to the international instrument for the free movement of persons, Mr. Desjardins drew the Commission's attention to the Report of the Working Party on International Regulations (8C/PRG/23), with special reference to section IV (pages 4 and 5). The Working Party had examined the Director-General's report (document 8C/PRG/8) and adopted the following draft resolution:
(40) Mr. Desjardins then read the text of the resolution on pages 4-5 of document 8C/PRG/23.

(41) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that, if the Commission adopted that resolution, it would have to be inserted after resolution 5.33, becoming 5.34.

(42) Mr. PRATT (Australia) associated himself with the recommendation of the Working Party on International Regulations and complimented it on its realistic approach to the problem.
(43) He supported the principle motivating Unesco in its programme for the Exchange of Persons.

(44) The recommendation of the Working Party on International Regulations was adopted with 4 abstentions.

(45) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) drew the attention of delegates to the draft resolution proposed by the Austrian delegation, International Students' Correspondence (document 8C/DR/10). The idea was to request the Universal Postal Union to prepare an international agreement on the reduction of postage fees for international students' correspondence.

(46) The Secretary added that the Advisory Committee had not felt able to entertain the project, since the General Conference was not competent to approach the Universal Postal Union direct.

(47) The Executive Board, on the other hand, was not in a position to recomment that the Conference approve the proposal, for the request contained in it was outside Unesco's scope.

(48) Mr. LOEWENTHAL (Austria) asked if the words "suggests to" might not be substituted for the words "calls upon" in his delegation's draft resolution.

(49) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the Director-General of Unesco could neither "call upon" the UPU to take action nor "suggest" that it do so. Member States alone could submit proposals to the Congress of that organization. Since many States were members of both Unesco and the UPU, the last paragraph of the draft resolution of the Austrian delegation might be drafted as follows: "Invites Member States to propose to the Congress of the UPU...".

(50) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) hoped that the Austrian proposal would receive wide support. In her view, any measure which helped to promote inter-school correspondence should be supported by Unesco.

(51) Mrs. LEGARDA (Philippines) supported the Uruguayan proposal.

(52) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that, although Unesco was interested in the proposal, it had no jurisdiction in that field.

(53) The correct procedure would be for the Austrian Government to put a proposal before the Universal Postal Union.

(54) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the draft resolution submitted by Uruguay relating to the free movement of persons (document 8C/DR/48).

(55) The Secretary added that the Advisory Committee had not recommended the proposal, the aims of which had been pursued by the Organization for several years past. Neither had the Executive Board recommended its adoption.

(56) The CHAIRMAN stated that, as it was not seconded, the draft resolution would not be put to the vote.

(A) International action for reduction of obstacles to free flow of information (paragraphs 88-102)

(57) Adopted, with 4 abstentions.

(B) Co-operation with United Nations, Specialized Agencies and other International Organizations (paragraphs 103-124)

(58) Adopted, with 5 abstentions.

(C) Studies on free flow of information (paragraphs 125-126)

(59) Adopted with 5 abstentions.

(60) The CHAIRMAN declared resolutions 5.31, 5.32, 5.33, and the new resolution 5.34, adopted.

Project 5.4: Clearing house and exchange and stimulation of educational, scientific and cultural programmes.

Paragraphs 127-135.

(61) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission), referring to paragraphs 130 to 135, drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by the French delegation on educational television broadcasts (document 8C/DR/34). The Advisory Committee had recommended the adoption of the proposal, which entailed no additional expenditure.

(62) The French proposal was adopted.

(A) General clearing house activities (paragraphs 136-142)

(63) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) also drew the Commission's attention to the draft resolution put forward by the Austrian delegation: Encouragement of international co-operation in the field of educational films on the part of Unesco (document 8C/DR/16), which he read out. He added that the Advisory Committee had not recommended the adoption of the resolution, which would entail expenditure of $1,000.

(64) Mr. LEFRANC (France) thought the Advisory Committee's decision hasty and ill-considered. There were technical film dictionaries, but there was none dealing with audio-visual techniques for teaching purposes, laying stress on the use and application in teaching of such techniques. The International Council for Educational Film, which had three working languages, thus experienced the greatest difficulty in dealing with its correspondence, owing to the lack of a suitable dictionary.

(65) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) agreed with the delegate of France and supported the Austrian resolution (document 8C/DR/16).
(66) He drew the attention of the Commission to the similarity between the activities proposed in paragraphs 139 and 158 and asked what the difference between them was.

(67) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) noted that the International Council for Educational Film might indeed have been mentioned in paragraph 139, but it was already referred to in connexion with the international exchange of educational programmes (paragraphs 157 to 159), which was a related activity.

(68) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) asked whether the Austrian draft resolution called for the sum of $1,000 in addition to the appropriations mentioned in section (A).

(69) The additional appropriation was approved, with 7 abstentions.

(70) The whole of section (A) (paragraphs 136 to 142), together with resolutions 5.41 and 5.42, was adopted.

(B) Press, film and radio for children (paragraphs 143-145 and document 8C/5, Corr. 3)

(71) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) stated that when document 8C/5 had gone to press, the Director-General was still without certain details needed to draw up the final text (document 8C/5 Corr. 3), which was now before the Conference and contained particulars of the two projects in view.
(72) He drew delegates' attention to the revised draft of the resolution submitted by the Italian delegation regarding Press, Film and Radio for Children (document 8C/DR/22 rev.). The Secretariat agreed to the substitution of the text there set out for paragraphs 143 and 143 bis.

(73) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) noted that the Advisory Committee had remarked on a certain overlapping between the activities described in paragraphs 143 and 144 of the original text (document 8C/5) and the action of Member States at national level. Documents 8C/5 Corr. 3 and 8C/DR/22 rev. had both appeared since then.

(74) Mr. CALO (Italy) recalled that the General Conference in 1952 had recommended that an international organization be set up to enquire into problems concerning children and young people in their relation to the cinema, television, press and radio. As could be seen from document 8C/PRG/16, many Member States and several non-governmental organizations had replied to the circular letter asking for their views on that recommendation. In many countries, particularly in Italy, the movement had made great strides, for government departments, educationists, programme producers and official representatives had taken an interest in it. What was needed was to co-ordinate the movement at the international level and to make use of the goodwill aroused in all countries and among all the organizations concerned. Exchanges should be arranged between the Member States in connexion with all the measures to be taken in the matter.
(75) If the estimated budget was too high, full use should be made of the studies and fact-finding campaigns conducted by the Department.

(76) Mrs. JOBORU (Hungary) said that films and radio played a big part in the upbringing of a child as well as did the home and school. It was suggested here that they should be used for the purpose of procuring better international understanding but they could also be the cause of hatred.
(77) She proposed that Unesco should collect information on the use of the cinema and radio in 1955 as a clearing house activity and, in addition, that at the end of 1955 the possibility or desirability of setting up a group of experts to study the problems involved, should be considered.
(78) If it should be discovered that films encouraged wars and hatred, Unesco would be in a position to raise a very strong protest. The authority of Unesco in the realm of teaching peace and spiritual values would thereby be increased.

(79) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) wished to support the Italian draft resolution.

(80) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) indicated that the United Kingdom delegation was opposed both to the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/22 rev. and to the contents of paragraph 143.
(81) An enquiry had been made in the United Kingdom on the effect of the cinema on young people and it had been discovered that to pursue the enquiry properly would be extremely costly.
(82) He would be more inclined to support the proposal by the delegate of Hungary that the collection of information should be a clearing house activity.

(83) After some discussion, it was agreed, by 27 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions, to substitute the Italian draft resolution for paragraphs 143 and 143 bis in document 8C/5 Corr. 3.

(84) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that the paragraphs 144 and 145 of Corr. 3 resulted from a Conference of experts on the film industry which had been held under the auspices of Unesco in July 1954 by the organizers of the International Film Festival at Locarno. It was expected that the film industry would, after a few years, soon take over responsibility for the measures advocated.

(85) The project was adopted without opposition.

(C) Co-operation with communication research institutes (paragraphs 146-148)

(86) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the draft resolution on the Clearing House submitted by the French delegation (document 8C/DR/112), and quoted document 9C/PRG/17, on co-operation with communication research institutes.

(87) Mr. TERROU (France) remarked that there were many communication research organizations in the world. Such research work was at the moment very little connected and to co-ordinate it would be just the sort of activity normally pursued by Unesco. The document quoted confirmed that such a project would be useful to Member States. The annual appropriation of $3,500 was obviously inadequate, and Unesco should take steps to deal with that point.

(88) The French proposal, supported by several delegations, was adopted by 29 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

(D) Television and the educational and documentary film (paragraphs 149-153)

(89) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) expressed doubt of the value of this activity. He thought that, as the possibility of financial co-operation between television and the production of documentary films was a commercial one, its solution lay in the commercial field.
(90) The various countries had different technical standards in the use of television, and their financing and programme policies were different. In addition, the conditions governing the expansion of television were unstable. Rapid developments might render the contents of paragraph 151 obsolete.
(91) He moved that paragraph 151 be deleted from the present programme.

(92) Mr. SHAHANE (India) also thought that the proposal contained in paragraph 151 was premature and that it would be wiser to give countries and commercial interests time to propound their views. He proposed that the activity should be postponed for two years.

(93) Mr. LEFRANC (France) could not accept that argument, for the film industry had come into being 50 years previously and television had been in operation with every success for 10 years past.

(94) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) wished to make a general remark on the subject of television. In a very few years, there would be few countries without their own network; of the 58 Member States which already had or would within a year have their own television system, 16 were in North and South America, 28 in Europe, 7 in Asia, 4 in Africa and 3 in Oceania.
(95) Radio, with several years' experience behind it, already had firmly rooted customs, which those in charge were reluctant to change.
(96) Television needed enormous quantities of expensive programmes, and many producers desired or expected action by Unesco.
(97) There were technical difficulties, and they were constantly changing; efforts might be made to solve them by co-operation between cinema and television technicians. The cinema was unquestionably going through a critical period, and television offered an excellent market for educational films. It was an extremely useful means of promoting international understanding, since producers in many countries were already eager to take part in programme exchanges at their own expense. It should be borne in mind that television was established in Japan, in the USSR, etc., and that it was in the process of developing in many other countries.
(98) In conclusion, Mr. Desjardins said that he had found it hard to believe that such was the situation, but that in the past two years he had become absolutely convinced.

(99) Mr. HARDY (United States of America) said that the United States delegation would give its general support to the practice of exchanging educational films.
(100) He warned against an over-optimistic view of the use of television in education. Television offered great opportunities for the use of educational films and would limit the cost of production but it would also show the shortcomings.
(101) He thought that it would be wiser to postpone the activity to allow countries to experiment before determining whether the scheme should have universal application.

(102) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) thought that the Commission was in agreement on the activity in so far as documentary films were concerned and wondered if the

item could be split into two parts with a separate vote being taken on each.

(103) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) was not sure that he had fully understood the proposal he had just heard. His project related to documentary films for which there was too small a market. It would entail an increase in the production of such films.

(104) The project was adopted by 31 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

(E) The rôle of broadcasting in the dissemination of culture (paragraphs 154-156)

(105) After explanations by Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) and the CHAIRMAN, the project, which the Commission had already approved in dealing with the cultural activities budget, and which, moreover, was supported by the Belgian delegate, was adopted without opposition.

(F) International exchange and stimulation of production of educational, scientific and cultural programmes (paragraphs 157-159)

(106) The project, warmly seconded by the French delegate, was adopted without opposition.

(G) World Braille Council (paragraphs 160-162)

(107) The project had been approved by the Advisory Committee, which had raised the sum for contracts for the establishment of the Council by $2,500 for 1956.

(108) Adopted with increased allocation.

(H) Assistance in the production and dissemination of art films (paragraphs 162a to 162h, document 8C/5 Corr.)

(109) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that the activities formerly dealt with partly by the Department of Cultural Activities and partly by the Department of Mass Communication had been linked up by the Director-General in the budget of the latter Department. Obviously the two services concerned would work closely together.

(110) The project was adopted, and included in the draft programme and budget.

Project 5.5: Use of the means of communication for fundamental and workers' education.

(A) Educational Film Institute for Latin America (paragraphs 172 and 173)

(111) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), referring to paragraph 172 of the chapter on Mass Communication, said that he was happy to see that an educational film centre was to be set up in Patzcuaro, but that his Government wished to make one reservation. It did not know what the total cost of the scheme would be, but was agreeable so long as the Mexican contribution was no greater than Unesco's.

(112) Paragraphs 163-173 were put to the vote and approved.

(B) Local production of fundamental education films (paragraphs 174-176)

(113) Adopted.

(C) Visual aid kits for fundamental education (paragraphs 177 and 178)

(114) Adopted.

(D) Influence of educational broadcasts (paragraphs 179 and 180)

(115) Adopted.

(E) Periodical reading material for new literates (paragraphs 181 and 182)

(116) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom delegation approved the project for providing periodicals for new literates. He stressed the importance of seeing that the periodicals were of a type to suit the readers and that they should be published cheaply.

(117) The most difficult problem of all about such periodicals was that of dissemination. He cited the case in British colonial experience, where it had been discovered that within two hundred yards of the official bookshop official books were sold in the market at five times their official price.

(118) He drew the attention of the Secretariat to that and similar problems of dissemination and asked that it should tackle them.

(119) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate that such problems should be tackled and stated that the Secretariat was aware of them and had already approached the Director of the Bantu Press with a view to obtaining information about the difficulties involved. The Secretariat would keep the request of the United Kingdom delegate in mind.

(120) Paragraphs 181 and 182 were adopted.

(F) Fellowships (paragraph 183)

(121) Adopted.

(G) Regional Film Library for the Middle East (paragraphs 184 and 185)

(122) Adopted.

(H) Use of television for fundamental or workers' education (paragraphs 186 and 187)

(123) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) stated that the Advisory Committee had

considered that the project was premature and recommended postponing it until the 1957-58 programme.

(124) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) reminded the Commission of what he had already said of television. An experts' seminar had been held in London with great success and a similar experiment was to be tried in Japan.

(125) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) stated that his country had had its own television service for a year. It was developing very rapidly and consideration would have to be given to the use of television for fundamental education much sooner than had been expected. He ended by saying that Japan would be very happy to take part in such an experiment.

(126) A vote was taken, and the project was adopted by 32 votes to nil, with 3 abstentions.

(I) Development of the radio forum as a means of fundamental education (paragraphs 188 and 189)

(127) Adopted without opposition.

Project 5.6: Technical aid to Member States in development of mass communication services (paragraphs 190-199)

(128) The project was adopted without opposition.

Project 5.7: Voluntary international assistance (paragraphs 200-220)

(A) Unesco coupon scheme and travel coupon scheme

(129) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the whole project had been recommended by the Advisory Committee, which had laid special emphasis on its educational aspect.

(130) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) pointed out that Unesco coupons were not accepted by booksellers everywhere in his country. He asked that efforts should be made to co-ordinate the scheme.

(131) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation could not vote in favour of the projects concerning Unesco coupons, as the Soviet Government had taken no part in working out the various coupon schemes and it would need to give the programme further study.

(132) Mr. HARDY (United States of America) supported the provisions of this section and said that it offered greater opportunities for world-wide international understanding than any other section of the Mass Communication programme.

(133) Mr. WALKER LINARES (Chile) said that his delegation was keenly interested in the Unesco Coupon Scheme, but that in view of existing difficulties in getting coupons accepted, particularly in Latin American countries, he thought it advisable that a resolution be put forward recommending that banks in Member States accept the coupons in question.

(134) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) recalled his proposal to set up a working party on the coupon schemes. Other delegations were interested in improving them, and he suggested that unofficial talks be held with representatives of the Secretariat.

(135) The CHAIRMAN remarked that similar talks held at the General Conference in Florence had produced excellent results.

(136) Mr. ZUCKERMAN (Department of Mass Communication) said that a discussion of that kind might be arranged for the following week.

(137) Mr. PAIK (Korea) testified to the effect of the gift coupon scheme in his country. His countrymen had been greatly impressed by the extent of the aid extended to it under the scheme. He hoped that it would be extended still further and gave it his whole-hearted support.

(138) Mr. LI U-YING (China) stressed the educational and social value of the Unesco Coupon Scheme. He thought that, modest though it was, the scheme should help in promoting the aims of the Organization.

(139) Mrs. KOCH (Denmark) agreed with the opinion expressed by the United States delegate.

(140) Denmark was concerned with four countries in the gift coupon scheme and concentrated on teaching about those four countries in its schools. All teaching was followed up with Unesco material. She emphasized that any textbooks on the four countries should not be prepared by Unesco but by experts having an inside knowledge of the countries concerned.

(141) The Danish Government felt that the ideals underlying the scheme were most vital to the work of Unesco.

(142) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the loyal co-operation of Member States in the gift coupon scheme provided Unesco with its happiest experiences in the carrying out of its programme.

(143) Paragraphs 200-210 were adopted with 5 abstentions.

(B) Gift Coupon Programme (paragraphs 211-221)

(144) Paragraphs 211-218 were adopted with 5 abstentions.

(145) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) drew delegates' attention to the resolution submitted by the French delegation: Discounts for administrative expenses in connexion with Unesco Coupons. He read out the draft resolution (document 8C/DR/33), and added that the Advisory Committee had not recommended its adoption.

(146) The CHAIRMAN mentioned the Congress of the International Federation of Library Associations, which had been held in Zagreb. He thought the French delegation's resolution was founded on insufficient

information, and he himself endorsed the Advisory Committee's view.

(147) The delegate of Italy seconded the French resolution.

(148) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the resolution had budgetary implications amounting to $100,000. He was of the opinion that it would be impossible to accept it, as the Commission had still a long way to go in its work of cutting the programme.

(149) The delegate of France withdrew his resolution (document 8C/DR/33).

(150) Paragraphs 219-221 were adopted with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution DR/11: United Nations stamps honouring Unesco

(151) This resolution was not seconded and was rejected.

Draft resolution DR/57 rev.: Circulation of educational, scientific and cultural publications

(152) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) regretted that many of the proposals submitted by her delegation had been rejected. She could not understand why the Executive Board had not recommended the proposal to bring out a special stamp to facilitate the exchange of cultural material.

(153) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the proposal would have to be amended, since the Director-General could not himself issue a stamp. The suggestion should be studied and submitted as a proposal to Member States, who could on their own account bring it before the Congress of the Universal Postal Union.

(154) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) added that the Board had not supported the proposal.

(155) The Uruguayan delegate agreed to the amendment and Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) accordingly proposed the following wording for the beginning of the draft resolution. "The General Conference invites Member States to propose that the Universal Postal Union issue.....".

(156) The proposed wording was accepted by the delegation of Uruguay, and by the delegate of the United Kingdom, and the project was adopted by 12 votes to 7, with 18 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

# TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 11 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.6 OF REVISED AGENDA: EXCHANGE OF PERSONS SERVICE**

(1) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that the programme was divided into three parts: clearing house and advisory activities; administration of fellowships; and the promotion of exchange of persons for international understanding. Continuous work in the three fields since 1947 had enabled the Secretariat to build up experience in all aspects of problems pertaining to the exchange of persons. The service now possessed extensive documentation, had developed a series of publications and established contacts with governments and provate organizations in the countries concerned.
(2) The policy for 1955-56 was a continuance of the previous programme with the addition of certain new features, the first of which was the development of advisory services and assistance to Member States in the form of technical consultations and discussions on problems raised by them.

(3) With regard to fellowships, the policy was to offer a limited number for the pursuit of studies abroad in specific fields related to Unesco's programme. The programme would inevitably fall short of the needs of Member States, but the Secretariat had felt that it would be better, instead of trying to cope with an unlimited number of requests, to plan in collaboration with the programme departments and link fellowships with specific activities in those departments. Fellowships would thus be an essential tool in the execution of projects. The whole programme represented a concerted effort, in collaboration with the beneficiary and host countries, to develop programmes adequate to to the needs of individual fellows, and was, in addition, a form of technical aid to both the individual and his country. Underlying it was Unesco's basic objective of international understanding.
(4) With regard to the third part of the programme, exchange of persons for international understanding, which was concerned especially with young persons, manual and non-manual workers, and teachers, new

features included the extension of workers' travel to Latin America and Asia; advisory services for the recruitment of foreign teaching staff; and the promotion of regional cultural studies. The object of the regional studies, which were described in paragraph 104, was to promote better international understanding by enabling graduates to acquire knowledge of countries other than their own.

Paragraphs 1-8

(5) Approved.

Project 6.1. Clearing House and Advisory Services

Paragraphs 9-22

(6) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) thought it would be advisable to merge certain publications dealing with travel. The Belgian delegation knew that the Secretariat had already given thought to that question and it brought it up only in order to encourage them to continue with it.

(7) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) assured the delegate of Belgium that the possibility of collaborating with the International Union of Official Travel Organizations was being actively pursued.

(8) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) considered that the clearing house and advisory services should be encouraged. Unesco was not the only organization handling the exchange of persons: Egypt, for example, had developed its own system and had already arranged exchanges of nearly 5,000 students and 1,600 teachers with 35 countries. If Unesco would work out a scheme for co-ordinating such activities, Egypt would be glad to participate.

(9) Referring to paragraph 17, he urged that evaluation of the results of exchange schemes should be pursued more vigorously. Staff and students who had been sent abroad were not always able to work in their fields of specialization when they returned to their countries.

(10) Mr. RIESZ (International Association of University Professors and Lecturers), after recalling the basic aims of the non-governmental organizations he represented, emphasized the extremely important part played by the exchange of teachers and students in the dissemination of knowledge and the development of international understanding, and as a preliminary to the establishment of international faculties; in that connexion, he mentioned the measures taken by Uruguay in establishing a Faculty of Humanities and Sciences (the work of the philosopher Vaz Ferreira).
(11) The International Association of University Professors and Lecturers received no subvention from Unesco but the Organization concluded contracts with it for producing reports on given subjects.
(12) In 1955-56, the survey in progress would be published, revealing difficulties and obstacles which still hampered the exchange of teachers, such as the necessity of providing accommodation in some of the large towns. The equivalence of degrees, the status of teachers and the question of sabbatical leave were all bound up with the problem and had already been dealt with in the Association's previous reports.
(13) Mr. Riesz mentioned another report which the Association was preparing for Unesco, and which would show the significance of the exchange of teachers to the important problem of collaboration between the universities and industry.
(14) Finally, with regard to research fellowships, Mr. Riesz was of the opinion that they should not always be allocated according to a rigid plan, but that some of them should remain at the disposal of the Director-General to meet possible needs connected with new activities.
(15) Mr. Riesz concluded by saying that increased expenditure on education and international understanding should reduce the necessity to spend money on armaments.

(16) Mrs. LEGARDA (Philippines), speaking as observer for the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, thanked Unesco on behalf of the Association's three million members for the valuable work which was being done in sponsoring exchanges of young persons. Two members had benefited in 1952 and two in 1954, but, with the establishment of a new training centre in Mexico during the coming year, more exchanges would be needed. She asked if the Director-General or the Executive Board would consider the possibility of increasing exchanges for young persons.

(17) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board was well aware of the importance of the rôle played by the Exchange of Persons Service. She read out the Board's comments (document 8C/5 Add. 1., paragraph 16, page 3).

(18) Paragraphs 9-22 were approved.

Project 6.2: Fellowship administration

Paragraphs 27-36

(19) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) said that it was essential to maintain at the same figure, and, if possible, to augment in future, the sums set aside for fellowships, by increasing the budgetary appropriation and reducing administrative expenses; to secure an equitable distribution of fellowships among countries and cultures; to award fellowships in such a way as to meet the particular needs of each country; and to rationalize the basis on which they were granted, stressing their technical character and their bearing on the principal educational problems.

(20) Mr. SAMBURSKY (Israel) said that it was important when arranging fellowships to send people to countries with a standard of development not too far above that of their own country, since it was more profitable for them to study conditions which had a reasonable possibility of attainment in the near future. It would also be useful if fellows could be given opportunities of studying the problems of the poorer parts of the host countries.

(21) Mr. CLEGG (United Kingdom) supported the section under discussion, but urged that awards should be notified as early as possible. Improvised arrangements for placing holders of fellowships at short notice might impair the quality of work.

(22) Mr. TOROCHESHNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the following sentence be added to resolution 6.2:

"Taking into account in this matter that in the granting of these fellowships priority should be given first of all to the needs of the underdeveloped countries."

(23) Underdeveloped countries had expressed a need for experts to help in implementing Unesco's programmes in the fields of education, science and culture, and every effort should be made to help them to train their own personnel.

(24) Mr. FRIEDMAN (ORT World Union) suggested that, with an eye to the future, consideration be given to the possibility of including in the draft programme, under project 6.2, fellowships for the investigation and extension of the study of vocational guidance problems, and of incorporating in draft resolution 6.34 (paragraphs 99 and 100) the exchange of teachers from vocational training schools, in order to promote international understanding.

(25) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that his delegation supported the proposal made by Spain and suggested, in addition, that in granting fellowships Unesco give preference to technical education.

(26) Mr. GOMEZ HOYOS (Colombia) referred to the successful experiment being carried out by the Instituto Colombiano de Especializacion en el Exterior (Colombian Institute for Specialization Abroad); and said he had come to the conclusion that administrative expenditure in Unesco's Exchange of Persons Service was in excess of real needs and absorbed a large part of the funds which might be used for fellowships.

(27) Mr. MONTALVO (Ecuador) whole-heartedly endorsed the views of the Spanish delegation, and proposed that, in granting fellowships, the Unesco Secretariat should take due account of Technical Assistance programmes being carried out in various countries.

(28) The amendment to draft resolution 6.2, proposed by the delegation of the USSR, was seconded and unanimously adopted.

(29) Paragraphs 27-36 were unanimously adopted.

(30) Paragraphs 37 and 38 were unanimously adopted

Paragraphs 39-43

(31) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the programme activities referred to in those paragraphs had been given high priority and the Advisory Committee understood that the same priority would extend to the relative fellowships.

(32) Paragraphs 30-43 were approved.

Paragraphs 44-46

(33) Miss DOUGLAS (Canada) urged that in granting fellowships special attention should be given to subjects in which Unesco was particularly interested, for example, the Arid Zone and the Geophysical Year. She hoped the Director-General would bear that in mind when using any surplus funds.

(34) The CHAIRMAN said that the Director-General and the Advisory Committee would bear the comments in mind.

(35) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) said that in the discussion on paragraph 45 (in connexion with paragraph 136 of the Natural Sciences chapter) it had been decided to add the word "astronomy" after "nuclear physics and cosmic rays".

(36) The CHAIRMAN thanked him, and put paragraphs 45 and 46 to the vote.

(37) They were unanimously approved.

Paragraphs 47 and 48

(38) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) said that many countries which were making efforts to promote education were hampered by the lack of statistical experts. He urged that the Secretariat should pay special attention to the need for helping such countries.

(39) Paragraphs 47 and 48 were approved.

Paragraphs 49-51

(40) Approved.

Paragraphs 52-54 and draft resolution 8C/DR/24

(41) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) reported that the Advisory Committee, after hearing from the Secretariat that the budgetary allocation was $20,000, had expressed approval of the project.

(42) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had been greatly interested in draft resolution 8C/DR/24, but in view of the efforts made to draw up a programme equitably distributed between existing needs, had been unable to recommend it for adoption.

(43) Mrs. PATRONETTO VALTER (Italy) said that, if her information was correct, applications for the seven fellowships for artists and writers had already been received from 38 States.

(44) The Advisory Committee was undoubtedly justified in asserting that an increase in the number of such fellowships would upset the balance of the budget; but it was regrettable that the Secretariat, in seeking to achieve a balance, had not made more allowance for such important fellowships.

(45) The Italian delegation therefore asked for an increase in the number of such fellowships, if not immediately, at least for the years 1957-58.

(46) Mr. IBANEZ GOMEZ (Chile) said that his

delegation supported the Italian proposal; he also wished to know in what proportion funds were to be assigned, respectively, to librarians and to artists and writers; he understood that Unesco was very little known as yet in artistic and literary circles and he moved that the sums for artists' and writers' fellowships be increased as much as possible in the 1957-58 period.

(47) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) said that her country was most sympathetic towards the Italian proposal and welcomed any effort to obtain an immediate increase in those fellowships.

(48) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that, although it was difficult to calculate exactly, the proportions in respect of Cultural Activities were approximately $24,000 for artists and writers and $12,000 for librarians. He pointed out that any increase under that project might affect paragraphs 55-61 and urged the necessity of maintaining the balance between the different parts of the programme.

(49) The proposal of the Chilean delegate to defer the Italian proposal (document 8C/DR/24) until the 1957-58 period was put to the vote and adopted by 19 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions.

Paragraphs 55-61

(50) Approved.

Paragraphs 62 and 63

(51) Approved.

Paragraphs 64-67

(52) Approved.

6.3: Promotion of exchange of persons for international understanding

Project 6.31: General promotion (paragraphs 69-76)

(53) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) proposed that resolution 6.31 be amended by adding the phrase, "taking into account, as far as possible, the problems raised by unemployment among intellectuals".
(54) The Lebanese delegate was not blind to the fact that the question was specially difficult because there was no precise definition of the profession of intellectual worker.
(55) But the problem was a real one and the former International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation had studied it very carefully and had come to the conclusion that a solution might be found by co-operating with ILO.
(56) Unesco might revive that idea of co-operating with ILO in attempting by a series of measures, such as the opening of an information office or the compilation of some kind of world register, to find remunerative employment for young intellectuals who were otherwise thrown back on themselves and ready to resort to anything.
(57) The social structure of many countries was still threatened and history would show what effect unemployment in a section of the intellectual class had had on the rise of dictatorships.

(58) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) said that the discussions proposed in paragraphs 73-74 represented one of the most useful of Unesco's activities, since many countries met with serious practical difficulties in connexion with exchange of persons. He fully supported the project and, while hesitating to ask for an increase in the number of the proposed meetings, urged that the existing plans should be implemented.

(59) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) said that the Japanese delegation attached great importance to the question, and his Government would be very pleased if the meeting for the Asian countries were held in Tokyo.

(60) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Secretariat's attention had frequently been drawn to the problem referred to by the delegate of Lebanon. If the intention of his proposal was that the Secretariat should bear it in mind and take whatever steps were possible within the framework of the programme, he was willing to accept it.

(61) Mr. STEWART (Canada) had no objection to the proposal, but was not satisfied with the drafting of the English text.

(62) The proposal of the delegate of Lebanon was put to the vote and adopted by 41 votes to nil with 2 abstentions.

(63) Paragraphs 69-76 were approved.

Project 6.32. Exchange of workers

Paragrapns 77.84

(64) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) observed that there was no mention of individual travel in Europe for workers, although that type of study tour had been encouraged and supported by Unesco.
(65) So long as every care was taken to ensure that such study tours were of use to the communities to which the grant-holders belonged, provision for them should continue to be made in the programmes, or should be introduced.

(66) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that efforts were being made to extend study tours not only in Europe but also further afield. Future activities had been planned more on a group basis than in the past, but he would bear in mind the possibility of individual tours when feasible. The plan envisaged, however, was to promote contact between small groups of workers.

(67) Mr. PRATT (Australia) supported the project but asked if it would be possible at a later stage to widen the scope of paragraph 81 to include Oceania.

(68) Mr. MATIC (Yugoslavia) drew the attention to the Secretariat to the fact that in certain countries - Yugoslavia, for instance - trade

unions were not necessarily affiliated with the international trade union organizations.
(69) The Secretariat should therefore try to find a means of enabling such workers to benefit from Unesco fellowships, as had already been done in the case of those offered by the United Nations Technical Assistance or other Specialized Agencies.

(70) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) wondered whether, as resolution 6.31 concerned intellectuals in particular, resolution 6.32 should not refer solely to manual workers, in order to avoid duplication.
(71) It would be sufficient to delete the words "and non-manual" at the end of the resolution.

(72) The CHAIRMAN pointed out to the Haitian delegate that the term "non-manual" did not necessarily mean "intellectual" (business employees, for example, were not manual workers in the usual sense of the term), and there was therefore an objection to deleting the words "and non-manual" from the resolution.

(73) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) did not insist on the deletion of the words, but urged that, in carrying out the resolution, priority be given to manual workers.

(74) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that a technical problem of terminology was involved. The co-operative and trade union organizations with which Unesco was collaborating distinguished only between manual and non-manual workers and did not speak of writers, artists or musicians as such. It was a question of clarification, since some of the trade union organizations concerned included civil servants and clerks, who were termed non-manual workers in contrast to those who worked in factories and industry; he would prefer to retain the existing wording.
(75) With regard to the question of proportions, while the Secretariat was willing to bear it in mind, the problem was a delicate one. In selecting 75 groups from about 150 applications it was not easy to analyse the proportions of, for example, older and younger workers or men and women.
(76) In reply to a question from the delegate of France, Mr. Carter said that rural workers were included under the resolution, applications being received through the International Association of Agricultural Producers.

(77) Mr. CHARYAVIBHAJ (Thailand) supported the project but asked that South East Asia should be included under paragraph 81.

(78) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that it had been the intention to include that area in the project.

(79) Paragraphs 77-84 were approved.

Paragraphs 85-87

(80) Approved.

(81) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that in developing the scheme the Secretariat had always borne in mind the need for emphasis on young workers as well as on the more mature.

Paragraphs 88 and 89

(82) Approved.

Paragraphs 90 and 91

(83) Approved.

Project 6.33: Exchange of young people (paragraphs 92-97)

(84) Miss MILLER (World's Young Women's Christian Association) said that the YWCA had been in existence for a hundred years and for the last fifty years the World's YWCA, with headquarters in Geneva, had united National YWCAs, which now numbered 64. Through Unesco, the World's YWCA had been admitted to a sisterly relationship with other international non-governmental organizations each working for a particular aspect of Unesco's programme. She pointed out that nearly every women delegate to the present Conference was a member of a YWCA.
(85) Travel grants for young persons were of special interest to her organization and she regretted that in spite of the rise in travel costs the budget for the coming two years had been reduced from $33,000 to $30,000. Unesco's travel grants were of inestimable value to young leaders in the movement, who were thereby given opportunities of travel and international contact far beyond the means of either headquarters or the local organizations. Women had hitherto had far less opportunity than men, and she urged the importance of helping them to play their full part in the international field and in supporting Unesco's programme for mutual understanding between the peoples of the world.

(86) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the reduction was due to a change in the programme. During the past three years travel grants had been made to enable members of qualified international youth organizations to participate in brief study tours, international conferences and seminars, lasting from three weeks to a month. With regard to the future, however, it was felt that long-distance travel grants should be conditional not only on attendance at short-term activities but also on development by the organizations concerned of periods of training for youth leadership lasting from three to five months. Despite the resulting need for additional financial efforts on the part of the organizations themselves, a slight decrease in Unesco's grant was considered justifiable.

(87) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) recognized the difficulties facing the Secretariat in meeting the competing needs for fellowships and travel grants and did not wish to disturb the balance that had been achieved. He urged, however, that more attention should be given to the training of youth leaders and emphasized the close relationship between travel grants and the work of the non-governmental organizations whose co-operation was sought by Unesco. He hoped

that the Secretariat would consider the possibility of transfers from other parts of the programme to increase study grants in 1955-56 and that more attention would be given to that aspect of the department's activities in 1957-58.

(88) Paragraphs 92-97 were approved.

Project 6.34: Exchange of Teachers

Paragraphs 98-102 and draft resolution 8C/DR/23.

(89) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) drew attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendation that draft resolution 8C/DR/23 be considered by the Director-General when preparing the 1957-58 programme.

(90) Mr. VITO (Italy), introducing document 8C/DR/23, which had been submitted by his delegation, stressed the mutual interest of Unesco and the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers, the recent international conference had greatly appreciated the message of support received from the Director-General. Reports at that conference had emphasized the importance of the study being carried out by the Association and the fact that no other organization was working in that field.

(91) The fact that the number of affiliates was increasing and now included Canada, Australia and other distant countries made it clear that a contract of $1,000 was inadequate to carry out the world-wide study of matters connected with the recruitment, employment and exchange of teaching staff. He therefore urged that the amount should be increased to $2,000 for each of the years 1955 and 1956.

(92) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the proposals in draft resolution 8C/DR/23 were already contained in paragraph 101 of the proposed programme and budget. Taking into account, however, the resources of the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers and the intended programme of action, the Executive Board had decided to recommend adoption of the resolution to enable the study to be carried out in a satisfactory manner.

(93) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) said that her delegation warmly supported the Italian proposal.

(94) (Document 8C/DR/23) submitted by the Italian delegation was approved by 29 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraphs 103-106

(95) Unanimously approved.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

(1) As there was no quorum the meeting adjourned for 10 minutes; it then opened in accordance with the provisions of Rule 69, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Procedure.

**PROPOSAL BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL CONCERNING THE VISUAL INFORMATION SECTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MASS COMMUNICATION (document 8C/PRG/28)**

(2) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the object of the proposal by the Secretariat was to give effect to suggestions put forward by several delegations, and particularly by those of France and Italy. He recalled that the Commission had decided to set aside a sum of $50,000 to develop the activities of the Visual Information Section. The Director-General considered that, if the proposals contained in the document were to be carried out, a sum of $60,000 would be necessary. It was therefore proposed that an extra $10,000 be freed.

(3) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) thanked the Secretariat for the information provided.
(4) It had been intended that $50,000 should be devoted to making a film such as "World Without End". Then the scheme had been dropped and the Secretariat had been asked to see whether the money could not be used for other purposes. Did the reference to the making of "topical shorts" mean that the scheme was being taken up in some other form?
(5) Under paragraph 248, no particular provision was made for staff. Was the one P.5 post proposed in document 8C/PRG/28 really needed?

(6) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the proposal that Unesco should make another big film had been decisively defeated. At the same time the Secretariat had been asked to reinforce

its visual information activities. The proposal was made in accordance with the desire expressed for more Unesco activity in that field and on the understanding that Unesco would not itself produce documentaries.
(7) The P.5 post would also supervise the work of the staff already provided for activities in connexion with exhibition and photography.

(8) Mrs. DA VENEZIA (Italy) supported the proposals made by the Secretariat in document 8C/PRG/28.

(9) Mr. LEFRANC (France) considered that the document was the logical outcome of previous discussions. Its object was to reshape the Visual Information Section and make the production of a certain amount of visual material possible. The French delegate relied on the Director-General to reframe the plan of work to fit the proposed budget.

(10) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) also approved document 8C/PRG/28, for the reasons given by the French delegate.

(11) The proposals contained in document 8C/PRG/28 were approved by 23 votes to nil, with 10 abstentions.

ITEM 8.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Project 4.42: Study of cultural relations (paragraphs 326-340)

(12) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) enquired about the fate of the proposal submitted by the Japanese delegation in document 8C/DR/31.

(13) Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur) explained that it had already been decided to consider the proposal for the programme for 1957-58.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/27 concerning the work of Palladio

(14) Mrs. PATRONETTO VALIER (Italy) reminded the Commission that, in document 8C/DR/27, the Italian delegation had presented a proposal concerning a study of Palladio's work. If that proposal were not accepted, Unesco could still invite the International Committee on the History of Art, which was to meet in Venice in 1955, to devote one day of its congress to the work of Palladio. The proposal would entail no special expenditure.

(15) Mr THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Secretariat was prepared to make the approach requested by the Italian delegation.

(16) Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur) said that the International Committee on the History of Art was already preparing for the conference it was to hold in Venice in September 1955. The Secretariat should therefore get into touch with the International Committee with all possible despatch, since it would be finishing its work early in January.

(17) It was agreed that the Italian proposal (document 8C/DR/27) should be referred to the International Committee on the History of Art.

(18) Paragraphs 326-340 were adopted.

Project 4.43: Dissemination of the visual arts and music.

Paragraphs 342-350

(19) Mr. MIHALYFI (Hungary) said that experience in his country had shown that the maintenance of cultural relations was the best way to achieve international understanding. Hungary maintained systematic cultural relations with more than twenty countries, and Hungarian children had recently won prizes in a competition for children's drawings, held in India.
(20) Accordingly, his country approved the exchange of exhibitions, and could not agree with the fear expressed that the results achieved would bear no relation to expenditure. It would gladly share in any scheme organized by Unesco for the exchange of exhibition material.
(21) Coloured reproductions of works of art were excellent instruments for spreading knowledge of national cultures. It was also true, as stated in paragraph 351 of the programme, that there were still no good reproductions of works of art from certain regions, especially the Orient. It was a great pity that Chinese art was so poorly represented. It was impossible to organize international cultural relations if the culture of one-quarter of the human race, with a magnificent history and wonderful prospects, was neglected. That was yet another argument in favour of ensuring the participation of the real representatives of China in the work of Unesco.

(22) Mrs. MALAKUL (Thailand) welcomed the programme of cultural activities, which was a decided improvement on that for the previous year. She would like to emphasize that there were, in Thailand, wall paintings worthy of reproduction.

(23) The CHAIRMAN announced at that point that Bolivia had made a payment which would thenceforward entitle its delegation to vote.

(24) Mrs. DA VENEZIA (Italy) pointed out that, in document 8C/DR/25, her delegation had presented a proposal calculated to encourage relations, and facilitate the exchange of photographic blocks between publishers of popular collections of art reproductions.
(25) With regard to catalogues of reproductions of works of art, Mrs. da Venezia stressed the fact that reproduction techniques were making constant progress and that the standards adopted in preparing such catalogues should be critically considered. Such an examination could be made at one of the meetings of experts on the subject.

(26) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) was in complete agreement with the Italian delegation's suggestions and recalled that the

Secretariat had already approached certain publishers of reproductions of works of art.

(27) Paragraphs 342-350 were approved.

Albums of reproductions of works of art (paragraphs 351-353)

(28) Mr. UNGARETTI (Italy) asked that the words "with which the public is little acquainted" be deleted from the heading of paragraph 351. He had no objections to the work undertaken by the Secretariat, but was convinced that it was art as a whole with which the public was but little acquainted.

(29) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Secretariat had so far refrained from publishing reproductions of well-known works in order not to compete with those already published. Furthermore, the Secretariat believed it was interpreting the General Conference's intentions correctly in devoting particular attention to spreading knowledge of the art of the East and of certain regions which could not call upon the most up-to-date reproduction techniques.

(30) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) was ready to leave the choice of subject-matter to the Secretariat. It was important that the albums published should maintain the highest standards of quality. Such works of art were a most effective contribution to international understanding.

(31) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) said that his delegation was particularly interested in the project, as it thought that the public in other parts of the world still knew too little about Asian art.

(32) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) said that the albums published by Unesco were already out of stock; their success was due as much to their originality as to their quality. He hoped that arrangements would be made for larger editions.

(33) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was prepared to amend the heading of paragraph 351 in accordance with the Italian delegate's suggestion.

(34) Approved.

(35) Paragraphs 351-353 were approved.

Travelling exhibitions of reproductions (paragraphs 354-356)

(36) Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur) suggested that the Secretariat should consider donating scientific exhibitions to Member States after they had served their purpose.

(37) Paragraphs 354-356 were adopted.

Dissemination of art films (paragraphs 357-359)

(38) Mrs. PATRONETTO VALIER (Italy) wondered why the project relating to art films was chiefly the responsibility of the Department of Mass Communication. As the essential object of such films was to spread knowledge about works of art, the project should really come under the Department of Cultural Activities.

(39) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that it had been thought necessary to do more on behalf of art films through the Department of Mass Communication, which had qualified specialists on its staff and was in direct contact with film producers. Previously, a very small sum had been provided in the budget of the Department of Cultural Activities, while the staff concerned were attached to the Department of Mass Communication. It had seemed desirable to bring that division of responsibilities to an end, but the Department of Mass Communication would, of course, work in close consultation with the Department of Cultural Activities on the matter.

(40) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that art films were liable to be of very unequal quality. The Secretariat should try to encourage commercial producers to produce better art films.

(41) Paragraphs 357-359 were adopted.

Paragraphs 360-371

(42) Adopted.

Promotion of the establishment of permanent museums of reproductions and of record and film libraries (paragraphs 372-374)

(43) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the observations on paragraph 372 made by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget in document 8C/BUD/1, page 15.

(44) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) accepted the deletion of the project and its postponement until a later date, in order to offset the additions made to the programme of his Department.

(45) The postponement of the project was unanimously approved.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/41: Measures for the development of drama and the spread of popular interest in the theatre

(46) The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Uruguay which was recommended by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (document 8C/BUD/1, page 16) was unanimously approved.

Project 4.44: Translations

Paragraphs 375-391

(47) Mr. MUJEEB (India) said that his country was very keenly interested in the matter, and his Government, as was stated in paragraph 378, had made large sums available to Unesco in order that Indian classics might be translated under Unesco's auspices.

Cultural Commission of the Arab League was at present sitting on the International Commission at Beirut, and the Secretariat would welcome any measures likely to strengthen co-operation between the Arab countries on that matter.
(65) Mr. Thomas said that his Department would be glad to study the suggestions made by Mr. Massaquoi. With regard to Mr. Bender's observations, Mr. Thomas noted that contradictory opinions had been expressed by the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation, on the one hand, and the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, on the other, with regard to the translation of works from the literatures of European languages which were not widely spoken. The General Conference had not so far taken any definite decision on the matter.
(66) In reply to Mr. Laugier, Mr. Thomas wished to make it clear that National Commissions were always consulted on translation questions. To conclude, he stressed that the observations made by the Italian delegation were very interesting. The scope of the work had gradually expanded as the result of numerous consultations and negotiations. The expansion of the work would probably later necessitate an increase in the staff and in the budgetary resources for the project. Furthermore, the very small number of translators capable of undertaking certain types of work made it difficult to carry out the plans rapidly. One of the only two French specialists in Persian, for instance, had needed three years to complete the work he had been commissioned to do.
(67) Mr. Thomas said that paragraph 389 dealt with works in languages that were not widely spoken, such as Dutch.

(68) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) said that translation was one of the most important instruments of international understanding. His country had on several occasions acted as a bridge between East and West. Greek works had been translated into Arabic and thence into Latin. It was trying to co-operate with Unesco in making Eastern cultures more familiar to the West, and vice versa. Unhappily, the International Commission in Beirut had made some serious mistakes, and it had been found that the Cultural Commission of the Arab League was more effective in promoting work of the type under discussion. Egypt was trying to co-ordinate the work of translation and to set up a clearing house in Cairo. All the experience acquired would be made available to Unesco.

(69) Mr. WALKER LINARES (Chile) was pleased at the translation into French and English of representative Latin American works, which carried on the tradition established by the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation with its earlier Latin American series.
(70) He agreed with Mr. Laugier that translations should not be confined to literary works, but that works on sociology and other sciences which deserved to be more widely known should also be translated.
(71) He asked that a preliminary enquiry be carried out in the various countries before the selection of such works was made; cultural bodies and associations of critics should be consulted.

(72) Paragraphs 375-391 were approved.

Project 4.41: History of the scientific and cultural development of mankind (paragraphs 318-325)

Report by the Working Party (document 8C/PRG/27)

(73) Mr. MUJEEB (India), as Rapporteur of the Working Party, introduced the report by saying that the matter had been most thoroughly considered. The Working Party recommended that the work begun should be continued.

(74) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) recalled that he had already had occasion, in the Working Party, to state that specialists from his country would be glad to co-operate in the preparation of the History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind and to help in making the work an objective account of the history of humanity.
(75) The Czechoslovak delegation thought it vital that the USSR, the People's Republic of China and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe should take a part in the work of the International Commission proportionate to the part they had played in the historical progress of mankind and in the development of historical science. Their contribution would be confined to the Commission's future work and would not imply acceptance of the responsibilities assumed by the Commission earlier.
(76) The Czechoslovak delegation had also expressed doubts about the project for preparing a shorter version of the history. A work of that kind was certainly to be desired if it was the fruit of extremely careful critical work, but the question was too important for the training of the younger generation and the development of popular education to be dealt with solely on a commercial basis.
(77) Mr. Hayek said, in conclusion, that the Czechoslovak delegation would vote in favour of the continuation of the project and the approval of the proposed appropriations, subject to the reservations he had just made.

(78) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) hoped that Japanese specialists would be able to take part in the International Commission's work.

(79) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) supported the Working Party's report and proposed that it be adopted.

(80) Mr. VITO (Italy) said that reference was made in the report to an Italian proposal which had been rejected. He wished to inform the Commission that his proposal had been rejected by a negligible majority.
(81) In making it he had taken his stand on the fact that it ran counter to the traditions of Unesco to publish works tending to cheaper knowledge.

(82) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that the proposal raised most serious questions.
(83) Contracts had been passed by the International Commission in the full exercise of the powers bestowed on it by the General Conference. Those contracts included one for the writing of the shorter history and, if it were broken, Unesco might be sued. It was therefore in the highest degree unwise to interfere.

(48) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) praised Unesco's work in this field. It had, however, to be recognized that very few translations were made and that it would be a long time before major works could be translated into the principal languages.
(49) Spain had for the moment made no request for the reproduction, by that means, of what was most individual and most essential in Spanish culture and thought. Unesco did not and probably would not have the means necessary for undertaking the enormous task of translating the works of all Eastern and Western cultures. Spain was in touch with the National Commissions and the most representative intellectual bodies in the oriental countries with the object of publishing the works of those countries in Spanish and vice versa. As soon as the financial and technical aspects of the project were settled, the Spanish delegation would apply to Unesco to co-ordinate the efforts being made.
(50) The first stage of the project would consist in translating into Spanish the major poetical, literary, philosophical and historical works of the Arab world.

(51) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) recalled that the first International Commission for the Translation of the Classics had been set up at Beirut. He wished to know whether other similar commissions had been formed and if it was proposed to group them in an international federation comparable with the International Federation of Translators, whose establishment he had noted with pleasure.

(52) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) said that for several years he had been wanting to speak on that very subject. In Africa history was largely unwritten history, unknown to the outside world and to the African peoples themselves. What books there were had largely been written in Arabic. Some of them had been translated into French, but were almost unobtainable. Important works had been written by French and German explorers (Frobenius, for example), but had never been translated.
(53) He therefore appealed to the Commission to help in writing the history of Africa, and not only the history of Africa after the Arab invasion. There must be many works in Spanish, Portuguese and French still to be unearthed, and perhaps valuable archives in places such as Lisbon and Madrid. Unesco should give assistance.

(54) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) entirely agreed with the previous speakers. If Unesco wished to reach the masses, it must speak in their languages. Hence Jordan warmly welcomed the scheme for translation into Arabic.
(55) He hoped that there would be more co-operation between the International Commission for the Translation of the Classics in Beirut and the Cultural Commission of the Arab League. It was important that Unesco should assist the International Commission in its task.

(56) Mr. LAUGIER (France) pointed out that cultural exchanges were hindered by linguistic barriers. The translation of representative works was therefore a task of the greatest importance; the French delegation strongly supported Unesco's efforts in that field and hoped that they could be intensified.
(57) Mr. Laugier added that translations made under Unesco's auspices should be as nearly perfect as possible, and stressed the need for giving National Commissions a say in the selection both of translators and of works to be translated. Specialists had criticized the quality of certain translations.
(58) Mr. Laugier considered that Unesco should not confine its attention to works of general culture or to philosophical and literary works. Certain modern scientific works were vitally important and might be of great interest to various countries. Works of that kind, however, took years to reach countries speaking other languages. Consideration should therefore be given to the possibility of having the essential scientific works of the contemporary world translated.

(59) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) warmly supported the resolution. He drew the Director-General's attention to the fact that his National Commission had some time ago submitted a list of works to be translated from Dutch. The Belgian and Netherlands National Commissions were co-operating in arranging for translations from that language. The Netherlands would certainly give all the assistance in its power.

(60) Mrs. MALAKUL (Thailand) was also strongly in favour of the resolution. Action of the type indicated was an excellent means of promoting international understanding. Great literature was exceedingly difficult to translate and translators ought to be well paid.

(61) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) said that in paragraph 378 it was stated that, from 1954 onwards, special attention would be paid to Oriental literatures. As the delegate of Liberia had said, it was just as important that attention be given to the literature of Africa.

(62) Mrs. PATRONETTO VALIER (Italy) said that, although the project had been a very modest one at the beginning, it had since developed very considerably, thanks to the competence of the Secretariat and to the project's intrinsic interest. She thought that the Secretariat should later be given larger resources for pursuing the undertaking. In addition, meetings of experts might be held from time to time, at the expense of the governments concerned, to define the criteria applicable in the field in question.

(63) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the suggestions made by the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation with regard to the translation of works written in European languages which were not widely spoken (document 8C/DIV/80, page 17), he also read out the observations of the Advisory Committee (document 8C/BUD/3, page 3).

(64) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the International Commission at Beirut was for the time being the only such body dealing with translations. The remarks of the delegate of Jordan were entirely in line with the wishes of the Secretariat. An observer from the

(84) The shorter history would of course be most carefully prepared and reviewed by a competent body. It would not be a textbook.
(85) Surely one of the aims of Unesco was to ensure that knowledge was disseminated on the widest possible scale. That aim would be furthered by publication of the shorter history.

(86) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) supported what had been said by the delegate of the United Kingdom. The matter had been most thoroughly discussed already.

(87) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) gave enthusiastic support to the project and entirely agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(88) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the work in hand, on a history of mankind, was of the greatest importance. It would make a signal contribution to international understanding. Soviet scholars would be happy to share in writing those sections devoted to a history of the peoples of the USSR. The question whether or not a shorter history should be edited was a secondary problem which could be decided on within the International Commission.

(89) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) supported what had been said by the delegate of the United Kingdom.
(90) The point of issuing a shorter version of the six-volume history, as he understood it, was that it would appeal to many thinking people who for one reason or another could not acquire the full work. In no sense would it be an authorized history for schools. Like the larger work, it would always be open to revision.
(91) He had always insisted that the work should not represent Unesco's own philosophy of history. It would represent the views of the scholars who had drafted it.
(92) It was quite natural that each session of the Conference should find something to criticize. But to stop the work in hand would be an act of complete irresponsibility.

(93) Mr. VITO (Italy), while recognizing the force of what had been said, considered that, in view of the terms of reference given to the Working Party, he had been well within his rights in speaking of the shorter history as a textbook. The point was that the purpose of the shorter version could be differently interpreted, and hence he would move that a decision as to its publication be deferred until the next session.

(94) Mr. LAUGIER (France) emphasized that the French delegation was aware of the considerable difficulties involved in the task with which the International Commission had been entrusted. Many intellectual problems had in fact to be solved. Unesco, which had been sympathetic to the project a few years earlier, should not complicate the Commission's task by raising financial difficulties. The French delegation would therefore vote in favour of the necessary appropriations.
(95) Mr. Laugier also wished to know how the International Commission intended to collaborate with Unesco's new Member States, for he attached great importance to such co-operation.
(96) The French delegation had serious reservations to make about the publication of a shorter version of the history. It hoped that the International Commission would confine itself to bringing out the scientific and cultural history unabridged, and did not think that Unesco should take responsibility for publishing a shorter version.

(97) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) said that in document 8C/PRG/27 (report by the Working Party) mention was made (page 2) of the fact that the delegate of Egypt had criticized the plan of the third volume on the grounds that not enough space was devoted to the literary and philosophical aspects of the history of Islam.
(98) Now Volume III covered the period from 400 to 1,300 A.D., when Islam had been at the height of its glory. In the existing plan of the volume, emphasis was chiefly laid on political history and architecture. The peoples of Islam felt that they had made an outstanding contribution to the cultural history of mankind in the realm of philosophy. In Islamic thought, the philosophies of Greece, of Persia, of India and of the Arab world were blended to form a harmonious whole. Islamic thought was an outstanding example of fruitful intercourse between different peoples and cultures.
(99) The literary history of Islam was also a glorious one. For no less than sixteen hundred years, great literature had been produced in Arabic, a record surpassed only by the Chinese.
(100) While appreciating the work done on Islamic history by foreign scholars, his country strongly felt that representatives of the Arab world should be called upon to contribute.

(101) Mr. FERNANDEZ QUINTANILLA (Spain) considered that the shorter version should be postponed until the principal work itself had been finished. That was the only way of gaining a proper understanding of the problem and discovering whether it was possible and desirable to publish the shorter version.
(102) He asked that, in future, commitments with publishing houses which might compromise freedom of action in pursuing the project, should be avoided.

(103) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) reminded the Commission that the history of the scientific and cultural development of mankind would require ten years' work and the expenditure of $400,000. It was therefore a major project. The General Conference had, so far, unhesitatingly approved the necessary appropriations, thus demonstrating its confidence in the International Commission and in its President, whom Mgr Maroun congratulated on the high standard of the numbers of the Journal published to date.
(104) Mgr Maroun noted that there had been no mention in any report that the publication of the complete work would, so to speak, depend upon that of the shorter version. In point of fact, it seemed that the publishers wished the two publications to be linked. In such circumstances, the International Commission, which was responsible for the complete edition, would also have to take responsibility for the shorter version.

(105) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that the question whether or not a work of such a wide scope was to be published in whole or in part was less important than that it should be soundly prepared.
(106) The Commission, of which Mr. Berredo Carneiro was President, could be relied on from the scientific point of view and its work would be crowned with success.
(107) With regard to the shorter version, which had been described as difficult and hazardous, the Chilean delegate sumpathized with the desire of the representative of the USSR that the Commission should study the possibilities of popularizing the History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind. The work would be of great value to scholars; it was very much more important that the great mass of workers should appreciate its historical interest.
(108) He asked Mr. Berredo Carneiro if the Journal referred to in the document under examination, could be used for that work of popularization.
(109) The delegation of Chile thought that the acceptance of new contributors was a problem which should be left to the Commission's discretion.

(110) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that Unesco had adopted the work plan of the history in question. That plan made definite provision for the shorter version. It had been referred to the International Commission for action. Therefore, although the Conference could negotiate with the International Commission on points of detail, it was quite powerless to rule that there should be a change in the number of volumes published or that work on the shorter version should be stopped.
(111) All that the Conference was asked to do was to make suitable budgetary appropriations for the implementation of its previous decisions.
(112) Definite legal contracts had been entered into. They had been drawn up on the advice of Unesco's legal experts and rested on the authority given by previous sessions of the Conference.

(113) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) supported what the delegate of the United Kingdom had said. As the Director-General had pointed out, the Conference had entrusted the International Commission with a definite task. Since the original decision in 1950, the Conference had on three separate occasions reaffirmed its intentions and made the necessary appropriations. As a result, the International Commission had entered into definite contracts. There was no reason at all to think that the shorter version would be prepared with less care than the longer history. Hence the Conference should approve the budgetary appropriations in question for another two-year period.

(114) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (President, International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind) said that the International Commission understood it was responsible for planning the work in six volumes and the two shorter versions intended for different sections of the general public. The Commission had never entertained the idea of publishing a textbook for any particular type of educational establishment. All it had done was to define the types of readers for whom the shorter versions intended for the general public were to be designed.
(115) The International Commission would certainly not shirk the task of preparing those shorter versions. It would use the same scientific methods and the same machinery for consulting specialists as for the complete editio . It was prepared, furthermore, to publish material for inclusion in the shorter versions, and even chapters from those works, in the Journal. There was therefore no question of two different techniques or of two different standards of exactitude.
(116) Mr. Berredo Carneiro added that the Commission would find it difficult to arrange for the publication of six 800-page volumes, containing many maps and illustrations, unless the publishers could count on the success of a more popular work to offset a possible loss on the principal work.
(117) The question had been very carefully studied, in order that the results of so much financial and intellectual effort should be accessible not only to a small élite but also to the general public.
(118) Mr. Berredo Carneiro wished to remind the meeting that the new Member States had been invited, as early as 1952, to collaborate with the Commission. The atmosphere of the Commission's work was truly international and it hoped to appoint members, corresponding members and consultants from among specialists of those countries.

(119) Document 8C/PRG/27 was finally approved with 6 abstentions.

(120) Project 4.41, paragraphs 318-325, was also approved, with 1 abstention.

**ITEM 8.4.4.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL PETITION IN FAVOUR OF ESPERANTO** (document 8C/PRG/3 and Addendum) **AND DRAFT RESOLUTION 8C/DR/116**

(121) Mr. BLINKENBERG (Denmark) thought it would be extremely rash and premature for Unesco to advocate the use of Esperanto. He would therefore vote against the draft resolution under consideration.
(122) In his view, neither its structure nor the number of its supporters entitled Esperanto to the status of a universal, international language. It was an auxiliary language invented by an amateur linguist who had made use mainly of components drawn from several western languages.
(123) A linguist could hardly give a favourable judgment on Esperanto. Its phonetic system was unsatisfactory for many nations; and its morphology and system of derivations was not particularly happy.
(124) As an auxiliary language, it had certain uses, but it could not be regarded as a real instrument of culture, or as a language into which the masterpieces of the world's literature could be translated. Moreover, it was not the only, nor the best, existing international language, and the possibility of using simplified forms of widely spoken languages, such as Basic English or Français élémentaire, might also be considered.

(125) Mr. LAPENNA (Observer for the Universal Esperanto Association) regretted that the Chairman

had been able to allow him only three minutes for presenting the petition signed by 16,500,000 people. Contrary to the opinion of the Danish delegate, he mentioned linguists who had expressed very favourable opinions on Esperanto (A. Meillet, M. Müller, Marr, Shishmanov, etc.). Other linguists, such as Collinson in England, Björn Collinder in Sweden, and Waringhien in France, spoke the language perfectly and had indeed published several works in Esperanto. They were in fact the only people who were in a position to give an objective and well-informed judgment on Esperanto. Mr. Lapenna said that, moreover, the Danish delegate's statements were entirely unfounded.
(126) He recalled that the Association's Research and Documentation Centre had published and distributed to all delegations a document entitled "The International Language and the Contribution of the Esperanto Movement to the Aims of Unesco". U. E. A. had endeavoured to give Unesco full information about Esperanto (Report to the Secretariat, documents submitted to National Commissions and an Exhibition, including 3,000 works, within a mere hundred yards of the Conference building).
(127) He added that a Unesco observer had attended the thirty-eighth Esperanto Congress at Zagreb. He had been able to see that nearly 2,000 delegates from the most varied countries understood each other perfectly, without translation or interpretation, during the debates and discussions, at the Summer School and artistic functions, and in private conversation.
(128) Mr. Lapenna hoped that delegates on the Commission, after seeing and reading all the information provided on the subject, would be prepared, by taking an impartial decision, to meet the wishes of the 16,500,000 people who had signed the Petition. Language barriers were one of the chief obstacles to better international understanding. Romain Rolland had said that "for people to come to an understanding, they must be able to hear and understand each other", and he had added that "Esperanto thus opens the ears of the deaf, who have been for centuries isolated in their several languages".

(129) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) observed that, as far as the resolution (document 8C/DR/46) contained a statement of facts, his delegation could vote for it. Paragraph 4, however, would commit Unesco to selecting Esperanto as an international language, rather than any of the other auxiliary languages which existed. In his view, it would be rash for Unesco to make such a choice, until the question had been thoroughly studied by experts.

(130) Mr. ESTABLE (Uruguay) said that his country had submitted a draft resolution designed to encourage bilingualism throughout the American continent. The idea was that all Americans should speak two languages, Spanish and English. A study of both languages at school for one generation would be enough for the essentials of two civilizations to become familiar throughout the continent.
(131) With the same object in view, Uruguay supported the petition for the spread of Esperanto. It was necessary to weigh the arguments for and against, and then come to a decision. Mr. Estable had made his choice not for technical reasons but in a spirit of sympathy and generosity, and asked that the proposal be approved.

(132) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on draft resolution 8C/DR/116.

(133) Rejected by 22 votes to 3, with 19 abstentions.

Draft resolution submitted by Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ecuador and Haiti (document 8C/DR/3/ rev.2).

(134) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the Advisory Committee's recommendation, which advised against adopting the draft resolution, in view of its financial implications.

(135) Mr. COTO CONDE (Union of Latin American Universities) commented on document 8C/DR/3 (rev. 2), saying that the first version had been revised so as to avoid budgetary implications. The Union of Latin American Universities, upon the advice of cultural associations and governments, hoped that the draft resolution would be approved in its existing form, in accordance with the procedure of the General Conference.

(136) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Advisory Committee had calculated the budgetary implications of the proposal before document 8C/DR/3 had been revised the first time. As the delegate of Honduras said that it had again been revised, it was difficult to know whether the proposal still had budgetary implications.

(137) Mr. COTO CONDE (Union of Latin American Universities) explained that he was referring to document 8C/DR/3 (rev. 2), which had been distributed, since he had a copy of it in his hands.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/6 concerning the dissemination of Asian and African culture in the West

(138) The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on draft resolution 8C/DR/6, submitted by the Indian delegation and announced that draft resolution 8C/DR/17, on the same subject, had been withdrawn by that same delegation.

(139) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out the comments of the Advisory Committee, which had seen no need to take a decision on draft resolution 8C/DR/6.

(140) Mr. MUJEEB (India) said that his delegation withdrew the draft resolution.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/106 concerning certain International Cultural Celebrations

(141) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) wished to comment on three points in the draft resolution. The proposal was simply that such celebrations should be held in certain countries in both continents; but, if it were approved, Unesco would be able to give them universal interest.
(142) The proposal had no budgetary implications. The draft resolution was dated 30 November but had

been submitted within the time-limit of seven days after the opening of the General Conference, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

(143) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) drew attention to two points in the last part of the draft resolution: (1) Unesco was to organize commemorative celebrations simultaneously in all countries, devoting some of its publications to them and calling upon National Commissions for assistance; (2) the Conference was to adopt a resolution concerning the commemoration of the anniversaries of certain artists and scientists. (144) The Director of the Department of Cultural Activities asked if the Hungarian delegation's intention was that the celebrations should be organized by the individual Member States, or at Unesco's instigation. He thought that the point should be made clear in view of the budgetary implications to be taken into account in the second case.

(145) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) read out the draft resolution and said that all that was asked was that Unesco adopt the idea and communicate it to Member States. No expenditure would be entailed.

(146) The CHAIRMAN asked if the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Hungary was seconded; the delegation of the Soviet Union replied that it was.

(147) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) proposed that a decision on the Hungarian proposal be postponed until the ninth session of the General Conference.

(148) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that by 1957 and 1958 certain anniversaries would already have gone by.

(149) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the delegate of Hungary be invited to prepare a new and more precise draft resolution, which would be examined at the next meeting.

(150) Approved.

(151) Mr. LAPENNA (Universal Esperanto Association) asked what interpretation was to be placed on the rejection of the draft resolution submitted by the Mexican delegation. Did Unesco intend to encourage the study of Esperanto and would the Conference take note of the conclusions contained in document 8C/PRG/3? He pointed out that, if the Commission approved those conclusions, and in particular item IV, which related to the teaching of Esperanto in Member States, Unesco could consider the results achieved during coming years, and could take decisions with a view to more specific action.

(152) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Commission had taken note of the report contained in document 8C/PRG/3, but that the Director-General was not contemplating any specific activities in the matter.

(153) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) thought that, in fairness to the representative of the Universal Esperanto Association, the Commission should either receive or approve document 8C/PRG/3.

(154) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark), seconded by Mr. MUJEEB (India), moved that the Commission take note of document 8C/PRG/3.

(155) The motion was adopted.

(156) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out draft resolution 8C/DR/3 rev. 2, which the Documents and Publications Service had been unable to reproduce in time.

(157) Mr. COTO CONDE (Union of Latin American Universities) said that the resolution had been drafted several times. It had been submitted in October and seemed acceptable to the Secretariat; but it was later found that it might have financial implications. The draft resolution was therefore revised, and when it was observed that further obstacles to its adoption might arise, it was redrafted and submitted in a different form. All that was asked was that the Director-General should investigate the possibility of instituting a World Culture, Science and Education Week and of establishing Unesco Awards. The Director-General would submit his conclusions to the ninth session of the General Conference.

(158) Mr. LAUGIER (France) had been pleased to find a proposal he had often advocated in the Executive Board in draft resolution 8C/DR/3 rev. 2. (159) He thought that Unesco should begin to adopt the policy of replacing expert committees by competitive awards. He recalled the number of expert committees which had met to discuss the question of propaganda in support of Human Rights, and the number of documents necessary for their work, and stated that the method was inefficient and should be discarded. From a quick calculation made by a member of the Secretariat, the work to which he had referred had cost from $400,000 to $500,000. If the Secretariat had simply offered awards and concluded contracts with the associations concerned, the cost would have been less and a large number of works on the subject would already have been available to specialists and Unesco.

(160) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on draft resolution 8C/DR/3 rev. 2.

(161) Approved by 34 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

(162) Before going on to study the chapter on documents and publications, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the delegation of the USSR, which had submitted draft resolution 8C/DR/70, and the delegations of Colombia, Ecuador, Jordan, Liberia, Mexico and United States of America, which had put forward an amendment to that draft resolution in document 8C/DR/117, should meet to draw up a joint draft resolution which would be examined at the next meeting.

(163) Approved.

CHAPTER 8 : DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS SERVICE

(164) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) first reminded the Commission of two features of his Service.

(165) The Documents and Publications Service had no programme of its own; it assisted all departments in the execution of their work and in the implementation of the Organization's programme.

(166) In addition, and particularly where publications were concerned, the Service went on with the execution of the programme when the departments had finished their work. That applied to reprints, re-issues and the sale of publications. The activities of the Documents and Publications Service were therefore concerned as much with Unesco's past as with the present.

(167) Mr. Delavenay emphasized an important aspect of the problem of publications, i.e. how Member States and National Commissions could co-operate in their distribution. In 1953, the Director-General had made specific recommendations to them with a view to enlisting their help (cf. document ODG/4, pages 38 to 41). Appreciable results had already been achieved, thanks to National Commissions and sales agents.

(168) The Chief of the Documents and Publications Service invited all delegates who wished to have further information on the question to come and see him before the end of the session.

(169) He also mentioned the improvements which it had been possible to make, as a result of sending questionnaires to National Commissions. Those questionnaires, which related to a particular Unesco publication, served to determine to what extent the publication fulfilled its object, the distribution it should be given, and the languages into which it should be translated.

(170) The sale of Unesco publications was expanding and had gone up noticeably during recent weeks. Mr. Delavenay gave the percentages of income from sales in relation to the funds obligated for contractual printing in preceding years: 8% for 1951, 13% for 1952, 15% for 1953, 32% for 1954. The net income at the end of 1954 would probably exceed $100,000, as against $220,000 spent by buyers, the difference of $120,000 representing the commission of sales agents and freight charges. In 1954, a sum of $26,000 had been spent on three experiments in connexion with the distribution of the Courier in French-speaking countries, the United States of America and Uruguay. Thanks to that campaign, the number of purchasers of the periodical had risen in six months from 6,000 (in December 1953) to 25,000.

(171) Mr. Delavenay drew the Commission's attention to the annex to document 8C/BUD/1: "Draft resolution consolidating the Rules of the Publications Fund."

(172) The Fund was of great help in the distribution of Unesco publications. The Advisory Committee's draft resolution was designed to fix its structure on a firm basis. The balance of the Fund for each year would be $50,000 instead of $150,000, the excess being surrendered to "Miscellaneous Income". The Director-General would be authorized to meet the cost of postage of publications out of the Fund.

(173) In the programme for 1955-56, provision was made for the establishment of two new posts at grade P. 2, whose incumbents would be responsible for distributing publications at the regional level. That that was the first step towards regionalization. Efforts would be made to increase the circulation of Unesco publications in Spanish in Latin America, where they were not yet widely enough known.

(174) In conclusion, Mr. Delavenay said that, while the existing budget should make it possible to look forward to the future with confidence, in 1957-58 greater efforts should be made, by regional action, to distribute publications arising out of programme activities.

(175) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) thanked and congratulated Mr. Delavenay. He took the increase in the sale of publications to be an encouraging sign. The criticisms made at previous sessions of the General Conference about Unesco publications had not been repeated, which proved that the existing estimates had met with general approval.

(176) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) congratulated the Documents and Publications Service on the excellent work it had done in making Unesco known to the world. The issuing of publications in different languages was one of the most effective ways of spreading knowledge of Unesco's aims and ideals, and also of furthering international cultural understanding. The Arabic-speaking countries were ready to help in every possible way in the publication and distribution of translations into Arabic.

(177) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) associated himself with the delegate of Egypt in praising the excellent work done by Mr. Delavaney and his Service. He was very happy to note the extension of translations into Arabic and hoped that every effort would be made to increase their number still further. He hoped that any money unspent would be used for that purpose.

(178) In conclusion, Mr. Salim moved the approval of Chapter 8 in document 8C/5 and Corrigendum.

(179) Chapter 8 in document 8C/5 and Corrigendum, together with the resolution of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, contained in the Annex to document 8C/BUD/1, were unanimously approved.

(180) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Commission still had to consider Project 3.4 of the chapter on Social Sciences.

(181) Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), remarking that there were no French or Russian versions of the relevant document, moved adjournment of the item until Monday, 6 December.

(182) Adopted.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

# THIRTIETH MEETING

*6 December 1951 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**ITEM 8.4.7.5 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON DECENTRALIZATION** (document 8C/PRG/25 rev.)

1. Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) presented the report of the Working Party on Decentralization.
(2) The report fell into six sections. The first, dealing with the general problems of decentralization, laid down certain essential principles and explained and justified the detailed recommendations that followed.
(3) Sections II, III, IV and V dealt with particular problems arising from various means of decentralization. The Secretariat had already made precise proposals in document 8C/5, for dealing with some of those problems, concerning science co-operation offices, the Regional Office at Havana and National Commissions. With the Indian delegation's proposal, dealt with in section V, the Working Party had considered a new means of achieving decentralization.
(4) That part of the report contained draft recommendations, which were submitted to the Commission for its approval.
(5) In section VI, the Working Party had considered the problem of where the General Conference should usually be held, trying to determine whether the fact of holding sessions away from headquarters might help in decentralization.
(6) Mr. Maheu suggested that the Commission study the various sections of the report separately.
(7) Section I did not entail adopting any specific text and the Commission could simply take note of it.

I. General problems of decentralization

(8) The Commission unanimously noted and approved section I of the report.

II. Science Co-operation Offices

(9) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the Commission that the question of the science co-operation offices had already been considered in dealing with the programmes of the Departments of Natural and Social Sciences.
(10) The Working Party recommended maintaining the science co-operation offices and asking the Director-General to make a careful study of their development. Mr. Maheu said that no reflexion on the Secretariat had been intended; the Working Party wished for such a study in order that the offices might be more effective.

(11) Section II was unanimously approved.

III. Regional Office, Havana (resolution 7.31)

(12) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the Commission could not discuss section III without at the same time taking a decision on draft resolution 7.31 (document 8C/5, Chapter 7, paragraph 23).
(13) The Working Party had recognized that the circumstances which had led to the establishment of the Havana Office were exceptional and that decentralization by that means was legitimate. But, as the circumstances were exceptional, it recommended that the experiment should not be repeated elsewhere without a thorough preliminary investigation.
(14) If section III were approved, paragraph (ii) of the Working Party's recommendation under that head would become the second paragraph of resolution 7.31.

(15) The CHAIRMAN thought it would be better if that paragraph became a new resolution 7.32.

(16) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Working Party had intended the evaluation mentioned in paragraph (ii) to be carried out by the Director-General, who would not request extra appropriations for that purpose. The Executive Board would only have to examine the file the Director-General had prepared; it would not have to carry out an independent enquiry, which would entail expenditure.

(17) Section III, resolution 7.31 and the new resolution 7.32 were unanimously approved.

IV. National Commissions

(18) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that section IV covered draft resolutions 7.11 and 7.12 (document 8C/5, Chapter 7, paragraphs 4 and 5) and the Working Party considered it to be the core of its report.
(19) The Executive Board had devoted special attention to the question of National Commissions, and the Working Party, after studying document 8C/11, had taken over the Board's recommendations in section IV.A.
(20) Section IV.A comprised recommendations regarding the study of: (a) the structures and methods of action of National Commissions; (b) the nature of their relationships with Unesco and with their governments; (c) obstacles encountered by Member States in the establishment of efficient National Commissions; (d) methods used by Member States to associate interested groups in Unesco's work.
(21) Mr. Maheu said that the Working Party had

dwelt particularly on item (d). The National Commission should be the rallying point of a country's energies, some of which were already concentrated in the national branches of international non-governmental organizations. If those energies could be more closely linked with the National Commissions, the Secretariat's work in the international sphere would be much easier.

(22) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Board had emphasized the importance attached to National Commissions, both in its submission to the Conference of the proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 (document 8C/5 Add. 1.) and in its report on the remodelling of the future programme (document 8C/PRG/13). He quoted from paragraph 18 of document 8C/5 Add. 1, (page 3). National Commissions, however, could only be set up by Member States, and Unesco's help was therefore conditional on action by those countries. The problem of National Commissions was one of the most important items before the current General Conference.

(23) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) thought that section IV of the report brought out one of the most striking aspects of Unesco's activity. Unesco's lack of success in some Member States was mainly due to the situation of the National Commissions, and he was glad to see that the Conference and the Executive Board were at last giving that question special attention.
(24) Mgr Maroun wondered whether it would not be advisable to add, after paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d), a paragraph (e), stating that the Executive Board and the Director-General should help the National Commissions to set up machinery for collaboration, so that they should have the necessary committee structure. Some of the Commissions lacked efficient subsidiary bodies and had not the necessary basis on which to build them up. The Secretariat should give special attention to their development.

(25) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) thought that the Lebanese delegate's proposal was covered by item (c) of section IV.

(26) Mr. TREJOS-DITTEL (Costa Rica), on behalf of his delegation, welcomed the document submitted to the Commission, and the Report presented by the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Assistant Director-General. He was convinced that anything done to assist the National Commissions would help the Organization, but asked why, on the occasion of the eighth session of the General Conference, no meeting of representatives of the National Commissions had been convened. The main defect of those Commissions was that their efforts were not co-ordinated, and it was the Secretariat's task to remedy that defect.

(27) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium), referring to Chapter 7, paragraph 9, of document 8C/5, said that his delegation saw no point in a regional conference of European National Commissions, since the members of those Commissions had ample opportunities of meeting.

(28) He also mentioned that the Belgian Youth Associations Committee had expressed a wish that delegates of such associations be invited to attend meetings of National Commissions.
(29) With regard to publication of documents in languages other than the working languages of Unesco, the Belgian delegate said that it would be advisable to consult the National Commissions of all the countries in which the language concerned was spoken. He quoted the case of Dutch, which was the language of a large part of Belgium as well as of the Netherlands.

(30) The CHAIRMAN put Section IV.A to the vote.

(31) Unanimously approved.

(32) The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on Section IV. B.

(33) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the methods recommended by the Working Party for implementing resolution 7.12 were designed to: 1. facilitate meetings between representatives of National Commissions; 2. enable the Secretariat to make the best use of the National Commissions in carrying out the programme.
(34) Replying to the Costa Rican delegate's remarks, Mr. Maheu explained that, at its previous session, the General Conference had withdrawn appropriations earlier made for meetings of the Secretaries of National Commissions before the opening of a session.
(35) He thought, however, that another method might be considered for the future: Secretaries of National Commissions taking part in the Conference as delegates could be invited to meet unofficially. If the Costa Rican delegate found that solution satisfactory, and if the Commission approved of it, the Secretariat would make the necessary arrangements.
(36) Mr. Maheu said that the Advisory Committee recommended abandoning the projects for the appointment of national correspondents and the organization of a regional conference of European National Commissions, on the understanding that the funds provided for those two projects would be distributed among other projects under resolution 7.12. The Working Party had endorsed those recommendations, as well as the one giving first priority to resolution 7.12.
(37) The work plan would therefore be as followed: (1) visits by Secretaries of National Commissions to the headquarters of the Organization or other National Commissions; (2) missions by officials of the Secretariat; (3) assistance to conferences of National Commissions, on the understanding that the National Commissions themselves would set those conferences on foot; (4) publication of a Handbook of National Commissions and a Guide for their use.
(38) The Working Party also recommended that the appropriations for the projects covered by resolution 7.12 as a whole should be increased by $20,000.

(39) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) moved the adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the projects concerning the appointment of national correspondents and the organization of a regional Conference of European National Commissions should be dropped. He also moved

that the global budget of $63,000 should be maintained without the additional $20,000 recommended in paragraph B (4), (page 4).

(40) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed the adoption of the Working Party's recommendations as a whole - including the additional $20,000. Such a decision would demonstrate belief in the importance of National Commissions.

(41) Mr. KABIR (India) supported the Norwegian delegate's proposal as far as national correspondents were concerned; with regard to the conference of European National Commissions, however, the Working Party had considered that, while it was not a high priority project, it should not be entirely rejected. He shared that view.
(42) In conclusion, he was entirely in favour of the additional $20,000. Assistance to National Commissions was one of the most important parts of Unesco's programme and, if the policy of paying more attention to activities in Member States under the remodelled programme were to be pursued, more funds would be needed for developing them.

(43) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL confirmed the possibility of a meeting of European National Commissions. If, either individually or collectively, any Member States expressed a desire to hold a meeting, the Secretariat would be prepared to give assistance.

(44) Mr. SAWADA (Japan) supported the Egyptian delegate's proposal, and stressed the value of international conferences of National Commissions. The recent conference in New Delhi, which he had attended, had given great encouragement to the Japanese National Commission.

(45) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) strongly supported the proposal of the delegate of Egypt and quoted the Working Party's recommendation in paragraph B (1) (c) of document 8C/PRG/25 (rev.). In view of that recommendation it was undesirable to delete the European conference from the programme, and in his opinion a certain freedom of action should be given to the Director-General. He moved the adoption of the recommendations of the Working Party.

(46) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that, in the course of seven General Conferences, hundreds of resolutions had been adopted asking for co-operation and action on the part of Member States, but the present Conference represented the first occasion on which measures were being taken to enable Member States to play their full part in executing Unesco's programme. In the opinion of the United States delegation, the proposals of the Working Party were designed to promote co-operation between Member States and the Secretariat and to increase world-wide action in the service of Unesco. He therefore supported the proposal of the Egyptian and Indian delegates that the Working Party's report be adopted in full.

(47) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) said that the French National Commission had the privilege of constant co-operation with the Unesco Secretariat and had recognized the value of such contacts. His delegation was ready to support any projects likely to foster relations between the National Commissions and the Secretariat.
(48) If Unesco could not count on the National Commissions it would be nothing but a bureaucracy. Mr. François said that his delegation endorsed the Working Party's proposal for an increase in the appropriations for resolution 7.12.

(49) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) was satisfied with the proposal for assistance to meetings of National Commissions and added that he had not abandoned hope that such a meeting would be organized for Europe.
(50) His delegation also supported the Working Party's request for an increase in the appropriations.

(51) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) joined in the praise which had been expressed for the Working Party's report. In the present instance, the New Zealand delegation was reversing its customary opposition to budgetary increases; first, because the work was so important as to merit additional funds; and, secondly, because the method of operating was an example for future programme presentation, in that the Conference was asked to approve general principles and the Executive Board and the Secretariat were allowed adequate freedom in putting those principles into practice. Such a procedure would reduce the need for the Commission to attend to details, and give more authority and more liberty of action to the Executive Board and the Secretariat, which were in a better position to work out details.

(52) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, before completing the programme and budget, the Secretariat had given serious consideration to the possibility of increasing the budget for the activities under discussion; it had finally been decided that any increase above what had been recommended should be the result of the initiative of delegates and a decision by the Conference; it should not be proposed by the Secretariat.

(53) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Working Party's proposal for an increase of $20,000 in the appropriations for resolution 7.12.

(54) Approved without opposition, but with 2 abstentions.

(55) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew the Commission's attention to paragraph 2 of Section IV.B, which recommended that the assistance to National Commissions described in paragraphs 19 and 20 of the chapter on Mass Communication be transferred and added to the work plan for resolution 7.12, with the corresponding appropriations ($30,000 for the two years).
(56) He explained that it was an activity within the competence of the Division for Relations with Member States rather than that of the Department of Mass Communication.
(57) In reply to the Belgian delegate's comment, Mr. Maheu said that, when a work was translated into, or adapted in a language spoken in several countries,

the translation or adaptation would be placed at the disposal of all those countries.

(58) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the transfer proposed by the Working Party.

(59) Unanimously approved.

V. Proposal of India (documents 8C/DR/7 and 8C/DR/14)

(60) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Indian delegation's proposal related to a new means of decentralization.
(61) India proposed setting up machinery, at its own expense, to facilitate co-operation between the National Commissions of South and South East Asia, and offered the Director-General the use of that machinery.
(62) Mr. Maheu explained that the proposal entailed action by a Member State, not the establishment of a regional organ of Unesco.
(63) The Working Party wished the Director-General to be authorized to give advice and assistance to the Office it was proposed to set up, and to submit a report on the question at the following session of the General Conference. It would be for the Conference to decide whether a similar scheme should be adopted for use elsewhere at a later stage.
(64) If the draft resolution were approved by the Commission, it would be inserted in the programme after resolution 7.12.

(65) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) strongly supported the proposal. His country too had participated in the New Delhi Conference, which had been the first occasion on which National Commissions had worked together. The results were to be seen in the group proposals submitted to the present session of the General Conference.

(66) Mr. KABIR (India) confirmed the remarks of the delegates of Japan and Ceylon. The success of the New Delhi Conference had suggested the desirability of setting up some kind of permanent machinery for consultation and collaboration between National Commissions in the region. The proposal of his delegation had been discussed by the Advisory Committee and the consensus of opinion had been that an office of the kind indicated could act as a clearing house and strengthen the activities of National Commissions in the region. There was no intention of setting up a regional office, and there could be no objection to the establishment of a permanent office of co-operation by a group of countries working for Unesco. He commended the idea to other regions.

(67) The CHAIRMAN put Section V, and particularly the last paragraph, to the vote.

(68) Approved without opposition, but with 1 abstention.

(69) Resolutions 7.11, as amended, and 7.12 were unanimously approved.

VI. Place of the General Conference

(70) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the Working Party's intention, in Section VI, had been to suggest some general principles concerning the location of future sessions of the General Conference.

(71) Unanimously approved.

(72) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that, when the Working Party had asked the Director-General and the Executive Board to prepare four detailed studies for the following session of the Conference, it had not underestimated the magnitude of the task, but had deemed it necessary.
(73) The next session of the General Conference would mark the tenth anniversary of Unesco's establishment. The Organization should then make a critical evaluation of its working methods with regard to decentralization, in order to determine its future policy. That was the object of the four proposed studies, which would constitute a coherent whole.

(74) The Working Party's report, as a whole, was unanimously approved.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/15 concerning Clubs of Friends of Unesco

(75) Mr. SAWADA (Japan), introducing document 8C/DR/15, said that the need for publicizing and popularizing the aims of Unesco was already well known, and his delegation considered that the establishment of Friends of Unesco Clubs, although not the only method, was a very effective one. Many such clubs existed in Japan and were proving useful instruments in promoting Unesco's aims among the people. In his opinion they deserved every encouragement, and he regretted that a resolution on the subject had been deleted from the Preliminary Draft Programme and Budget for 1955-56. The Japanese delegation had accordingly proposed the reinstatement of the project, the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee were in favour of the proposal and he hoped that it would be unanimously adopted.

(76) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of France.

(77) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) was in sympathy with the Japanese resolution, but pointed out that many of the organizations catering for young people during and after the school period had aims similar to those of the Friends of Unesco Clubs. He accordingly proposed the insertion of the words "where necessary" in the first line of the resolution.

(78) Mr. SAWADA (Japan) agreed to the proposed amendment.

(79) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the sum of $500 mentioned in the last paragraph of the draft resolution for the publication of a Handbook of Clubs of Friends of Unesco could easily be found in the budget. But he wondered whether it would not be preferable to wait until 1957 before publishing the Handbook.

(80) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) said there were many Friends of Unesco Clubs in France, especially in university circles, and the National Commission was anxious to put them into touch with similar clubs in other countries. The Handbook would be extremely useful for that purpose

(81) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) did not press the point; if sufficient material could be collected in 1956, the Secretariat would be glad to publish the Handbook.

(82) Draft resolution 8C/DR/15 was unanimously approved.

Project 7.2: Study of international cultural relations (paragraphs 13-21 and document 8C/PRG/11)

(83) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that document 8C/PRG/11 was a report on a very complex question and the Secretariat was submitting it simply as a preface to a more detailed study.
(84) The General Conference had decided, at its third and fifth sessions, that a study of the bilateral and multilateral agreements concluded by Member States should be undertaken from the legal standpoint.
(85) The study had very soon taken on a technical and political character, for it had been found that the importance of the agreements under consideration lay not so much in the texts as in the way they were applied.
(86) The Assistant Director-General said that the Secretariat wished to continue the study with the help of experts who had practical experience of the implementation of agreements.
(87) The Secretariat felt that the activities of Member States within the international framework of Unesco system and their activities under bilateral and multilateral agreements were neither contradictory nor incompatible. They could and should be co-ordinated to render them more effective in both spheres. But for that purpose Unesco needed to be thoroughly acquainted with the structure and working of the bilateral and multilateral agreements, and, if necessary, to take them into account when planning and carrying out its own projects.
(88) Mr. Maheu was convinced that, if Unesco, with the help of the National Commissions, succeeded in co-ordinating the two systems, its action would be considerably more effective.

(89) Mr. RAADI (Iran) said that his delegation had studied document 8C/PRG/11 with great interest and hoped that the Secretariat would continue its enquiries.

(90) In his opinion, the study would render great service to Member States desirous of concluding bilateral agreements, as it would enable them to profit by what had already been done in that field.

(91) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) said the Advisory Committee recommended that project 7.2 be adopted but that the appropriations proposed for 1955 for payment of consultants be cut by $2,000.

(92) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) warmly congratulated the Secretariat on its Report on Cultural Agreements. He had, however, a few comments to make on paragraph 19 of the General Resolutions chapter in document 8C/5, and suggested that it be amended to provide that the Committee would be composed of experts representing the various existing systems of cultural relations.

(93) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed with the comments of the delegate of Spain.

(94) Mr. GOMEZ-HOYOS (Colombia), on behalf of his delegation, supported the Spanish proposal.

(95) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was not opposed to international cultural conventions but disapproved of any large-scale outlay by Unesco on the publication of texts at the present time. There were many other activities deserving of higher priority and he was in favour of postponing the project for at least two years.

(96) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) supported the Spanish delegate's proposal.

(97) Mr. CARBONELL (Cuba) also supported the proposal and asked for the draft resolution to be put to the vote

(98) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) endorsed the United Kingdom delegate's views.

(99) Mr. MIGONE (Italy) was in favour of the proposal to convene a committee of experts. He hoped that when the committee was set up it would include not only representatives of countries with much experience in the matter, but also less experienced countries, which would be able to tell the Committee of the difficulties they had to face. He added that certain international institutions that dealt with those problems, such as the Council of Europe, should also be consulted.

(100) Mr. MONTALVO (Ecuador) supported the Spanish delegate's proposal.

(101) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to take a decision on the Advisory Committee's proposal regarding the cut of $2,000 to be made in the appropriations for the payment of consultants.

(102) Unanimously approved.

(103) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) reminded the Commission of his proposal, which had been duly seconded, to postpone the project for two years

(104) The United Kingdom delegate's proposal, seconded by the Belgian delegate, was rejected by 18 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

**ITEM 8.4.7.1 OF REVISED AGENDA REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL ON THE DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND ON MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS** (documents 8C/PRG/10 and 8C/DR/121)

(105) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that, since the last session of the General Conference, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights had held its ninth and tenth sessions and drawn up draft Covenants which had been submitted to the General Assembly for examination.
(106) Unesco had been asked to comment on those drafts. With regard to the definition of educational and cultural rights, the texts adopted had already been approved by the General Conference at its previous session. Since then, the Executive Board had made certain comments on the implementation of the draft Covenants.
(107) The Commission on Human Rights had also considered how far judgment could be given on complaints of violation of those rights. It had decided that the Human Rights Committee should consider complaints concerning the violation of civil rights, but that its competence should not extend to those regarding economic, social or cultural rights. In accordance with the instructions of the Executive Board, which attached great importance to the consideration of complaints, it had been suggested that Unesco should be authorized to submit its observations to the Human Rights Committee whenever that Committe had before it an allegation of violation of the right to information.
(108) At its ninth session, the Commission on Human Rights had studied new methods of implementing human rights. Those methods had been very carefully examined by the Secretariat, which, on instructions from the Executive Board, had submitted certain observations. The Board had taken the view that the adoption of the Covenants was essential and considered that the suggested methods of implementation should not take the place of the Covenants but should supplement them. It had also stated that Unesco was in a position to co-operate fully and effectively in the application of those methods.
(109) Mr. Saba concluded by saying that the General Conference had to give its views on the observations submitted, and to issue directives for the drawing up of further observations, since the United Nations General Assembly was to examine the draft Covenants at its next session.

(110) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) thought that Unesco should keep the United Nations informed of its point of view, as in the past. He hoped that the observations submitted by the Organization would be examined as soon as possible by the Third Committee. If the General Assembly did not complete its work within a year, the texts might be amended and the Executive Board might have to reconsider the question.
(111) The French delegate said that his delegation wanted to make certain amendments to document 8C/DR/121: (1) In the third paragraph, the words "approves the directives" should be altered to "noting the directives"; (2) the last paragraph should be replaced by the following text: "(3) to include in his report, with the agreement of the Executive Board any appropriate proposals on the steps to be taken to enable the Organization to play a full part in the implementation of educational and cultural rights".
(112) The French delegation's draft resolution was seconded by the delegates of Switzerland, Belgium, Chile and Ecuador. It was put to the vote, and unanimously approved.

**ITEM 8.4.7.4 OF REVISED AGENDA – OFFICIAL SEAL AND EMBLEM OF UNESCO** (document 8C/PRG/9)

(113) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) said that the proposal submitted to the Commission for approval was based on a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1946 with a view to protecting the colophon, symbol and emblem of the United Nations.
(114) The proposal provided for measures designed to prevent the use, without authorization by the Director-General, and in particular for commercial purposes, of the emblem, official seal and name of the Organization, and of abbreviations of that name through the use of its initial letters.
(115) The Egyptian delegation had suggested amending the text in order to make the prohibition valid for all alphabets. Mr. Delavenay wondered whether that amendment was necessary, for it seemed to him that the existing wording covered the Egyptian proposal.

(116) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) remarked that Unesco's seal and emblem bore Latin characters and there might be some doubt about the scope of the prohibition. In his opinion, it would be advisable to amend the text by adding the words "in Latin or other characters" after "its initial letters" in paragraph 2(1).

(117) That amendment was approved by the Egyptian delegate.

(118) Mr. EL-ZAYAT (Egypt) proposed the following amendment to the resolution on the first page of document 8C/PRG/9: in the first line of the first paragraph under "1. Resolves", insert after the word "above" the following phrase: "as well as other designs depicting the Organization's initials in other alphabets".

(119) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) asked the Legal Adviser how he would meet the difficulty that would arise if a commercial firm had already for some time past been using the initials of Unesco.

(120) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought that the laws of the various Member States should see to it that the prohibition was absolute.

(121) The CHAIRMAN asked whether a publication bearing the Unesco emblem, but published in a country where the emblem was not protected, could be put on sale in a country where it was protected.

(122) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that everything would depend on the measures taken by the States concerned. The draft resolution constituted a recommendation which was not automatically enforceable.

(123) Mr. CARBONELL (Cuba) asked that, as the draft resolution under consideration did not include the design of the emblem, the words "reproduced above" should be replaced by "Unesco".

(124) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that Unesco's emblem was a distinctive sign and seal for which only Latin characters should be used. He thought, however, that a distinction should be made between the seal and the use of Unesco's name in any characters whatsoever.

(125) The draft resolution contained in document 8C/PRG/9 was put to the vote and unanimously approved.

**ITEM 8.4.7.3 OF REVISED AGENDA – PUBLICATIONS IN ARABIC** (7C/6.722)

(126) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) reminded the Commission that the General Conference, at its seventh session, had adopted resolution 6.722, calling for a report to be made to the Conference at its eighth session on publications in Arabic.
(127) That report was contained in documents 8C/3 and 8C/3 Add.

(128) Mr. Delavenay added that the Commission was simply asked to take note of it.

(129) The Commission noted the report.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/12: Translation of Unesco publications into German

(130) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) said that the Advisory Committee had recommended that draft resolution 8C/DR/12 be studied with a view to inserting it in the future programme, and that it had also approved a resolution concerning the translation of Unesco publications into languages other than the official languages of the Organization.
(131) It seemed therefore that it would be possible, with the co-operation of the National Commissions in the German-speaking countries, to make a start on the implementation of the Austrian delegation's proposal.

(132) The proposal was put to the vote and unanimously approved.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

# THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

*6 December 1951 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. MARTINEZ ESPINOSA (Ecuador)

**CORRIGENDUM: SOCIAL SCIENCES PROGRAMME – PROJECT 3.4 · SOCIAL SCIENCES AND PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND TENSIONS** (document 8C/PRG/29)

(1) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) recalled that, after the very important joint resolution on peaceful co-operation had been adopted, Project 3.4 had been referred back for revision by the Secretariat.
(2) In revising the project, her Department had benefited from the resolutions passed, and the suggestions made, in the Commission. It had taken account of two resolutions (documents 8C/DR/21 and 8C/DR/95, not formally discussed) and had given attention to the report by the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation. It had also taken such expert advice as was available in individual delegations.
(3) Some individual projects had been dropped; elsewhere the emphasis had been changed. Aid to Member States (paragraphs (161)-(163)) remained as in document 8C/5.
(4) There were now only two main projects instead of three, namely A. Peaceful co-operation, and B. International Understanding and Misunderstanding.
(5) As regarded the former, an attempt had been made to embody the substance of the Czechoslovak draft resolution, and it was proposed that Unesco should convene an inter-disciplinary meeting of social scientists from regions with different cultural outlooks.
(6) In paragraphs (152) and (153) an attempt was made to emphasize the means laid down in the United Nations Charter for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and also to give satisfaction to those who had advocated Gandhian doctrines.
(7) In paragraphs (158)-(160), it was proposed that an attempt should be made to trace the sources of international misunderstanding by means of research into the media of mass communication.
(8) She had worked on the assumption that the same budget limits should be respected. In fact, it had been possible to make a small saving of some $800.

(9) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) said that his delegation fully approved the proposals now before the Commission. They were the outcome of fruitful collaboration between the heads of departments and the experts in individual delegations.
(10) The Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation had discussed the matter just before the Conference and had reported thereon (document 8C/DIV/80). That report had been thoroughly discussed by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (see document 8C/BUD/3), which, in general, had approved the views of the Expert Committee.
(11) He would therefore propose that the Commission adopt the following resolution:

"The General Conference

1. Takes note of the Final Report by the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation (document 8C/DIV/80).

2. Recognizes that the Report contains views, suggestions and recommendations which seem likely to serve the cause of international understanding and provide criteria and recommendations for future action by Unesco in this field.

3. Invites the Director-General and the Executive Board, in executing Unesco's programme for 1955-56 and in drafting future programmes, to consider the views and recommendations set forth in this Report."

(12) Paragraphs (141)-(151), (152)-(155), (156)-(157 (a)), (158)-(160(b)), and (161)-(163) of document 8C/PRG/29 were successively adopted.

(13) Mr. KELLY (Australia) was glad to find that most of the objections that had been raised at previous meetings to the project as a whole had now been answered. He appreciated the work done by the Department of Social Sciences in revising it, and was in favour of the adoption of the Swedish resolution.

(14) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) recalled that the French delegation had made serious reservations with regard to resolution 3.4. If it was now prepared to give its approval, it was because the whole project, as recast, was more homogeneous and, what was even more important, made it clear that one of the essential functions of the Department of Social Sciences was to obtain information which could be profitably used by the other programme departments, and because it stressed the need for close collaboration in that field with the appropriate non-governmental organizations.
(15) Lastly, the project dealt with exactly the type of activity that Unesco should pursue - long-term work whose success depended to a great extent on continuity of effort.
(16) The systematic study of the factors making for international understanding and misunderstanding would provide some index of public opinion with regard to the possibility of peaceful co-operation between the peoples.
(17) Such a study was essential and the French delegation hoped that the project would be given an even larger place in future programmes.

(18) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked whether the Swedish delegation wished its proposal, with the substance of which the Secretariat agreed, to take the form of a specific resolution, or whether it would be satisfied if the text appeared in full in the Commission's report, in view of the fact that approval by the General Conference in plenary meeting would give it, in common with the rest of the Report, the force of a directive to the Director-General.
(19) Apart from the fact that the proposal would, owing to its form, be difficult to insert among the other programme resolutions, it should not be forgotten that the report which had given rise to it was produced by an Expert Committee convened for consultation, and that the Director-General had simply submitted it to the Commission for information, owing to its importance.

(20) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) said that he would be satisfied if the substance of the resolution he had proposed were embodied in the Commission's report, as a decision.

(21) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) was happy that the suggestion made by the Assistant Director-General had been adopted.
(22) Project 3.4, as amended by the Department of Social Sciences, showed that Mrs. Myrdal was most amenable to the suggestions that had been made, and he was confident that the Secretariat would give close attention to the report by the Expert Committee, a most valuable document.

(23) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) recalled that the idea of establishing such a committee had been put forward by France in 1952, but with different purposes in view.
(24) The French delegation had reservations to make about the way its suggestion had been interpreted, about the constitution of the Committee and about the mission assigned to it.
(25) It would not, however, oppose the discussion of the report in plenary meeting, but it wished to urge the Commission to recommend that the introduction be very carefully examined, as it had already given rise to many objections regarding both form and content.

(26) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) seconded the proposal by Sweden, as amended after discussion with the Assistant Director-General.

(27) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) emphasized that the word "approve" occurred nowhere in his proposed text, which was merely a recommendation to the Director-General to give attention to the report by the Expert Committee in planning future programmes.

(28) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) supported the Swedish proposal.

(29) The text proposed by the delegation of Sweden (to take the form of a decision in the Commission's report) was put to the vote and adopted by 27 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

(30) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) read out draft resolution 8C/DR/88, submitted by

the Brazilian delegation in the form of an amendment to document 8C/DR/69 (International Cultural Fund).

(31) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said that his Government and National Commission had for a long time been trying to find a solution to the problem arising from the great disparity between the Organization's resources and the real needs of Member States.
(32) The Brazilian Government wished to collaborate with the majority of Member States who were trying to stabilize the programme and budget, for the States which bore the greater part of the financial responsibility for the Organization were justified in not wishing the ceiling of expenditure to rise year after year.
(33) But, though stabilization of the budget at the existing level might be necessary, it was still desirable that Unesco's activities should continue to develop if the manifest disparity between the aid given to Member States and their real needs was ever to be reduced.
(34) For that reason, the Brazilian delegation asked the Conference to authorize the Director-General to arrange for a study, in consultation with the Executive Board, the Member States and the United Nations, of the proposal to institute an International Cultural Fund to serve the real needs of the States in the fields of education, science and culture.
(35) That extra-budgetary fund would be financed by gifts from Member States, national and international organizations, and public or private associations.
(36) When the National Commissions of various Member States - particularly in the many under-developed regions - met, they often felt that they were getting nowhere because they simply had not the necessary resources.
(37) It was essential that those countries should know and see that Unesco was concerned about their difficulties, was studying means to remedy them and preparing a report which the Director-General would submit to the General Conference at its next session.

(38) Mr. ESTELRICH (Spain) warmly supported the well-calculated and optimistic proposal which the Brazilian delegation had just put forward.

(39) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) strongly supported the creation of a fund to be operated in conjunction with the other Specialized Agencies.

(40) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that all would sympathize with the ideas behind the Brazilian resolution. But a similar proposal had already been submitted, in connexion with the creation of an educational fund. It had been decided that, pending the outcome of discussions in progress within the United Nations whether such a fund should be set up and how much money should be devoted to it, action should be postponed until the ninth session. He would therefore propose that for the sake of consistency action on the Brazilian resolution be postponed until the ninth session.

(41) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) had wished to say the same thing, and strongly supported the United States suggestion.

(42) Mr. GOMEZ HOYOS (Colombia) said that, as the proposal was not only optimistic but realistic, it might be approved immediately on the understanding that, in two years' time, at the ninth session of the General Conference, the methods that the Director-General would suggest for its implementation would be discussed.

(43) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) thanked the delegates of the United States of America and the United Kingdom for the sympathy they had expressed for his proposal.
(44) But the great host of illiterates would not be content with expressions of sympathy; they needed action and practical measures to assist them.
(45) Mr. Berredo Carneiro assured his colleagues that, if they only travelled through India or Latin America, they would not have the heart to oppose what was at the moment merely a suggestion for a study.
(46) The division, which had become apparent at the last session of the General Conference, between States without resources which were asking for aid and more fortunate States which were seeking to restrict the field of activity, had already lasted too long.
(47) The establishment of the proposed fund was necessary, and should be given consideration without delay. The Brazilian delegation hoped that there would be a unanimous decision on the resolution so that the Commission might disperse in an atmosphere of concord and hope.

(48) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) agreed with the Brazilian proposal and trusted that it would meet with the unanimous approval of the Commission. Without indulging in exaggerated idealism, he considered that Unesco should embark upon a study of the proposal.

(49) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) asked what was to be done with the proposed fund. How would it be collected? From voluntary sources in Member States, or would governments be asked to contribute. How would the fund operate in relation to the United Nations Technical Assistance programme and to Unesco's own programme of technical assistance?

(50) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said that he would not have asked for the project to be studied if he had known the answers to the questions put by the United Kingdom delegate.
(51) Each Member State would have to say how it thought the fund should be organized, how much it desired such a fund, and what methods it wished to see adopted for operating the fund. The members of the Executive Board would also have to give their views on the feasibility of the scheme.

(52) The Brazilian delegate reiterated that it would be an independent, extra-budgetary fund managed by Unesco. It would absorb smaller funds which were too numerous to be effective.

(53) It could be said immediately that it was in Unesco's power to set up such a fund, but the questions asked by the United Kingdom delegate should be left to the Executive Board, the Director-General, Member States and the United Nations to answer in two years' time, after detailed studies had been carried out.

(54) Draft resolution 8C/DR/88, submitted by the Brazilian delegation, was approved by 30 votes to 10, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/68 on the establishment of a Latin American regional centre for secondary school teachers

(55) Mr. COTO CONDE (Union of Latin American Universities) said that the proposal submitted by the delegation of Honduras had no financial implications, as the Chilean Government had officially offered to do the work of implementing it; he therefore asked the Commission to approve it.

(56) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that the scheme would provide a happy answer to one of the most urgent cultural needs of Latin America. Secondary education in those countries required standardization of curricula, methods, techniques, information, etc. At the proposed Regional Centre, serving teachers from the whole continent would meet to follow basic courses on education and the different branches of science and literature. In addition, the Centre would provide information, and deal with exchanges and experiments in the different types of secondary education.
(57) The Government and the National University of Chile, which were anxious that Unesco should collaborate as far as possible in founding a Latin American regional centre for secondary school teachers, were prepared to provide premises, laboratories and some of the teaching and administrative staff for the Centre.
(58) In giving its assent to the proposal put forward by the delegation of Honduras, Unesco therefore stood to lose nothing, on the contrary, the support it gave would add to its prestige.

(59) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) said that, according to the sponsors of the proposal, Unesco would not be called upon to contribute. But reference was made to help from the Director-General. Did that imply financial commitments?

(60) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the request could be met within the funds for which provision was already made in document 8C/5.

(61) Mr. GOMEZ HOYOS (Colombia) warmly supported the draft resolution and, in view of a certain reluctance to incur expenditure on the project, suggested that Unesco should give technical aid to the proposed Centre by arrangement with the Chilean Government. In that way, the new institution would at least have a certain international standing.

(62) Mr. ROMANO MUNOZ (Mexico) was very sympathetic towards the draft resolution and did not wish to oppose it in principle. But the extreme diversity of methods and curricula in Latin American secondary education led him to believe that, independently of any aid that Unesco might give, all those countries would first have to reach agreement on the necessary standardization of secondary education. Besides Unesco's aid, a Latin American congress on secondary education should be held without delay to bring about the standardization which was essential if the studies to be promoted in Chile were to produce practical results.

(63) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that under resolution 1.213, already adopted, he had all the authority he required to examine projects of the kind mentioned in the resolution. He already had authority to spend money on the proposed centre.
(64) He would be glad to consider the question of assisting such a centre. But, at the stage reached, the Conference ought not he thought to adopt specific resolutions of that kind without having had the time to consider them in detail.

(65) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said that the Director-General's comments were in line with his own ideas. The Chilean delegation could rest assured that the Secretariat was interested in its proposal.
(66) For the rest, many of the resolutions already adopted left the Director-General ample latitude for action of that sort.

(67) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) recalled that at an earlier meeting the Chairman had ruled that resolutions which were not definite amendments to the programme and were submitted after the time-limits laid down could not be discussed, since they would not have been considered either by the Advisory Committee or by the Executive Board.
(68) If the proposal was a definite amendment to the programme, it should have been submitted when the Commission was discussing resolution 1.213.
(69) It was not correct to say that the proposal had no budgetary implications. It would certainly use up some of the money already appropriated for such purposes over the next two years.
(70) Was the proposal an amendment to the list of fields enumerated in paragraph 199 of the Education chapter of the programme and budget as being those in which assistance might be requested free and compulsory schooling, teacher training, etc.?

(71) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said that, in adopting the various programme resolutions and appropriations, the Conference was authorizing the Director-General to proceed with certain types of work. Thereafter, if a particular Member State wanted work done on its territory, it should write to the Director-General to put its case, and the Director-General would then weigh one claim against another.
(72) It would be most unfortunate if the Programme and Budget Commission were to be flooded with resolutions calling for specific work to be undertaken in specific places.

(73) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) agreed. The Commission had a tendency to go into excessive detail. It should confine itself to questions of principle, and leave the Director-General free to implement its decisions as he saw fit.

(74) Mr. COTO CONDE (Union of Latin American Universities) said that the proposal under discussion

had been submitted in good time to the competent authorities in Unesco by Chile, Honduras and the Union of Latin American Universities, and the wording of it had been decided in agreement with them.

(75) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) endorsed the observations of the delegates of the United Kingdom and New Zealand.

(76) The French delegation would not take a decision on such an important matter as the establishment of a regional centre for secondary teachers on the basis of a draft resolution a few lines in length, with no supporting explanation or background information.

(77) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that, while the Executive Board had recommended that the procedure for aid to Member States should resemble that for Technical Assistance, no definite procedure had been adopted. Thus proposals calling for technical aid should merely be referred to the Director-General, who would decide between them, and award priority treatment, on their merits.

(78) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) explained that the aim of the proposed regional centre was to improve the standards of secondary teaching in Latin America by achieving a more even level in education between different countries. He mentioned, at the same time, that the first South American Seminar on Secondary Education would shortly open in Santiago, Chile.

(79) In that instance, recourse had been had to Technical Assistance, which was considered to be the best method of procedure. The Chilean proposal was really that the Director-General should take due account of the wishes of the Latin American countries.

(80) The proposal had been carefully thought out, and the Director of the Department of Education had in his possession a memorandum giving full background information.

(81) Objection might be raised to the form of the proposal but to belittle it and speak lightly of it as an improvisation ceased to be merely inept and became offensive and irritating.

(82) Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) wished it to be understood that a vote against the proposal in no way implied that the delegation so voting did not want the Director-General most carefully to examine the proposal, or wanted him to refuse all aid to the project in question. If his delegation voted against, it would be because it felt that the Director-General had been given sufficient authority already to deal with it on its merits.

(83) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the proposal had in fact been discussed with the Secretariat in rather fuller detail than might at first sight appear. The proposal was most interesting, and he had the Director-General's authority for saying that, if it were submitted in the ordinary way, it would receive the most sympathetic consideration.

(84) The resolution of the delegation of Honduras (document 8C/DR/68) was put to the vote and rejected by 17 votes to 5, with 17 abstentions.

(85) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) confirmed the interpretation to be given to the rejection of the draft resolution submitted by Honduras, it in no way implied that the proposal would not be studied, but merely that it would be examined with other similar requests received from Member States.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/106 (rev.) International Cultural Celebrations

(86) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) submitted draft resolution 8C/DR/106 (rev.) and read out an amendment to the second paragraph made by the Indian delegation, as follows

"Authorizes the Director-General, in consultation with the Executive Board, to study the question of marking the centenaries of writers, painters, musicians, scientists, philosophers and other men of genius who have enriched the cultural heritage of mankind, and to invite Member States and their National Commissions to organize suitable celebrations for this purpose."

(87) Mr. MUJEEB (India) strongly supported the Hungarian proposal. His delegation had proposed an amendment to the second paragraph. If that amendment were adopted his country would provide the names of distinguished Asian figures whose centenaries might suitably be celebrated.

(88) Only persons of international importance should be proposed for celebration by Unesco. In other cases, individual States or National Commissions could take the initiative.

(89) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) endorsed the request by the Indian delegate and further suggested that the Unesco Courier should take up the question by publishing biographies and articles about eminent men whose names appeared in the list.

(90) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) supported the resolution as amended, and hoped that suitable additions to the list of distinguished figures would be proposed from other parts of the world.

(91) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) agreed with the amendment suggested by India, since it did no more than confirm the importance of commemorating in common the great figures of world culture.

(92) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that nobody would quarrel with the ideas behind the resolution.

Educationalists in many countries were endeavouring to familiarize the public with the achievements of persons who had made their mark in history.

(93) The idea of celebrating anniversaries was not new. August Comte had drawn up a calendar of his own for the purpose. Some of the names he had chosen would sound strangely to modern ears.

(94) The list of persons worthy of celebration was already exceedingly long, and to add more names would require more days than there were in the year. Any action by Unesco on the lines suggested would most certainly not increase the prestige of the Organization. Such action could best be left to the initiative of Member States. He would therefore move that no action be taken on the resolution.

(95) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand), as the headmaster of a large school, agreed with the previous speaker that to lay down a list of names would be to impose a formidable burden on educationalists. If there were too many celebrations, the effect intended would be entirely lost upon young people.

(96) An interesting suggestion had been made by the delegate of France. Perhaps the Courier could from time to time provide educationalists with factual data about the lives of famous men and women, in order that, every year, a few such great men and women might be selected for celebration.

(97) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the task of Unesco was to improve the cultural level of mankind, and adoption of the proposal would contribute to that end.

(98) He could not share the apprehensions felt by the delegate of New Zealand. Under the proposal, only five centenaries would be celebrated in two years.

It would increase the prestige of Unesco if such celebrations were made world wide.

(99) The Hungarian resolution, as amended by India (document 8C/DR/106 (rev.), was put to the vote and adopted by 28 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

(100) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil), with the Chairman's consent, read out a recommendation adopted by the International Folklore Congress, held at Sao Paulo in 1954 under Unesco's auspices. It ran as follows "that a meeting of a limited number of experts representing the main trends be convened under Unesco's auspices at the appropriate time to make an exhaustive study of such problems and, if possible, to propose the solutions called for."

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

# THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

*8 December 1971 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**EXAMINATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET ON PROPOSED REDUCTIONS TO KEEP THE DRAFT BUDGET WITHIN THE PROVISIONAL BUDGET CEILING (documents 8C/BUD/4 and 8C/BUD/5)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to examine documents 8C/BUD/4 and 8C/BUD/5. He explained that the cuts in document 8C/BUD/4 were proposed by the Director-General, and those in document 8C/BUD/5 by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. Both aimed at keeping the budget within the limits laid down by the General Conference at its thirteenth plenary meeting.
(2) The Chairman then called on Mr. Gardner Davies, Chairman of the Advisory Committee, to make a statement.

(3) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) recalled that, when the Programme and Budget Commission had concluded its work on the draft programme and budget, the budget corresponding to the programme approved had exceeded the approved provisional budget ceiling by $362,713. The Advisory Committee had consequently been asked by the Programme and Budget Commission to adapt the programme and budget to that ceiling, working on the basis of proposals made by the Director-General. The reductions suggested by the Director-General were contained in the second part of document 8C/BUD/4. The Committee had paid tribute to the way in which the Director-General had accomplished the difficult task of proposing reductions, often on the basis of contradictory advice from the Advisory Committee and the Programme and Budget Commission, and, on the whole, the Advisory Committee considered his proposals to be very good.
(4) The procedure followed by the Advisory Committee had been to examine the proposed cuts one by one and, where it did not agree with them, to propose equivalent reductions in some other part of the programme. For example, in the chapter on Natural Sciences, the Committee had opposed the proposed cut of $15,000 in paragraph 137, but had suggested a reduction of $15,000 on the project in paragraph 102 - Basic research on cancer (document 8C/BUD/5). The decision had been carried by 6 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.
(5) In conclusion, Mr. Gardner Davies advised the Programme and Budget Commission to adopt the same procedure, in examining the proposed reductions, as that followed by the Advisory Committee.

(6) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Commission should start by taking note of the First Part of document 8C/BUD/4 (Resumé of Budgetary Effects of Decisions taken by the Programme and Budget Commission and the Administrative Commission - pages 1-8). In that connexion, he drew delegates' attention to the Note on page 4, on which a recent comment had been received from the Netherlands delegate; the Note read as follows:

"In addition, the Programme and Budget Commission recommended that, if funds are available, the subvention to ICSU be increased by $40,000 for two years."

(7) At the Chairman's request, Mr. SKENAZI (Secretary, Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) read out the letter in which the Netherlands delegate proposed deletion from the above Note of the words: "if funds are available". According to the Netherlands delegate, the Programme and Budget Commission had unconditionally approved the Netherlands proposal for the $40,000 increase mentioned in the text.
(8) With the summary record of the Commission's fifteenth meeting (document 8C/PRG/SR.15 prov.) before him, Mr. Skenazi read out the paragraphs relating to the discussion which had arisen out of the Netherlands proposal, and to the decision taken in the matter.

(9) The CHAIRMAN remarked that everything depended on whether the decision previously taken by the Commission in regard to the Netherlands proposal had been correctly understood.

(10) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) said that, as he had pointed out in his letter, he had been under the impression that the proposal in question had been unconditionally approved. That was still his opinion.

(11) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered the Note on page 4 to be a faithful account of the conclusions reached by the Commission, i.e. that the subvention to the International Council of Scientific Unions should be increased only if other funds became available for the purpose.

(12) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) believed that the decision had been to approve the additional sum, provided that funds were available.

(13) Mr. SCOTT (United States of America) stated that it was the view of his delegation that the approval of the sum had been contingent upon surplus funds being available in some other part of the programme.

(14) When attending the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) had thought that he had heard a clear statement of what had been decided in the Programme and Budget Commission. After hearing the summary record read, however, he realized that the position was not so clear and he feared that he had voted on the wrong premises. He would like the question to be taken up again in the Advisory Committee.

(15) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) pointed out that the Advisory Committee had not voted on the subject. There had been a note in an information report from the Director-General, stating that the Programme and Budget Commission recommended that additional funds be granted if available; as no funds were available, the Committee had taken no action or vote.

(16) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) regretted that he had used the word "vote". What he had meant was that his attitude had been determined by the information in document 8C/BUD/4; it might have been different if he had had the summary record before him.

(17) Mr. PAGE (Canada), referring to his own verbatim notes, thought it quite definite that the motion to provide ICSU with an additional $20,000 per annum had been contingent upon savings being made in some other part of the Natural Sciences programme.

(18) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the Commission had to take a decision on two separate questions:

(a) a legal question: had the decision taken by the Commission at its fifteenth meeting been correctly interpreted by the Secretariat?

(b) a question of substance: did the Commission thenceforth wish to recommend that the subvention to the International Council of Scientific Unions be increased by $40,000, even if no additional funds became available during the two-year period 1955-56?

(19) Since the Commission was at liberty to reopen the discussion on the latter question, Mr. Maheu requested that it concur in the Secretariat's interpretation of the decision which it had taken at its fifteenth meeting.

(20) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) agreed with the Canadian delegate in thinking that the Secretariat's interpretation was the right one. He very much hoped that, at such a late stage in the Commission's work, that discussion, which he at least had considered closed, would not be reopened.

(21) At the Chairman's suggestion, the Commission agreed to accept the Secretariat's interpretation for the time being, on the understanding that the discussion of the question of substance could be reopened at a later stage.

(22) The Commission having taken note of the First Part of document 8C/BUD/4, the CHAIRMAN requested delegates to consider the reductions proposed in the Second Part of the same document, in conjunction with those in document 8C/BUD/5. He pointed out that, in setting out each reduction, a reference had been inserted in the margin to the relevant paragraph in document 8C/5; in discussing the various proposals, therefore, the order of those paragraphs should be followed.

**PART I – GENERAL POLICY**

Paragraph (17)

(23) The reduction proposed in document 8C/BUD/4 was approved.

**PART II – PROGRAMME OPERATIONS AND SERVICES**

**CHAPTER I – EDUCATION**

Paragraphs (51) and (167)

(24) The reductions proposed in document 8C/BUD/4 were approved.

Paragraph (175)

(25) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Director-General had proposed, document 8C/BUD/4, a reduction of $16,800 on the project concerned. The Advisory Committee's proposal, on the other hand, was that a cut of only $14,800 should be made (document 8C/BUD/5) and that a saving of $1,500 which had become available under General Resolutions, paragraph 21, should be transferred to the project (Evaluation of a national pilot project in school education).

(26) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) proposed that the $1,500 just mentioned should not be used for the project outlined in paragraph (175), but should be deducted from the $2,000 cut proposed by the Advisory Committee in paragraph (384) (Associated Youth Enterprises). That cut would thus be brought down to $500.

(27) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) stated that the Secretariat had no serious views on the subject. The original sum of $16,800 had been reduced to $2,000, but the Advisory Committee had decided that a sum of $1,500 which had become available under General Resolutions, should be added to it, making a total of $3,500. The result of the French proposal would be to restore the appropriation for paragraph (175) to $2,000, leaving the project in paragraph (384) with a reduction of only $500 instead of $2,000.

(28) The French delegate's proposal concerning paragraphs (175) and (384) was approved.

Paragraphs (185), (192), (213), (218); (413 and (145)

(29) The reductions proposed in document 8C/BUD/4 were approved.

CHAPTER 2 – NATURAL SCIENCES

Paragraphs (58) and (79)

(30) The reductions proposed in document 8C/BUD/4 were approved.

Paragraph (102)

(31) The CHAIRMAN explained that the cut proposed in document 8C/BUD/5 concerned basic research on cellular growth. As he wished to take part in the discussion as an ordinary delegate, he asked Mr. Umreiko, Vice-Chairman of the Commission, to take the Chair temporarily.

(32) Acting as Chairman, Mr. UMREIKO (Soviet Socialist Republic of Byelorussia) called upon Mr. Bourgeois to speak, adding that he would remain in the Chair until the end of the discussion on paragraph (102).

(33) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) expressed keen regret that the Advisory Committee should have seen fit to recommend reducing by $15,000 the funds earmarked for basic research on cellular growth. Those funds, he reminded the Commission, had been requested so that Unesco might investigate ways of co-ordinating such research at the international level. The importance of such an enquiry had been repeatedly stressed, since 1948, in resolutions and statements issued by the Economic and Social Council, a Committee of Experts convened jointly by the United Nations and Unesco, the International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme, the Executive Board of Unesco and the present Commission.
(34) The reduction proposed in document 8C/BUD/5 had been approved by the Advisory Committee, but only by a very small majority. Mr. Bourgeois therefore hoped that the Commission, fully aware of the extent to which the project concerned might help in solving the cancer problem, would recommend to the General Conference that it should not make the proposed cut.

(35) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) seconded the delegate of Switzerland. He pointed out that, if the reductions proposed in paragraph (102) were put into effect, the funds available for basic research on cellular growth would be reduced to $2,680 for two years. It should be noted that the Advisory Committee had recommended restoring the $15,000 which the Director-General had suggested cutting out in paragraph (137) (Technical Aid to Member States). Even without those $15,000, there would still be an appropriation of $30,000 for the project in paragraph (137), and that would appear to be all the more adequate since sums set aside in the Exchange of Persons Chapter for the financing of certain fellowships might be considered as additional to it. Mr. François therefore proposed that the Commission recommend to the Conference that it approve the reductions proposed by the Director-General in paragraph (137) and that the original estimates for paragraph (102) be retained.

(36) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) seconded the two previous speakers and expressed his conviction that the study proposed in paragraph (102) was eminently suitable for Unesco.

(37) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) was in favour of the $15,000 reduction proposed by the Director-General in paragraph (137).
(38) In order to clarify the discussion, he recalled that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had voted on two questions, one after the other.
(39) The first question had been whether the Committee wished to link together the decisions it would be taking on paragraphs (102) and (137). The Committee had voted in favour of linking those decisions by 7 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.
(40) The second question had been whether to reduce the appropriation for paragraph (102) by $15 000. The Committee had voted in favour of that reduction by 6 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

(41) Sir John SIMONSEN (United Kingdom) thought that most of the speeches made had been somewhat emotional. It was a purely scientific problem and the question was whether or not Unesco could contribute to its solution. As the delegate of Belgium, a distinguished biochemist, had said in the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, there was no scientific evidence that research on cellular metabolism would necessarily affect the cancer problem. Personally Sir John Simonsen believed that the solution might well come, not from teamwork in the laboratory, but from some unexpected source. Feeling, therefore, that Unesco could not usefully contribute to the solution of the problem, the United Kingdom delegation supported the proposal of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(42) Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that his delegation had found the arguments of the delegates of Switzerland, France, Italy and Belgium in defence of the project in paragraphs 101-102 entirely convincing. The Soviet delegation therefore supported the maintenance of the sum of $15,000 under paragraph (102).

(43) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) pointed out that the funds provided under paragraph (102) were intended to enable Unesco to co-ordinate, at the international level, research on cellular growth being carried out in the various countries. He considered that, even if such research did not in the end provide the answer to the problem of cancer, the funds in question could not be appreciably reduced without a danger of misinterpretation by the press, and without, consequently, harming Unesco's prestige. He accordingly advocated the retention of the original estimates.

(44) Mr. LINKSON (Australia) fully shared the humanitarian feelings expressed by the delegates of Switzerland, France, Italy, Belgium and the USSR, but he was not convinced that they were right in judging it to be a humanitarian project. In his view, it might be a particularly cruel project, for it might raise false hopes among sufferers from cancer throughout the world. If the proposed reduction would mean a hold-up of cancer research, the Australian delegation would be unable to support it, but it was obvious that a vast amount of cancer research would

continue, whether Unesco entered the field or not. His delegation therefore seconded the proposal of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(45) Having listened to all the arguments for and against the project, Mr. PAGE (Canada) wished to go on record as supporting whole-heartedly the proposal of the Advisory Committee to reduce it by $15,000.

(46) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) recalled that, when the project in paragraph (102) had been debated earlier in the programme, the Danish delegation had voted for it. The project in paragraph (137) however, was also very near to Mr. Nielsen's heart, and he found himself in a difficult position.
(47) As a solution of the problem before the Commission, Mr. Nielsen suggested that it might be wise to accept the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee, instructing the Secretariat to find out, by negotiations with WHO and correspondence with Member States, whether it was likely that Unesco could be of any assistance in the field of basic research on cellular growth. He asked the Secretariat if such a task could be carried out with the remaining appropriation, and stated that he would reserve his attitude until he had received a reply to his question.

(48) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) was emphatic in pointing out that Unesco by no means proposed, as the United Kingdom delegate appeared to think, to embark independently on research into cellular growth. What it did propose was to co-ordinate and facilitate work in progress in that field in the various countries. Even though very large sums might not be required for that purpose, an adequate appropriation should nevertheless be available for travel, so that the necessary contacts might be established from the outset between members of the Unesco Secretariat, laboratories in the various countries and eminent scientists particularly interested in cellular growth. The original estimates in paragraph 102 might possibly be reduced to some extent, but they should in any case remain well above the figure of $2,680, which would result from the cut of $15,000 proposed by the Advisory Committee.

(49) Mr. MUDALIAR (India) supported the proposal to maintain the sum of $15,000; he supported it not on emotional grounds, however, but on the basis of his personal experience as a medical man. In his view, it was not true to say that Unesco's participation in the programme would create false hopes. It should not be thought that Unesco was suddenly going to discover data which research in so many parts of the world had failed to reveal; but it seemed to him that it would be appropriate for Unesco to enter into the picture at the present stage; the Organization had a valuable part to play in co-ordinating such research, disseminating results and stimulating new activities. It had the great advantage of being in contact with scientists of all disciplines in every part of the world. It was true that excellent scientific journals existed, but it took some time for a scientist to bring out an article in a journal, and it would be far quicker for him to transmit the results of his research to Unesco for dissemination.
(50) The Indian delegation therefore considered that there was no justification for reducing the appropriation for paragraph 102 and moved that the original appropriation be restored.

(51) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) stated that his delegation shared the views expressed by the delegates of the United Kingdom, Australia and Canada and would support the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee.

(52) Referring to a remark made by the delegate of the United Kingdom, Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) claimed that he had approached the problem as a scientist and had not let his feelings get the better of his judgment. He was only too aware, however, of the dangers of science, when it was not inspired by humanitarian considerations, not to urge once more that the original estimates in paragraph 102 be restored.
(53) Despite the assertion of the United Kingdom delegate, not all scientists agreed that there was practically no connexion between research on cellular growth and possible answers to the cancer problem. Even if such answers had finally to be sought elsewhere, Mr. Bourgeois wished to emphasize that the search could not be left to chance, and he felt that the task of international co-ordination which Unesco proposed to undertake with the funds mentioned in paragraph 102 was nevertheless extremely worth while.

(54) Mr. RAADI (Iran) was also in favour of restoring the appropriation concerned. There was no reason why all necessary precautions should not be taken to prevent the project from raising false hopes among those afflicted with cancer.

(55) The CHAIRMAN then invited the Commission to vote on the proposals by the delegate of France.
(56) The first proposal was to recommend to the General Conference that it withhold its approval of the reduction of $15,000 in paragraph (102) proposed by the Advisory Committee.
(57) The above proposal was adopted by 25 votes to 13, with 5 abstentions.

(58) The CHAIRMAN next asked the Commission to vote on the proposal to recommend that the General Conference approve the reduction of $15,000 in paragraph 137 proposed by the Director-General.
(59) The above proposal was unanimously adopted.
(60) Mr. Bourgeois having resumed the Chair, the Commission went on to examine the reductions proposed in paragraphs (172) onwards.

Paragraphs (172) and (196)

(61) The reductions proposed in document 8C/BUD/4 were approved.

Paragraph (197)

(62) Referring to the economy of $12,000 which it was proposed to make by abolishing the Istanbul Branch Office, Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) asked Mr. Auger to explain to the Commission why it was proposed to close the Office.

(63) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the discussions of the General Conference, and especially those of the Working Party on Decentralization, had shown the wisdom of focussing the work of the Science Co-operation Offices on the execution of the programme and of cutting down their information and documentation activities. The Istanbul Office was hardly in a position to follow the new trend. Moreover, it had never been completely autonomous, since it had always been more or less a branch of the Cairo Office. If the Office were closed, however, the Secretariat would do its utmost to ensure that Turkey and its National Commission continued to benefit from assistance in the field of science, similar to that which they had hitherto received from the Office. All that was involved was a change in the method of affording such assistance.

(64) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) drew the Commission's attention to the fact that the Istanbul Office was the only Science Co-operation Office in Europe. In his view it was extremely desirable to maintain it and even to make it independent so that it could work directly with the Secretariat, instead of being subordinate to the Cairo Office, as it had been in the past.

(65) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) emphasized the importance of the past achievements of the Istanbul Office and proposed, as already suggested by Mr. Photiades, that the post be maintained as an independent Office.

(66) Mr. SAMBURSKY (Israel) seconded the view expressed by the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences. He recalled that the Istanbul Branch Office had been established to serve three non-Arab countries in the region, namely Iran, Israel and Turkey. He was not aware of the opinion of Iran, but in Israel it had been found more effective to be in direct contact with Headquarters in Paris. He did not think that Turkey need feel that her prestige was involved: it was merely a question of adopting the most effective method and of saving Unesco money.

(67) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) asked Mr. Auger which countries were at present being served by the Istanbul Branch Office.

(68) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that the Istanbul Office primarily served Turkey. He thought that the aid which the latter at present received from the Office could be furnished under Unesco's new programme to govern its relations with National Commissions.

(69) Mr. RAADI (Iran) thought that the Secretariat should be able to work out a solution which would satisfy Turkey, by guaranteeing that it would continue to receive aid in the scientific field comparable to that so far supplied by the Istanbul Office.

(70) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) again urged that the Office be maintained.

(71) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, unless the Commission was prepared to agree to the suppression of the Office, together with the corresponding appropriation of $12,000, the provisional budget ceiling would be exceeded. The Commission would then have to decide whether it was willing to go before the General Conference with estimated expenditure slightly higher than the provisional budget total approved by the Conference at its thirteenth plenary meeting.

(72) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) stated that, at the end of the chapter on Natural Sciences, he wished to revert to the question of the subventions to ICSU.

(73) The CHAIRMAN took note of the remark of the delegate of the Netherlands, which made him feel even more strongly that the Commission ought to make up its mind at once about the "provisional ceiling".

(74) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) would strongly oppose any suggestion to exceed the approved budget ceiling. He had already agreed to a series of reductions simply on the grounds that the ceiling could not be exceeded; to change that decision would make it necessary to reopen the discussion on every programme item that had been cut.

(75) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) seconded the remarks of the delegate of New Zealand.

(76) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) remarked that, since the decisions regarding the budget ceiling were provisional, the Commission should be entitled to make necessary adjustments forthwith, even if there were a slight discrepancy between the resultant figure and the maximum "provisionally" approved.

(77) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) agreed with the delegates of the United Kingdom and New Zealand that it would be advisable to keep to the provisional ceiling already adopted.

(78) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) pointed out that most delegations had by now received instructions from their governments which compelled them to consider the "provisional ceiling" as a final figure.

(79) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) interpreted "provisional" to refer to "instructions"; when the General Conference agreed upon a given figure, it gave instructions to the Programme and Budget Commission to work within that ceiling and all the work which the Commission did would be provisional until the General Conference, at its final meeting, confirmed the Commission's decisions and converted them into marching orders for the Executive Board.

(80) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) fully agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom and the Assistant Director-General, and strongly opposed any further discussion of the provisional budget figure.

(81) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) again urged that an effort be made to find some way of retaining the sum of $12,000 originally provided in the budget for the Istanbul Office.

(82) The CHAIRMAN warned the Commission of the

danger which lay in rejecting some of the proposals for reductions without making cuts elsewhere to offset the resultant increase in expenditure.

(83) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom that it was necessary, in practice, to keep within the provisional budget total.
(84) He wished to make it clear that, if that opinion were shared by the Commission as a whole, the only way to retain the $12,000 for the Istanbul Office would be to economize on other items.

(85) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) said that, if the duties discharged by the Istanbul Office could be carried out by other means, there should be no major objection to closing the Office.

(86) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that Turkey could be given all the necessary guarantees.

(87) In view of the foregoing discussion, Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) agreed to the suppression of the $12,000 which had been earmarked for the Istanbul Office.

(88) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), thanking the Turkish delegate, explained that the steps that would be taken by the Secretariat to compensate for the disappearance of the Istanbul Office, would consist, at the scientific level, of affording Turkey the services of the Headquarters staff of the Department of Natural Sciences, while, in a general way, the Turkish National Commission would receive the assistance available under resolution 7.12, provided that the Turkish Government requested it.

(89) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) expressed admiration for the generosity of mind shown by the delegate of Turkey, who had proved that it was possible to arrive at a truly international point of view and act as a citizen of the world. The United Kingdom delegation very much appreciated the attitude of the delegate of Turkey.

(90) Paragraph (197) was adopted.

Paragraph (198)

') Adopted.

(92) Returning to the question of the subvention to ICSU, Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) recalled that it had been agreed by a large majority that a sum of $220,000 per annum was necessary for ICSU; the only question had been how to find the funds. He therefore moved that the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences be asked to find the necessary money within his Department's budget.

(93) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) suggested that the delegate of the Netherlands be asked to propose an equivalent reduction elsewhere to offset the increase which he advocated.

(94) Replying to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that, if the General Conference so instructed him, the Director-General would certainly endeavour to find the sum necessary to offset the proposed increase in the Natural Sciences budget. That would, however, be no easy task.

(95) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) observed that, if the Secretariat managed to find the necessary funds, it would inevitably be at the expense of other projects. He wondered if there were any chance of making a slight reduction in the figure of $20,000 per year, corresponding to the proposed increase.

(96) Mr. KRUYT (Netherlands) pointed out that, during the earlier discussion, the representative of ICSU had said that, in order to carry out its work effectively, ICSU required an additional sum of $100,000 a year. The additional $20,000 proposed thus represented only part of what was needed.

(97) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) observed that the Commission would be faced with the same problem when it came to the subvention to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (CIPSH) in the chapter on Cultural Activities. He thought that Unesco should try gradually to achieve some sort of balance in its subventions to the two organizations, both of which were doing valuable work. He pointed out that it was more difficult to obtain money for the humanities than for the natural sciences. In view of the need to keep within the budget ceiling, however, the Swedish delegation would reluctantly agree to the reductions proposed by the Advisory Committee, both for ICSU and for CIPSH.

(98) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission might invite the General Conference to recommend that the Director-General allocate to the International Council of Scientific Unions, over and above the agreed subvention, such amounts as he might be able to economize during the period 1955-56, without detriment to the implementation of the programme adopted.

(99) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) thought that document 8C/BUD/4 was so excellent and well balanced that there was no need to continue to discuss it item by item. He moved that it be adopted in toto and that the Commission suggest that, if any savings were effected in the course of the year, the Director-General, in consultation with the Executive Board and taking account of comments made during the eighth session of the General Conference, be authorized to increase certain subventions.
(100) The above proposal was seconded by the delegations of Ceylon, the United Kingdom and Egypt and adopted.

(101) The CHAIRMAN did not wish, for the time being, to submit documents 8C/BUD/4 and 8C/BUD/5 as a whole to the Commission for approval, as suggested by the delegate of India. He invited the Commission to continue its examination of those documents chapter by chapter instead of paragraph by paragraph, as thitherto.

(102) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the

Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) pointed out that there were no further proposals for modification in document 8C/BUD/5.

**CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL SCIENCES**

(103) Adopted.

**CHAPTER 4 – CULTURAL ACTIVITIES**

(104) Adopted.

**CHAPTER 5 – MASS COMMUNICATION**

(105) Adopted.

**CHAPTER 6 – EXCHANGE OF PERSONS**

(106) Adopted.

**CHAPTER 8 – DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS**

(107) Adopted.

**PART III – GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**

(108) Adopted.

**PART IV – COMMON SERVICE COSTS**

(109) Adopted.

(110) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) proposed that, if savings were effected, the surplus funds be used, not only to increase the subventions to ICSU and CIPSH, but also to increase the appropriation for assistance to Palestinian refugees.
(111) This proposal was accepted.

(112) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the Commission that it was really for the Executive Board to decide, during the financial year, how to allocate any sums that had been economized. Proposals such as that just made by the delegate of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan would in fact curtail the freedom of the Executive Board and the Director-General in that respect. It was therefore not advisable to make many more proposals of that kind.

(113) Dr. HIGGINS (World Health Organization) asked for the word "cancer" to be replaced by the expression "cellular growth" in document 8C/BUD/5 and that the title of section B, paragraph 101, of project 2.22 (document 8C/5 Natural Sciences Chapter) be altered accordingly.

(114) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) assured the WHO representative that the English, French and Spanish texts would be brought into line, and that the words "basic research on cancer" would be replaced by "basic research on cellular growth".

Draft resolution 8C/DR/123: Measures to promote the use of means of mass communication to increase mutual confidence and understanding among the peoples of the world, submitted by Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, India, Lebanon, Mexico, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom and United States of America.

(115) Mr. STOLETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the fact that the press, radio and film were among the most important conquests of the mind of Man, for they influenced everyday life and the morals of every nation. They were capable of rendering inestimable services to the cause of international understanding and peace, but they could also be used as a means of defeating that same cause; no more powerful weapons existed for the stimulation of hatred and the sowing of suspicion and mistrust that led to war. The fundamental task of the General Conference was to ensure that mass media were used to promote Unesco's aims, as set forth in Article I of the Constitution. During the eighth session of the General Conference, delegates had heard speeches by women of India and the Philippines, laying emphasis on the importance of educating children for international understanding and peace, but all such efforts would be set at nought if mass media were allowed to implant distrust and hatred in the hearts of the young. The General Conference would not have fulfilled its obligations if it did not do everything in its power to fight against all forms of propaganda designed to incite men to aggression.
(116) The Soviet delegation had been very happy to note the desire for co-operation and mutual understanding shown by the delegations sponsoring the draft resolution, and it very much hoped that the latter would be unanimously approved by the General Conference. The unanimous adoption of the resolution would be warmly welcomed by the Soviet people, for, since 1951, all propaganda designed to constitute a threat to peace had been forbidden in the Soviet Union. The Soviet people, however were unaccustomed to fine and empty phrases and they would look forward confidently to the translation of the resolution into practical action. Mr. Stoletov therefore hoped that, if the draft resolution were approved, all Member States of Unesco, the Executive Board, the Director-General and the Secretariat would do all in their power to see that it was implemented, considering it as a fundamental part of Unesco's programme.

(117) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the contribution to the work of the General Conference made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other friends. It had been a pleasure to his delegation to work with them, and it fully supported the draft resolution before the Commission.
(118) Like the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom deplored any tendency to inject hatred into discussions or relations between the nations. Often, in international organizations, there had been draft resolutions designed to prevent war propaganda, but they themselves had sometimes been expressions of propaganda, based on assumptions unacceptable to those who understood democracy and freedom of information and ideas in the sense that his delegation and the people of the United

Kingdom understood them. Peace with justice and freedom was sought by all, and mass media should be used to promote that aim. In the United Kingdom, however, it was not felt that it was the function of governments to control information or prevent propaganda, so that the United Kingdom delegation would have preferred not to use the words "undistorted information" but to base the resolution on resolutions 290 (IV) and 424 (V) of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which called on all nations to remove barriers to the free exchange of information and ideas. Nevertheless, despite that reservation, the United Kingdom delegation fully supported the draft resolution.

(119) In speaking of the removal of barriers to the free flow of information, the United Kingdom delegation meant also information about ideas and not merely columns of statistics or eulogies of achievement. It wished to see Unesco encourage, as the Organization was indeed already doing, the full and free confrontation of the thoughts, values and ideas which, throughout history, had determined the practical conduct of States and man. It wanted Unesco's meetings to be a true meeting of minds, intent on the pursuit of justice, freedom and peace, and it hoped that, as a result of the lead given by Unesco, such contacts of mind would be not only between States, but between the peoples whose welfare they were responsible for safeguarding. Above all, the United Kingdom delegation wished the present exchange of views to lead to practical action demonstrating the sincerity with which the resolution was put forward.

(120) The United Kingdom delegation associated itself with the resolution and expressed appreciation of the initiative taken by the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(121) Mr. AFTALION (Argentina) warmly welcomed and supported the draft resolution because it so admirably expressed the point of view which had been upheld by his country in the Economic and Social Council on 9 April 1954.

(122) Mr. SCOTT (United States of America) said that his delegation was glad to support the joint resolution, which was constructive and affirmative in both approach and content. The resolution, sponsored by eleven delegations whose countries girdled the world, appealed to all who were concerned with the dignity of man to encourage in every country the use of press, radio and films for the promotion of better relations between the peoples, and invited all Member States to promote the use of mass communication in the interest of increasing mutual confidence and understanding among the peoples of the world.

(123) The resolution made it clear that, to achieve those ends, it was essential to ensure freedom of expression and to remove barriers to the free flow of information. That was a view to which the United States had always subscribed and which was inserted in their Constitution and Bill of Rights. When the resolution became an expression of the views, not merely of the eleven countries sponsoring it, but of the entire Conference, it might well mark a milestone on the road towards better international understanding. However, much depended upon the degree to which it was carried into effect. If it helped to remove the obstacles and restrictions which had hitherto kept the peoples in ignorance of each other, their aspirations and achievements, the labours of those who had evolved the resolution would not have been in vain.

(124) Like the United Kingdom delegation, the delegation of the United States had felt that the word "undistorted" might lend itself to misinterpretation. It conjured up the spectre of censorship, government control and artificial restrictions imposed upon the press, radio and films. That was a concept which the American people had always firmly rejected and they found repugnant any suggestion that straight news reporting might be distorted information. People in the United States of America did not believe that it could be left to any government authority to decide what news was likely to be conducive to improved international relations; it was considered essential that the people should have free access to all the news, whether it originated at home or abroad. As we read in St. John's Gospel: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free". Universal application of that principle would be a major factor in bringing the peoples of the world closer together, lifting the burden of ignorance from them and at the same time giving them the tools to contribute to the achievement of that peace towards which they all aspired.

(125) The United States delegation therefore supported the draft resolution warmly and sincerely, and hoped that it would meet with the approval of the General Conference.

(126) Mr. SEDES (France) was most gratified at the spirit of co-operation which had induced so many countries to join together in submitting the draft resolution set out in document 8C/DR/123, and he briefly explained how important it was.

(127) As the hour was late, it was agreed, at the CHAIRMAN's proposal, to postpone further discussion on document 8C/DR/123 until the afternoon meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

# THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

*8 December 1951 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

Draft resolution 8C/DR/123: Consideration of measures to promote the use of means of mass communication to increase mutual confidence and understanding among the peoples of the world (continued)

(1) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that the resolution represented the culmination of the Conference's work; its submission towards the end of the session was evidence of the degree of unanimity reached among delegates and a token of the feeling which was rapidly spreading through Member States.
(2) The Conference had been an eventful one for several reasons. It had been attended by the largest number of Member States to date; new Members had been welcomed; and the resolution, if adopted, would go a long way towards demonstrating to Member States and the people of the world Unesco's true ideology. It was encouraging to see that the resolution appealed to the people of the world to use every effort, individually and collectively, to counteract attempts to undermine peace. It would be welcomed by Member States, and delegates would return home with evidence that, at the eighth session of Unesco's General Conference, a duty was imposed on every citizen to endeavour to interpret the spirit of the resolution, in the quest for happiness, well-being and the protection of human rights all over the world.

(3) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) considered that, of all the resolutions submitted to the Conference, resolution 8C/DR/123 was perhaps the most deserving of delegates' attention. In the name of the Haitian people, the delegation of Haiti begged the other delegations to approve it unanimously, and indeed by acclamation. It hoped that the resolution would be effectively and honestly applied, so that it would have the force of law.

(4) Mr. DE SALIS (Switzerland) was sure that every delegation would have been pleased to sponsor the draft resolution. The text exactly expressed the feelings of the Swiss people with regard to peace. Freedom of information and objective commentaries on events were indeed essential features of the functioning of democracies. The Swiss delegate hoped that the resolution would be effectively implemented everywhere.

(5) Miss BOLLO (Uruguay) supported the proposal. Uruguay believed in complete freedom of information through the cinema, wireless and press, and the Uruguayan people would never resign themselves to censorship.

(6) She expressed her confidence that truth would spread throughout the world, thanks to freedom of information, and did not share the opinion of those who said that the press was governed solely by its own interests. Reference had also been made to women's mission in the world, and the Uruguayan delegate said that women believed in a peace founded on honour, liberty, respect for honest toil and consideration for human freedom.
(7) The Uruguayan delegation would vote in favour of the proposal.

(8) Mr. CARBONELL (Cuba) said that his delegation could accept no restrictions on the freedom of the press, which was one of the constitutional principles of his country. Liberty of the press was the buttress of peace. The more attention was paid to freedom of the press and to the free expression of ideas, the more easily would better understanding be achieved among men.

(9) Mr. LI U-YING (China) stressed the undeniable complexity of the question of peace. That morning the word "falsification" had even been used in that connexion. The Chinese delegate, however, would place the emphasis on the value of the guiding principles of freedom and sincerity. Recalling the words of a speaker at the previous meeting, he stressed the fact that to talk at length about culture was not enough. Culture was too often used as a means to other ends. He concluded by expressing his ardent desire for a free and genuine peace.

(10) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation attached considerable importance to the draft resolution. In the course of recent history the interests and independence of the Czechoslovak people had been gravely threatened by pressure and attacks which had largely taken the form of a tendentious use of the media of communication. Similar campaigns had compromised the interests of other peoples and, indeed, the peace of the world.
(11) Mr. Hayek recalled that the National Assembly of his country had in 1951 passed a law prohibiting war propaganda. For that reason the Czechoslovak delegation was interested in any measures calculated to emphasize the peaceful purposes and genuine objectivity which should characterize all news services. It was anxious that the exchange of information and the comparison of ideas should be developed along those lines, in order to provide a basis for, and strengthen, mutual understanding, friendship and co-operation among the peoples of the world.
(12) The Czechoslovak delegation had accordingly given its support to the Soviet draft resolution and had taken part in preparing the draft under consideration.

It had been pleased to find that several delegations had put forward the same ideas and had agreed on the text. That went a long way towards reducing tensions in a matter in which Unesco could play a useful and perhaps decisive part. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore associated itself with all those who proposed the unanimous approval of the resolution.

(13) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) supported the resolution, in spite of the difficulty of combating the 24-hour daily stream of war propaganda being issued through mass communication media in some parts of the world.
(14) Doubts had been expressed during the discussion whether certain parts of the resolution might not interfere with the principle of freedom of information. In the opinion of the Polish delegation, however, Unesco's Constitution, the United Nations Charter and the resolution adopted by the United Nations in 1947 implied a plain duty to oppose the use of mass communication for the criminal purpose of spreading propaganda for hatred and war.
(15) It could be argued that such action would infringe the Declaration of Human Rights; but Article 29 of that Declaration provided that freedom of information was subject to restrictions defined by the regulations of State defence, public order, security, health and morals. Just as in trade there was no freedom for the sale of pornographic literature or traffic in persons, so in propaganda there must be no freedom to encourage hatred and war. Radio, which was one of the finest media for promoting culture, must not be used for the annihilation of man; and despite Unesco's limited possibility of influencing political propaganda, all means of mass communication at the disposal of Unesco and its Member States must be used to implement the resolution and promote Unesco's aims and the well-being of mankind.

(16) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) added the Swedish delegation's support to the important resolution, which he regarded as a promise for the future. He recalled that some years before there had existed in Europe a community of minds known as "the republic of letters". He had always hoped that Unesco would create a republic of free minds devoted to the promotion of culture, and he was convinced that culture must be based on the free flow and exchange of information.
(17) The Swedish delegation whole-heartedly supported the resolution.

(18) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) associated himself with the spirit of the resolution, which called for the use of all means of mass communication to promote peace and co-operation. He coupled his support with a wish and a prayer that the spirit be transformed into practice so that the resolution would not remain one of so many empty professions of faith.

(19) Mr. VO VAN LUA (Viet-Nam) was entirely in favour of the draft resolution, which was inspired by the highest sentiments of humanity and justice.
(20) He wished, however, to comment on the last paragraph but one. Although the Viet-Namese delegation was against any censorship of the press or of the various means of expressing ideas, it was none the less true that freedom of expression could be a two-edged weapon. For ten years Viet-Nam had been the victim of freedom of expression in certain forms. In some cases, moreover, even objective information could be tendentious.
(21) In the circumstances, the delegate of Viet-Nam wished the last paragraph but one to be amended as follows:
"...to take the necessary measures to assure freedom of expression in normal circumstances and to remove barriers to the free flow of objective and pacific information between Member States...".
(22) The last suggestion, incidentally, followed out one of the ideas voiced by the Czechoslovak delegate.

(23) The CHAIRMAN felt that the point raised by the Viet-Namese delegate was primarily a question of interpretation. He proposed that his comments be noted, but pointed out that it would be inadvisable at the last moment to redraft a text which had been worded after long and careful thought.

(24) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) supported the comments of the Chairman. The resolution was the product of great labour and if conceived in sincerity, could be a turning point in world history. There must be no doubt that each signatory had the full support of his government, otherwise it could only be a farce.
(25) For his part, he accepted the resolution as a sincere expression of the combined efforts of the great nations whose names were attached to it, and he would be sorry to see it altered in any way.

(26) Mr. CARBONELL (Cuba) thought that, if the word "undistorted" were deleted, the draft could be unanimously approved.

(27) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) said that his delegation was happy to be among the authors of the resolution, and was very pleased at the attitude of mind to which it bore witness. In his opinion, the text could form a common basis for all Member States in their work for freedom of thought and for peace.

(28) The CHAIRMAN thought he would be interpreting the feelings of the different speakers correctly if he proposed that the Commission adopt the draft resolution by acclamation.
(29) Draft resolution 8C/DR/123 was adopted unanimously by acclamation.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/104: Emergency aid to States afflicted by natural disasters.

(30) Mr. BRICHET (France) first reminded the Commission of the disaster which had just ravaged several countries in Latin America, and Haiti in particular. He pointed out that in such a situation the universal impulse to give aid might well take shape in the repairing of material damage, and added that the French delegation regretted that neither the United Nations nor the Specialized Agencies had any relief fund for meeting disasters of that kind. After commenting on his delegation's proposal, Mr. Brichet hoped that the Commission and the General Conference would adopt the resolution, which had no budgetary implications.

(31) Mr. CARBONELL (Cuba) seconded the proposal. His country had been the first to go to the aid of Haiti in the recent disasters suffered by its people. The assistance given had consisted in the provision of food, medical supplies and over $50,000. By virtue of his office he had himself been responsible for giving that aid, which had established permanent ties between Cuba and Haiti.

(32) The CHAIRMAN put the resolution to the vote and it was unanimously approved.

Draft resolution concerning the Future Programme (document 8C/BUD/2 Add. 1).

(33) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that document 8C/PRG/13 had been referred to the Advisory Committee after preliminary discussion by the Programme and Budget Commission. Three questions were to be studied

(1) the definition of general and special activities;

(2) criteria for selection and development of major projects within the future programme, and

(3) directives to the Director-General and the Executive Board for implementing the remodelled programme.

Draft resolution 8C/DR/86 had also been referred to the Committee.

(34) He recalled briefly the history of Unesco's efforts to concentrate the programme, which had started with the adoption at the fifth General Conference of a decalogue of ten major items of activity. The seventh General Conference had set up a working party to study the future programme, whose recommendations had been circulated to Member States for comment, and finally, during the past year, the Executive Board, after long discussion, both formal and informal, had drawn up document 8C/PRG/13, which was an invitation to the eighth General Conference to take practical steps towards the reorientation and the remodelling of Unesco's programme.

(35) The Advisory Committee had examined the questions referred to it and had realized that, while the Conference had to give specific guidance to the Director-General and the Executive Board for preparing the 1957-58 programme, it was important to leave room for freedom in the details of the programme. The Committee's conclusions were submitted in document 8C/BUD/2 Add. 1, which, while not a model of perfection, was at least a practical step forward. He hoped that the Commission would recommend the document for adoption by the General Conference.

(36) In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the Advisory Committee for its spirit of co-operation and its concern with the interests of the Organization as a whole rather than with those of individual Member States. The resolution which had been prepared was of great importance to Unesco's future and he formally moved its adoption.

(37) The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of all his colleagues, thanked the Advisory Committee and its Chairman for the detailed and thorough work they had performed for the Commission.

(38) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board), speaking on behalf of the Board, paid a warm tribute to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. He had been present during the discussions of the Committee and appreciated its concentration on the practical action which the Board had hoped would result from document 8C/PRG/13.

(39) Mrs. HEFFELFINGER (United States of America) supported both the resolution and the report, which, far from representing hastily considered action, were the implementation of ideas long discussed by the Secretariat, the Executive Board and the Conference. The debates during the present Conference had shown a spirit of co-operation in seeking to promote the welfare of the Organization and concern that Unesco was not making sufficient impact on the intellectual world or on the people, the document was the result of long-range planning to enable Unesco to take its proper place in the present-day world. While the gradual transformation of ideas into practical plans was not perfect, in her opinion it represented an admirable balance between the divergent, and sometimes conflicting, needs and interests of Member States.

(40) The resolution was a milestone in Unesco's history and, if adopted and accepted with good faith, could make the eighth General Conference a memorable occasion.

(41) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported the resolution, which had been formulated as a result of compromise and the practice of international understanding among members of the Committee.

(42) It had been necessary at the present juncture to take stock of the situation and for the first time it had been admitted that Unesco was not yet making sufficient impact on the intellectual world or on the masses. He hoped that in implementing the resolution a just balance would be struck between activities for the Organization and activities for the world in general. Permanent activities were not enough, for Unesco would be judged not on its work at headquarters, but on what it did within Member States, without which it could not gain the support of the people.

(43) For their spirit of give-and-take and international understanding he commended the report and the resolution for adoption by the Commission.

(44) Mr. VERONESE (Italy) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution and congratulated the Advisory Committee on its work. In particular, he stressed the importance of the document, which, with the resolution recently adopted on strengthening National Commissions, marked an important stage in Unesco's development. He asked all delegations to call the attention of their Governments to the importance of those directives.

(45) Mr. Veronese also wished to make it clear that the work contemplated in the document could be carried out only with the whole-hearted assistance and active support of Member States. He therefore asked them to facilitate the Director-General's work in preparing the 1957-58 programme.

(46) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) congratulated the Executive Board on document 8C/PRG/13, which was a real exercise in self-examination on the part of Unesco; he pointed out that the document had provided

the basis on which the Advisory Committee had drafted the resolution under consideration.
(47) The French delegation supported the resolution, more particularly for the following reasons:

(i) in answer to repeated demands for concentration, the Advisory Committee had produced a concise document, which was thus more likely to be read and understood.

(ii) the draft resolution also added a number of important ideas to document 8C/PRG/13; in particular, it accentuated the interdependence of the two parts of the programme, i.e., the general activities representing the Organization's permanent functions, which were of interest to all Member States, and the special activities designed to meet particular needs of Member States.

(48) The French delegation hoped that Unesco would continue to promote the growth of an international community of minds, and thought that it should not become a mere organ for distributing aid to Member States. It was therefore inadvisable to encourage one type of activity to the detriment of the other and, in particular, to develop special activities at the expense of general activities. If the Organization ever had larger funds, they should be equally divided between the two categories. Subject to those comments the French delegation enthusiastically supported the draft resolution.

(49) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) supported the resolution and hoped that it would be approved by the General Conference. He shared the sentiments of some of the previous speakers, especially the delegate of France, who had paid a tribute to the Executive Board. He wished especially to pay a tribute to the Chairman of the Board, whose long and extensive labours had contributed so greatly to the preparation of the report. At the end of his term of office he was leaving a testament for which all would be grateful.
(50) The United Kingdom delegation, however, did not believe, as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had seemed to imply, that the Board's report was simply a new decalogue to replace the one submitted by the fifth General Conference; it was rather an effort to present in summary form the experience and experiments of the past nine or ten years.
(51) He congratulated the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on his excellent work.

(52) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) joined in the tributes expressed by the United Kingdom delegate.
(53) The Swedish National Commission was particularly interested in three items in document 8C/PRG/13.
(54) Firstly, while he did not intend to make a formal proposal, he hoped that clearing house activities would not be too limited in scope.
(55) Secondly, the National Commission had had doubts on the formulation of paragraph 68 of the document, but he felt that they had been satisfied by the discussions at the plenary meetings and in the Advisory Committee, which had resulted in a new definition of general and special activities.
(56) Thirdly, the most important part of the draft resolution in respect of Unesco's future was contained in paragraphs 10-13, which made it clear that the programme would no longer be presented as a reflection of the Secretariat's organization, and that projects would in future be presented not in accordance with the various disciplines, but in their entirety. Such an arrangement would facilitate the discussion of projects at future conferences.
(57) In conclusion, he expressed whole-hearted support for the resolution.

(58) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) joined in the praise which had been accorded to the documents, but re-emphasized a previous statement that full use was not being made of the teaching profession in the planning of programmes. The teaching profession could be one of the most valuable instruments in implementing the aims set out in No. 4 of the resolution. He recalled the decision not to increase the subvention to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession and urged that, if there were any doubt about the merit of such organizations, it was the duty of Unesco to provide them with the stimulus and machinery necessary for improvement, since they could supply the answer to many of the Organization's problems.

(59) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) pointed out that the draft under examination was the result of long efforts by the Secretariat and the Executive Board, and he had personally seen the part played by the Chairman of the Board in preparing the document. He also wished to pay tribute to the work of the Advisory Committee and its Chairman, and to the Secretariat.
(60) The document marked out the path that Unesco was to follow in future. The inadequacy of the contacts between the Secretariat and Member States had often been deplored in the past, but some progress had been made, and the document under consideration asked the Director-General to maintain and develop the collaboration which had been established between the Secretariat, Member States and international non-government organizations. The document rounded off the already appreciable work accomplished by the Commission, and Mgr Maroun was happy to associate himself with the tributes paid to all who had helped to draft it.

(61) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) wished to associate himself with the appreciation expressed to the Executive Board and to all who had been concerned with the preparation of document 8C/PRG/13. The document represented a transition, and he hoped that co-operative work during the coming two years, by the Executive Board, the Secretariat and Member States, would produce a programme for 1957-58 which was still nearer to the desired objective.

(62) Mr. MAHIU (Assistant Director-General) first emphasized the importance that the Secretariat attached to the document, to the ideas it expressed, and the directives it contained. He assured the Commission that the Director-General and the Executive Board would spare no pains to follow those directives faithfully. He thought, however, that in a document of that kind the spirit was more important than the letter. Situations not expressly provided for would no doubt arise and would have to be dealt with in accordance with the spirit of the document.

(63) Mr. Maheu added that the Secretariat had noted all the suggestions and comments made during the discussions, and would certainly strive to strengthen the existing bonds between Unesco and the teaching profession, as suggested by the New Zealand delegate. It would also bear in mind the comments of the Swedish and French delegates.
(64) Mr. Maheu agreed with the Egyptian delegate that the document did not give a final definition of the rôle and future of Unesco; it marked a stage on a very long journey. Like all living things, Unesco was continually developing. But the document had the virtue of freeing Unesco from the tendency to conservatism and of opening up new paths for the Organization to follow.
(65) In conclusion, Mr. Maheu endorsed all the comments made about the part played by the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee, and emphasized that the Director-General attached great importance to the draft resolution, which was, in his eyes, the starting point for the Organization's future activities.

(66) The CHAIRMAN did not think that the Commission could act on the proposals, made by the Brazilian delegation in document 8C/DR/86, for the amendment of the report presented by the Executive Board (document 8C/PRG/13). He proposed, however, that the Brazilian delegation's comments be noted.

(67) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the main points in the Brazilian delegation's proposals had been included in the draft resolution in document 8C/BUD/2 Add. 1.

(68) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that draft resolution 8C/DR/86 had been prepared after discussion in the Advisory Committee, and he understood that the Brazilian delegate was satisfied with the form in which it appeared.

(69) There being no seconder, the CHAIRMAN said that note would be taken of the resolution.

(70) The resolution contained in document 8C/BUD/2 Add. 1 was put to the vote and adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

# THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

*9 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

(1) As there was no quorum, the CHAIRMAN decided to adjourn the meeting for ten minutes, in accordance with Rule 69 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference.
(2) Although there was still no quorum when the meeting resumed, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the meeting continue.

(3) Approved.

**APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION FOR 1955 AND 1956** (document 8C/BUD/6 rev. 2)

(4) The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Gardner Davies, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, to submit the draft appropriation resolution for 1955-56.

(5) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) observed that document 8C/BUD/6 rev. 2 set out the work of the Advisory Committee in digestible form.
(6) He pointed out that, in the English text of the document, the figure for the total appropriation in Part I of Annex I should read $847,861.

(7) Mr. TOROCHESHNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) announced the intention of his delegation to vote against the appropriation for 1955-56. The reason was to be found in the Soviet delegation's objection, already expressed, to the adoption of a budget at such a high level.

(8) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) shared the view of the Soviet delegate on the budget total but expressed his intention of voting for the proposed appropriation. The General Conference had, by a majority decision, accepted the budget level and it was now necessary only to adopt the form which the appropriation was to take.

(9) The CHAIRMAN observed that the decision concerning the budget total was a matter for the General Conference, not the Commission.

(10) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought the United Kingdom delegates observation was correct.
(11) His impression was that the Commission had embarked on its work with the understanding that, on the explicit instructions of the Conference, it was to keep to a given budget ceiling. To challenge the ceiling fixed was therefore contrary to those instructions.
(12) Mr. Maheu asked the delegate of the USSR to withdraw his statement and to put forward his observations at a plenary meeting.

(13) Mr. TOROCHESHNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had wished to make clear the position of his delegation with regard to the figure adopted for the budget ceiling; his statement stood.

(14) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to vote on the appropriation resolution.

(15) Approved, with 6 votes against and 1 abstention.

**COMPOSITION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET**

(16) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that, when the question of the advisability of setting up an Advisory Committee for the ninth session of the General Conference had been discussed in the Advisory Committee, views had been divided because of the governmental structure of the new Executive Board. The Committee had agreed, however, that it was impossible to know at the present stage what changes would arise as a result of that change in structure and, in order to make certain that it would be possible to have an Advisory Committee if necessary, had recommended that such a Committee should be set up by the General Conference and that it should be left to the discretion of the Executive Board whether and when to convene it.
(17) The Advisory Committee had submitted the following resolution: "The General Conference decides to set up an Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, to be convened at such a time and for such purposes as may be recommended by the Executive Board."
(18) He moved the adoption of that resolution.

(19) Mr. SEDES (France) said that his delegation approved the draft resolution.
(20) It seemed to him that the work of the Advisory Committee during the Conference had made no contribution to the preparation of the programme, but had helped the Programme and Budget Commission considerably in examining special problems.
(21) The Executive Board should therefore decide to keep the Advisory Committee in being and work on that basis.

(22) The CHAIRMAN observed that it was not left to the Board to decide whether the Advisory Committee should be retained; the Board would merely decide what work it should do.

(23) During the last discussions in the Advisory Committee Mr. SEDES (France) had received the impression that the Board would be left a degree of freedom on that point.

(24) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) agreed that the question was important. In the course of discussion in the Advisory Committee, the opinion had been expressed that the Executive Board should be free to decide not to convene an Advisory Committee if it did not appear necessary to do so.

(25) The CHAIRMAN thought that it would be for the Executive Board to decide whether the Advisory Committee should meet before the opening of the ninth session of the General Conference, but that, once the session had opened, decisions regarding it would rest with the Conference.

(26) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) considered that the work of the Advisory Committee during the Conference had been useful and constructive in certain matters, but, in others, had duplicated the work of the Programme and Budget Commission.
(27) He recalled that, when the Advisory Committee had been set up, by a decision of the General Conference at its seventh session, to replace the Budget Committee, the object had been to ensure greater concentration and from that point of view the Committee had proved useful. He therefore felt that the Committee should be kept in being, but that its work should be concentrated on certain essential problems.

(28) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) thought that, even though the Commission did not always agree with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Committee served a useful purpose. If the membership of the Advisory Committee were increased to include representatives of more Member States, the Committee would be even more useful, especially if it consisted of representatives of Member States not already represented on the new Executive Board.
(29) Referring to the resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee, he pointed out that, if the Committee were to be called between sessions of the General Conference, expenses would be greatly increased, whereas, by calling the Committee immediately prior to a session of the General Conference, extra travel costs would be avoided.

(30) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, and asked, as the delegation of Ceylon had done, that the membership of the Committee be increased and, in particular, that representatives of countries not on the Executive Board be included.

(31) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) thought that one reason for duplication of work between the Advisory Committee and the Commission was that the Commission did not use the Committee as it was intended it should be used.
(32) Everyone hoped that the Executive Board and the Secretariat, in making plans for the ninth session of the General Conference, would attempt to see that the best possible use of available time was made and that duplication was avoided.
(33) In his opinion, the Advisory Committee had made a wise recommendation in providing the Executive Board with facilities for preparatory work for the ninth session. He supported the resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee.

(34) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) found the discussion interesting, but thought it should be remembered that, ever since Unesco began, the delicate matters of co-ordination and agreement had been the subject of many discussions, which had produced, successively, the Budget Committee, the Programme and Budget

Commission and, finally, the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
(35) The Greek delegate wondered whether the work of co-ordination could not in future be carried out by the Executive Board, which was the best informed and most competent body to take decisions between sessions of the General Conference. He saw no need to set up a new body, whose members would be delegates of their respective governments and might not have sufficient background knowledge to do the work required of them.
(36) He urged that the Organization's working methods should be studied with a view to simplifying them.

(37) The CHAIRMAN did not think that the discussion could be continued without a representative of the Executive Board, and proposed that the meeting adjourn for a few minutes to enable the Board to send one.

(38) Agreed.

(39) On the arrival of Sir Ronald Adam, Chairman of the Executive Board, the meeting resumed.

(40) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the resolution, though sharing the doubts expressed by the delegate of Greece.
(41) In his opinion, the creation of a Committee having a governmental structure, when the Executive Board had such a structure, would only mean a duplication of work. The need for duplication was less now than it had been formerly and he wondered whether it was necessary to have an Advisory Committee at all. The Executive Board held a position of trust and, if it were trusted, all the preparatory work for the next General Conference could be left in its hands.
(42) He would vote for the resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee as being the best compromise solution, but on the understanding that the Executive Board had powers not to convene the Advisory Committee before the next session of the General Conference if it so desired.

(43) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) did not see the force of the argument of duplication of work. It was always necessary for the General Conference to scrutinize the programme and budget and only a small body such as the Advisory Committee could carry out a detailed scrutiny successfully.
(44) He was of the opinion that, if the scope of the Committee's activities were widened, its work would be of greater use. He suggested that, in order to save time in the Programme Commission, the Executive Board and the Programme Commission should give the Advisory Committee a specific mandate.
(45) He thought that it would be worth while to have on the Advisory Committee representatives of Member States not represented on the Executive Board, especially if the work of the General Conference were reorganized.

(46) Mr. CALO (Italy) paid tribute to the very great assistance that the Advisory Committee had given the Programme and Budget Commission on certain points. But he felt that, on the whole, the work of the Advisory Committee had duplicated that of the Commission and had done something to cause indecision and difficulties. While recognizing that the Committee could help in effecting economies and introducing new methods, the Italian delegate thought that, in view of the new structure of the Executive Board, the continued existence of the Committee might lead to sharper and bitterer conflicts than in the past.
(47) He therefore proposed that, in the new version of Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, which had just been adopted by the Conference, the words "the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget" be deleted.
(48) If his proposal did not meet with general agreement, the Conference could leave the decision to the Executive Board.

(49) Mr. LOEFFLER (German Federal Republic) endorsed the tributes paid to the Advisory Committee and said that he agreed with the United Kingdom delegate on every point.

(50) Mr. DE SALIS (Switzerland) also paid tribute to the work accomplished by the Advisory Committee; it seemed to him that the fears voiced about duplication were not really justified. In his opinion, the Executive Board, owing to its new structure, would in future have a heavier and more difficult task than in the past. It might wish to pass on to another body certain problems connected with figures and programme details, so as to concentrate on long-term work. It might also be glad to hear another independent opinion.
(51) The Swiss delegate therefore hoped that the resolution would be so drafted as to make the Advisory Committee an aid to the Executive Board between sessions of the General Conference and an organ of the Conference during sessions.

(52) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) joined with other delegates in praising the services of the Advisory Committee.
(53) The Burmese delegation had supported the proposal for the changed structure of the Executive Board, because it felt that, by having a governmental structure, the Executive Board would be strengthened. The Executive Board was bound by the Constitution to act in the interests of all Member States. In spite of that, he thought that it was necessary to have an Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget in order to obtain a more representative opinion and he agreed with the delegate of Ceylon that the Committee should be composed of representatives of Member States not represented on the Executive Board.
(54) He disagreed with the proposal of the Advisory Committee that its existence should be at the discretion of the Board. The Advisory Committee should exist in its own right.

(55) The CHAIRMAN observed that the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee gave no indication of the number of the Committee's members; the subject under discussion was the principle of keeping the Committee in being.

(56) Mr. SUZUKI (Japan) said that his delegation was prepared to approve the proposed draft resolution.

(57) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) was of the opinion that, as the Executive Board was now composed of government representatives, it would be a duplication of work to have an Advisory Committee also composed of government representatives. He thought that the Advisory Committee served a useful purpose and suggested that it should, in the future, be composed of experts.
(58) He would support the resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee if the character of the Committee were changed.

(59) Mr. BENDER (Netherlands) supported the proposal of the Advisory Committee and the remarks made by the delegate of the United Kingdom.
(60) The work done by the Advisory Committee was useful to the General Conference. If there was a danger of its work overlapping that of another body of the General Conference, its terms of reference could be changed.
(61) He suggested that an Advisory Committee should be set up by the General Conference as a transitional measure and that any decision as to its future should be left to the ninth session of the General Conference.

(62) Sir Roland ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) outlined the work done by the Executive Board in connexion with the programme and budget. In the November before a General Conference, the Director-General gave an outline of his proposed programme to the Executive Board. The Board discussed that programme in the following March and, in the following July, prepared its report on the programme, which report was sent to the Member States.
(63) The Executive Board followed the programme through all the stages of its growth and knew more about it than any committee could possibly know.
(64) In his opinion, the new Executive Board, representing twenty-two Member States, making a detailed report on the future programme, was in a much better position to judge its merits than any committee would be, even after a detailed scrutiny lasting two weeks.

(65) Mr. RAADI (Iran) said that, if the structure of the Executive Board had not been altered, he would be entirely in favour of retaining the Advisory Committee, provided that its working methods were changed to avoid duplication.
(66) He agreed with the United Kingdom delegate that in the existing circumstances it was the Commission which should vote for its abolition.
(67) However, as the Advisory Committee had gained some experience in the course of its work, he thought he might suggest a compromise: the Commission would agree to the abolition of the Advisory Committee in principle, but would decide that, at meetings of the Executive Board concerned with the preparation of the programme and budget, the existing officers of the Advisory Committee could be called upon to give their views in an advisory capacity; the final decision would be left to the General Conference at its next session.

(68) Mr. CALO (Italy) asked whether the decision taken by the Conference with regard to the new text of Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure should be considered as definite and final.

(69) The CHAIRMAN thought so and wondered whether the Commission could reopen discussion on a decision of the General Conference.

(70) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) remarked that the decision of the General Conference obviously altered the situation. That decision would mean that the Executive Board did not have the power to suppress the Advisory Committee.
(71) The resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee would still be useful, however, as it would give the Board the opportunity of deciding the most appropriate time for convening the Committee as well as latitude with regard to its terms of reference.

(72) The CHAIRMAN said that the question of the Advisory Committee's existence was no longer at issue, but the Commission could consider how the Conference's decision was to be carried out.

(73) Mr. CALO (Italy) suggested that the Executive Board be instructed to decide upon the date at which the Advisory Committee should meet, as well as on its functions and responsibilities.

(74) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) observed that, in view of the explanations given by the Chairman, the draft proposed by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee was no longer suitable.
(75) The Conference should be requested, not to set up the Advisory Committee, but to decide the date on which it should be convened.

(76) The CHAIRMAN thought that the first paragraph should read as follows: "The General Conference decides that the Advisory Committee shall be convened at such a time and for such purposes as may be recommended by the Executive Board", and that the second paragraph should deal with the membership of the Committee.
(77) The first paragraph was put to the vote and approved by 42 votes, with 1 abstention.

(78) The CHAIRMAN did not think it was for the Commission to decide which countries should be represented on the Advisory Committee - that was a matter for the Nominations Committee - but it could decide the size of the Committee's membership.

(79) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) suggested that the Commission recommend to the Nominations Committee that, in nominating members for the Advisory Committee, representatives should be chosen from Member States not already represented on the Executive Board.

(80) Mr. RAADI (Iran) said that, in the opinion of his delegation, the resolution should mention that the Executive Board was responsible for clearly delimiting the respective tasks of the Advisory Committee and the Programme and Budget Commission.

(81) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought

it would be advisable to make it clear that the Executive Board was responsible for reconsidering the functions and terms of reference of the Advisory Committee.
(82) He also reminded the Commission that the Advisory Committee had been set up by a decision of the Conference at its seventh session. The decision just taken on the subject by the plenary conference had been taken by default, as the question of the Committee's continued existence had not been raised, the amendment to Rule 25 being simply a verbal change.
(83) The Assistant Director-General thought that the question could therefore be reopened and that it was accordingly essential to make it clear that the Executive Board was not bound by the decision taken at the seventh session, but could re-examine the terms of reference and functions of the Advisory Committee.

(84) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), drew attention again to the character of the Advisory Committee, pointing out that, in his opinion, it should in the future be composed of experts, as the Executive Board was composed of government representatives. Priority should be given to representatives of Member States not already represented on the Executive Board.
(85) He questioned the legality of the resolution passed by the Plenary Conference, pointing out that the Programme and Budget Commission had not yet pronounced on the programme phase of the Advisory Committee's report when the resolution had been adopted. He thought that the matter should be taken up and the Plenary Conference asked to reconsider its decision.

(86) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) agreed with the Iranian delegate with regard to the competence of the Advisory Committee.
(87) The Committee had been set up at the seventh session of the Conference and its mandate should have ended with the eighth session. Owing to the changes made in the various conference organs, it was no longer so important, and the Executive Board should therefore define what it was to do.

(88) Mr. DE SALIS (Switzerland) also supported the Iranian delegate's proposal.
(89) With regard to the membership of the Advisory Committee, the Swiss delegate thought that members should not be government representatives but should act as experts or advisers to the Executive Board.

(90) Mr. CALO (Italy) explained that he had proposed raising the question of retaining the Advisory Committee because he had in front of him the record of the plenary Conference's discussions.

(91) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) observed that, according to the draft resolution submitted for the Commission's approval, the Conference would nominate the countries to be represented on the Advisory Committee; as the Committee was a technical one, however, he saw no need for nominating countries.

(92) Mr. SEDES (France) recalled that the Advisory Committee was responsible for assisting the Programme and Budget Commission in its work; he therefore considered that decisions concerning it were the business of the Commission.

(93) The CHAIRMAN asked delegates to vote on whether the question of the Committee's existence should be referred to the General Conference.
(94) It was decided, by 25 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions, that the decision to keep the Committee in being still stood.

(95) The CHAIRMAN wondered whether the first paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee should not be amended in accordance with the French delegate's suggestion.

(96) Mr. SEDES (France) explained what his comments implied; the Executive Board should be responsible for determining what the Advisory Committee was to do, but only after deciding upon the functions of the Programme and Budget Commission, and with reference thereto.

(97) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) thought that, although all delegations were agreed that it would not be necessary to hold a meeting of the Advisory Committee before the ninth session of the General Conference, it would be advisable to make arrangements for having such a Committee to help with the work at that session. The Advisory Committee had the important task of making adjustments to the budget and of balancing it.
(98) He supported the proposal to set up an Advisory Committee and of leaving it to the Executive Board to decide when it was to meet.

(99) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) felt that the task of the Advisory Committee was to advise the Programme and Budget Commission.
(100) He agreed with the views expressed by the Burmese delegate concerning the selection of members of the Advisory Committee from among representatives of countries which did not belong to the Executive Board, and with the Liberian delegate's opinion that they should serve as experts. On the last point, he thought it would be advisable to choose people with experience of the various chapters of the programme.

(101) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) suggested the addition of the following paragraph:
"Requests the Executive Board, in considering the organization of the ninth session of the General Conference and in particular connexion with the Advisory Committee on the Programme and Budget, to make precise recommendations concerning the terms of reference of such an Advisory Committee."

(102) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) considered that it would be better not to define the functions of the Advisory Committee in the second part of the resolution. The Administrative Commission was faced with difficult problems from time to time, which it referred direct to the Legal Committee. The Programme Commission could do likewise with the Advisory Committee, but only if the terms of reference of that Committee were not too closely defined beforehand.

(103) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) observed that the regulations in force authorized the Executive Board to call in qualified experts to assist it in its work. He therefore saw no need to call in new experts to review the work of the others.

(104) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America), raising a point of order, said that, although the resolution would authorize the Executive Board to convene the Advisory Committee if and when necessary, reference had been made in the discussion to the fact that it would be unnecessary to convene it before the ninth session of the General Conference. If it was correct that the Committee would not be convened before the ninth session, he could see no point in the resolution. If the Committee was to meet prior to the ninth session, its composition, the time of its meeting and its terms of reference could be left to the Executive Board. He did not consider that such details could be determined by the Programme Commission at the present stage.

(105) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that the Advisory Committee was an organ of the General Conference, and at the next session it would be well to consider the expediency of retaining it as such.

(106) In his opinion, the Executive Board should be invited, when discussing the reorganization of the Conference's work, to submit recommendations to the Conference on the functions of the Committee and the need for its continued existence.

(107) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the discussion be adjourned to allow an exact text to be prepared, and submitted for approval by the Commission at its next meeting.

(108) Agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p. m.

# THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

*9 December 1954, at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland)

**RESOLUTIONS ON THE PROGRAMME AND THE BUDGET – REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR** (document 8C/PRG/30 (prov.))

(1) Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur) in presenting the document, said that the major and second part of the report consisted of an annex setting out the changes voted by the Commission in respect of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56. The first part contained his own comments on the Commission's actions, under three headings:

1. Introductory remarks.
2. A selection of the main events in the eight chapters of the 1955-56 programme, and in particular the new items introduced into it.
3. Observations on methods of procedure, made both inside and outside the Commission, which he had thought proper to summarize and place on record for the benefit of the Secretariat, the Executive Board and future participants in the Conference.

(2) A matter of some concern had been the fact that the Commission had not started work until six days after the opening of the Conference, and not until the twelfth day had it been provided with a budget ceiling on which to base its examination of the programme.

(3) The remodelled programme had been explained by the Chairman of the retiring Executive Board and debate on it had been postponed until completion of the study of the programme. After careful examination, and after hearing the report of the Advisory Committee, which satisfied previous doubts on the problem of general and special activities, the Commission had unanimously approved the remodelled programme.

(4) The Technical Assistance programme had been approved at an early stage of the Commission's work, and the Rapporteur wished to draw the attention of the Director of Technical Assistance to some of the excellent comments on his programme. In pointing out an error in the second line (page 2, No. 3 of the document) - the word "fortuitous" should be replaced by the word "fortunate" - he stressed the heavy work involved in preparing and amending documents and thanked the Secretariat for its great and valuable efforts in that respect. He hoped that the directors of departments would find time to read the many revealing and constructive comments made by delegates on programme activities.

(5) A tribute was due to the working parties and to the Chairmen and Rapporteurs for their excellent reports, all of which had been adopted unanimously. In that connexion, he had been struck by the zeal of members of the Commission, who, aware of the responsibility invested in them, had been determined to investigate each programme thoroughly and had been quick to oppose the delegation of their duties to working parties or the limiting of discussion to items on which there was disagreement. It was the more to be regretted, therefore, that because of the superabundance of documents they had not had time to carry out their intention.

(6) The Rapporteur then commented briefly on the different chapters of the programme.
(7) Education. He had been astonished to find, after the long debates, decisions and resolutions, that the programme as set out in document 8C/5 remained almost unchanged.
(8) Natural Sciences. There had been two points of serious controversy.
(9) First, the Campaign against Cancer. Now that the project had been adopted, he hoped that the heated discussions would be forgotten and that delegates, Member States and the Secretariat would make a success of it under its new title "Basic Research on Cellular Growths".
(10) Second, the determination to play a part in the use of atomic energy for peace. The project was, he considered, one which would attract wide attention and which would be well publicized through Unesco's channels of information.
(11) Mention should also be made of the Arid Zone and Humid Tropical Zone projects and of the section which referred to Oceanography.
(12) Social Sciences. Delegates had accepted the Social Sciences programme more readily than any other, thanks, perhaps, to its Director. He had been impressed by the Director's readiness to accept and act on suggestions, one of which had meant the deletion of a major activity, and another the speedy submission of revised and acceptable proposals.
(13) Of special significance was the resolution on peaceful co-operation (document 8C/DR/115), produced jointly by the delegates of the United States of America and Czechoslovakia and adopted unanimously.
(14) Cultural Activities. Regretting that his appointment as Rapporteur had prevented him from working on cultural activities, as he had intended to do, at the Conference, he had, perhaps, placed extra emphasis on that section of his report. Many delegates, however, had expressed great interest in the subject.
(15) A new project attracting considerable attention was the provision of books for new literates, and he had been impressed by the constructive contributions of delegates from a wide variety of countries. It had been asked why the project had not been placed in the chapter on Education; in his opinion it was an activity which transcended departmental barriers. He looked forward with great interest to seeing what books were produced.
(16) Other activities singled out for mention included the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict; international regulations for archaeological excavation; and an international competition in architecture; a new venture: the publication of a book commemorating the centenary in 1955 of the Polish poet Mickiewicz; and the preparation of a scientific and cultural history of mankind.
(17) Resolutions under the chapter had been too numerous, and he feared that some worthy ones had been overlooked.

(18) Mass Communication. The major development was the reorganization recommended by the working party and adopted by the Commission.
(19) A discussion had taken place on films, and hasty action in rejecting a film-making project, for which the Commission had already approved two new posts, had had to be corrected. The possibilities of television had also been discussed.
(20) The Rapporteur drew attention to two amendments to the document: first, at the end of the fourth paragraph under Mass Communication (page 7). The Director wished the following sentence to be inserted "In the field of information all projects relating to programme activities were adopted." Secondly, in the French text only, the last part of paragraph 1 under Information should read: "... qui propose une structure correspondant aux deux fonctions principales du Département de l'Information".
(21) The most important event in the chapter was the adoption of a resolution (document 8C/DR/123) on the use of the means of mass communication, which was destined, he believed, to make an impact on the world. Of special interest was the emphasis on implementation by Member States.
(22) Nothing of special importance was to be noted in respect of exchange of Persons and Documents and Publications.
(23) General Resolutions. The most important item under that chapter was the report of the Working Party on Decentralization, which, while approving the establishment in India of an office for co-operation with Unesco, and the extension and stimulation of activities of National Commissions, drew attention to the basic principle of universality in Unesco and gave a warning lest excessive decentralization should lead to disintegration.
(24) Finally, the Commission had accepted the recommendations of the Advisory Committee for making the revised programme fit the budget ceiling and had suggested that, if at any time the Secretariat should be able to make further economies, the Director-General should bear in mind the possibility of using them for the following purposes:

(a) to increase the subvention to the International Council of Scientific Unions by a maximum of $20,000 per annum for 1955-56;

(b) to increase the subvention to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies by a maximum of $10,000 per annum;

(c) to raise by $32,650 the contribution to UNRWA for Palestine refugees.

(25) The Rapporteur then read in full the last five paragraphs on page 9 and the first paragraph on page 10 of the report, which referred to excessive documentation and made suggestions on the plan of work for the General Conference.
(26) Finally, in accordance with Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure, the following paragraph should be inserted before the final paragraph of the Introduction:

"Resolutions adopted by the General Conference shall be communicated by the Director-General to the Members of the Organization within thirty days after the close of the session."

(27) The document under discussion was provisional and would be revised by the Secretariat before distribution to Member States. It would be necessary for the Commission to authorize the Director-General to modify the numbering of the resolutions and to do such editing as he saw fit.

(28) The CHAIRMAN paid tribute to the Rapporteur for the remarkable work he had performed, with the

help of Mr. Chevalier and all his colleagues.
(29) He suggested that the Commission confine its discussion to the introduction to the draft report, since the Annex was merely a list of decisions taken at previous meetings. Any typographical errors could, of course, be corrected by the Secretariat.

(30) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) pointed out that in the reference to resolution 8C/DR/115 on page 6, India had not been included among the sponsoring countries mentioned, although the original proposal had been made by the Indian Government. A similar omission occurred on page 5 in connexion with the resolution on atomic energy. He also asked that mention should be made, in the introductory section of the report, of the Brazilian proposal for an International Fund for Education, Science and Culture (page 33, resolution 10.2).

(31) The RAPPORTEUR regretted the omissions, which had been unintentional, and said that the necessary insertions would be made. He proposed to include a reference to the Brazilian resolution under chapter 7.

(32) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) objected to the wording of the second section of page 2 of the report. While the Board had considered at length the division of the programme into general and special activities, it had concentrated more on the major part of the programme, and it would be unjust to say that it had concentrated on the existing rather than the new.

(33) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested changing the first sentence of section 2, on page 2, to read: "The report of the Executive Board on the remodelling of the programme (document 8C/PRG/13) was based on the principle of aid to Member States; it drew particular attention to the distinction between 'general activities' and 'special activities', and to the advisability of adopting a few major projects."
(34) The fourth paragraph under "Natural Sciences", on page 5, would be improved by the deletion of the last part of the sentence from "and it was understood" onward. A decision to that effect had indeed been taken, but it was not advisable to mention it in the general introduction.
(35) Lastly, Mr. Maheu thought that the last sentence of the fifth paragraph, under the same heading, on page 5, should be reworded to read: "The Turkish delegate was assured by the Director-General that appropriate services to his country would be continued either by the central services at the Secretariat or under arrangements for aid to National Commissions."

(36) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that some reference should be included in the report to the speeches by non-governmental organizations, in order to show that there had not been only governmental voices at the Conference.
(37) With regard to the request of the Indian delegate, in his opinion it would be unwise to draw attention to the item in the introduction. The action taken was not very encouraging and might raise undue hopes.

(38) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) did not agree that a simple statement of fact would raise false hopes.

(39) Mr. HOPE (Rapporteur) asked if the delegates of India and the United Kingdom would draft a suitable sentence. With regard to the suggestion of the United Kingdom delegate, he intended to insert it not in the introduction but under Chapter 7 - General Resolutions.

(40) Mr. ZIMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a reference to be made to the fact that resolution DR/123 on the use of mass communication to increase mutual confidence and understanding, submitted jointly by eleven countries, was based on a resolution from the Soviet Government, which had been later amended by the delegates of the United States and other countries.

(41) The RAPPORTEUR noted the request.

(42) The Introduction was adopted unanimously.

ANNEX – PART I

(43) Adopted.

ANNEX – PART II

CHAPTER 1 – EDUCATION

(44) Adopted.

CHAPTER 2 – NATURAL SCIENCES

(45) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) noted that on page 8 of the Annex, under resolution 2.41, Part B, paragraph 158 was said to be amended instead of paragraph 156. It referred to the work of the Science Co-operation Office for Latin America (Montevideo). Paragraph 158 had not been amended.

(46) The CHAIRMAN said that the necessary correction would be made.

(47) Chapter 2 was unanimously approved.

CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL SCIENCES

(48) Unanimously approved without discussion.

CHAPTER 4 – CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

(49) Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary of the Commission) pointed out two typographical errors. Project 4.35 (A), in the French text, "La croisade des musées" should read "Campagne en faveur des musées". Project 4.42, "Study of cultural relations" should read "Study of relations between cultures".

(50) Chapter 4 was unanimously approved.

CHAPTER 5 – MASS COMMUNICATION

(51) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), referring to (167) resolution 5.52 (A) "Educational Film Institute for Latin America", under Section II, on page 23, said that, although the resolution was shown as approved, the Mexican delegation had made a reservation regarding the cost of the project.

(52) The CHAIRMAN said that note would be taken of the reservation.

(53) Chapter 5 was approved.

(54) Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 were unanimously approved without discussion.

(55) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) paid a warm tribute to the Rapporteur for his excellent and valuable work. His report had not only captured the essence of the delegates' aims and wishes, in spite of the discussion which sometimes obscured them, but had also enhanced the interest of the discussions themselves.

Document 8C/DIV/155: Draft text submitted by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(56) The CHAIRMAN announced that before the Commission completed its agenda, it had still to consider document 8C/DIV/155, which embodied the proposals examined that morning. The last paragraph was identical with the draft resolution (document 8C/DR/127) submitted by the delegations of Ceylon, India and Liberia.

(57) The first and second paragraphs were unanimously approved.

(58) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon), presenting the resolution, said that the figure of twenty-four had been proposed as being one-third of the total membership of Unesco; the suggestion concerning persons competent in the fields of education, science and culture had been included at the request of his delegation; finally, it had been thought advisable to include members of countries not represented on the Executive Board.

(59) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) fully appreciated the intentions of the authors of the proposal contained in the last paragraph. He feared, however, that the proposal might mean a repetition of the protracted discussions which had already taken place on the structure of the Executive Board. Moreover, there was no reason to limit the number of fields in which members of the Advisory Committee should be expert. It would surely be desirable to include specialists in finance or administration in the Committee.

(60) In the circumstances, Mgr Maroun would vote against the adoption of the text. Since the Executive Board was to lay down the Advisory Committee's terms of reference, there was no point in adding to the end of the resolution details which might hamper the Board. It would be better to retain only the first sentence of the last paragraph.

(61) Mr. MALAKUL (Thailand) proposed that the word "arts" in the fourth line of the resolution should be changed to "education".

(62) The CHAIRMAN noted the amendment.

(63) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) said that, with an Executive Board of 24 and an Advisory Committee of 22 members, the 26 remaining Member States would not be short of advice.

(64) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon), replying to the delegate of Lebanon, said that the wording of the resolution was not intended to limit membership of the Advisory Committee to persons competent in education, science and culture and would not preclude, for example, financial experts.

(65) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) could not support a text which seemed to him to contradict the first two paragraphs, already approved. Those paragraphs gave the Executive Board very broad powers so far as the competence and membership of the Advisory Committee were concerned. Moreover, the text would lead to a legally impossible situation. The Conference would simply nominate the States to be represented on the Committee. The individual members would then be chosen by the governments concerned. Lastly, Mr. François thought that the Advisory Committee should not have a membership of more than 15 to 20. The figure proposed seemed to him too high, in view of past experience of the working of smaller committees.

(66) The CHAIRMAN mentioned that the two paragraphs adopted referred to the date for convening the Advisory Committee and its terms of reference. So far, no decision had been taken about its membership.

(67) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) joined in the opposition expressed by the delegate of France, not only because of the effect of such an arrangement on the Executive Board and the Conference, but for the more important reason that advisory services should come from the National Commissions. The members of the Board, although government representatives, would be in close touch with National Commissions and the Board would thus have access to the best advice not only from 24 countries, but from all the Member States of Unesco. The National Commissions, which existed or were being created in every country, provided an unrivalled source of advice on all matters of education, science and culture, and he saw no reason to set up new machinery. He hoped that the resolution would be rejected as unnecessary.

(68) Another objection was the financial aspect, which had not yet been considered. The members of the Advisory Committee as at present constituted received neither expenses nor per diem; but the proposed new committee would have to be financed by the 24 countries selected for membership, who might be unwilling to support the cost of members of the Advisory Committee in addition to the upkeep of National Commissions.

(69) The CHAIRMAN emphasized that the Committee would not be permanent. All that was at issue was

its constitution for the ninth session of the Conference The General Conference could then take a decision on the advisability of retaining the Committee.

(70) Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) was perplexed at the attempts to minimize the effects of the resolution. He could not see that the proposed membership was too large, bearing in mind that in 1951, when it had been fifteen, there had been only sixty Member States, whereas at the present time there were 72, including a whole new region of the world. As to the character of the Committee, he insisted that it should be determined by the Commission and not by the Executive Board, which was now a government body. With regard to financial considerations, nobody could expect advice without payment, and as to who should pay, whether it was the General Conference, the Organization or Member States, it would still fall to governments, since Unesco was an intergovernmental body.

(71) In his opinion, the question raised by the United Kingdom was immaterial to the problem before the Commission, which was whether the persons designated by Member States should be embassy or legation officials or experts in special fields. He would prefer the committee to be composed of experts in education, science, culture or finance.

(72) The CHAIRMAN considered that the definition set out in the last sentence of the final paragraph was at variance with the provisions adopted under paragraph 1. He thought, however, that it would be helpful to specify the number of members and possibly give some indication about the choice of States, to be represented on the Committee.

(73) Mr. SEDES (France) was in entire agreement with the Chairman. It was hardly possible to say, in one place, "The Conference decides....", and, in another, ".... the General Conference shall endeavour to include ....". In his opinion, the General Conference could not at one and the same time take decisions and give itself advice.

(74) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that there appeared to be some misunderstanding over the draft before the Commission. It had been intended to meet the different views expressed: namely, that an opportunity should be given to Member States not represented on the Executive Board to be associated with the preparation of the programme and budget; and that the committee should consist of persons expert in Unesco's various fields of work. It had never been intended that the General Conference should elect the experts; the meaning of the resolution was that the Conference should designate the 24 countries and that Member States should choose the experts. In spite of all that had been said, he was not convinced that the future of the Advisory Committee was affected by the change in the constitution of the Executive Board, since, if it were argued that governmental representation on the Board rendered the Advisory Committee unnecessary, the same could be argued for the General Conference itself. He could not see any financial problem, since experts could be included in delegations, whose expenses were always paid by Member States.

(75) In conclusion, he submitted the following revised draft of the resolution: "Decides that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget shall consist of 24 members. In electing the members of the Committee, the General Conference shall endeavour to include Member States not already included in the Executive Board. Member States elected to the committee shall nominate such members on the committee as are competent in the various fields of Unesco's activities."

(76) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the members of the Committee would be chosen from the delegations of States designated by the Conference. In the text under discussion, it seemed to be assumed that such States might send to the General Conference delegates with no special qualification in the fields of interest to Unesco.

(77) Mr. FAWZI (Egypt) recalled that the Commission had that morning been called upon to examine two very simple proposals which had been approved. It was true that the delegations included specialists in various aspects of the programme. But, if the Committee were to meet before the Conference, each delegation would probably choose only one representative. He thought that the Advisory Committee should be regarded as an expanded working party, set up to examine the draft programme and budget as a whole. Moreover, it was unnecessary to specify that members of the Committee should be "persons competent in education, science and cultural activities..." as the delegations themselves were undoubtedly composed of people competent in the various fields of interest to Unesco.

(78) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) saw a confusion in the discussion. The Advisory Committee had been in existence for two or three years and its virtues and defects were now known. The Commission having decided to refer to the Executive Board the task of investigating the exact nature of the Committee's function in helping the General Conference, he doubted the wisdom of limiting the discretion of the Executive Board by suggestions of the kind put forward during the meeting. Suggestions could only be made after a report had been received from the Executive Board. Similarly, the number of members would depend on the exact nature of the Committee's duties. He therefore proposed that the decision should be a transitional measure and that the resolution should be amended as follows:

"Decides that, as a transitional measure for the Conference of 1956, the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget shall consist of 24 members", with the addition of a reference to the inclusion of States not represented on the Executive Board, if desired. He would prefer to see 18 members instead of 24, but would not press the point.

(79) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that the decision on the advisability of setting up an Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget for the ninth session of the General Conference had already been taken. It had also been agreed that the Executive Board might, if it saw fit, convene the Advisory Committee before the session opened.

(80) All that remained to be done was to settle how many Member States should be represented on the Committee and to make a recommendation regarding the choice of States. Since the principle of geographical distribution had always been observed in setting up small committees, there was no need to refer to it in the text. Finally, the Chairman considered it would be improper to cast any doubt on the competence of members of delegations.

(81) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) recalled that he had already proposed an amendment to delete the last sentence of the paragraph under discussion.

(82) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) proposed that the following be substituted for the last paragraph:

"The General Conference

Decides

That the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget shall consist of 17 Member States, the majority of which shall be chosen from among those not represented on the Executive Board. Member States are invited to designate, as their representatives on this Committee, experts in education, science and cultural activities."

(83) Mr. PRATT (Australia) asked whether the Advisory Committee had expressed any opinion on the third paragraph in document 8C/DIV/155.

(84) The SECRETARY of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget explained that the first paragraph of the document in question had been approved by the Advisory Committee, as already stated by the Chairman of that Committee.

(85) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the figure proposed by the French delegate.

(86) It was decided, by 22 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions, that the Advisory Committee should comprise representatives of 17 Member States.

(87) Mr. FAUBLAS (Haiti) saw a great difference between "17 Member States" and "24 Members".

(88) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stressed that the Commission had just taken a decision on the figure of 17 Member States. It could not, therefore, designate the individual members of the Committee, but it could invite the Member States which were designated by the Conference to select, as their representatives, people outstanding in fields of interest to Unesco.

(89) Furthermore, as the General Conference would have to designate the 17 Member States on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, the proposal of the Indian delegation would require some slight amendment. The Commission might ask the Nominations Committee to give preference to Member States not represented on the Executive Board.

(90) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said that he had abstained when the previous vote was taken because he thought the discussion had been confused. There was a question of terminology still outstanding. At one time mention was made of "members" and at another of "Member States". The Rules of Procedure relating to the membership of the Conference committees, however, spoke only of "members", and it had always been understood that the Nominations Committee first designated Member States, while the delegations of those States thereafter selected persons qualified for membership of one or other Committee. He therefore thought there was a risk involved in introducing the notion of "Member States".

(91) The CHAIRMAN fully concurred in the opinion of the Belgian delegate.

(92) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) proposed that the decision just taken be phrased as follows:

"The General Conference decides that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget shall be composed of representatives of the following 17 Member States: .....", the list of Member States designated by the Conference later being inserted.

(93) The Commission might also recommend that members of the Advisory Committee be chosen, for preference, from among Member States not represented on the Executive Board and, if it saw fit, might make special mention of the particular qualifications required.

(94) The text proposed by Mr. Saba was approved.

(95) The CHAIRMAN then called for a vote on the proposal of the Lebanese delegate for the deletion of the last sentence of the third paragraph.

(96) The proposal was adopted by 27 votes to 8.

(97) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) agreed with the Legal Adviser. He thought it out of place to make special mention of the character and qualifications of those who were to be members of the Advisory Committee. If members were to be representatives of the Member States, it lay with those States to select delegates capable of performing their duties satisfactorily.

(98) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) proposed that either one or two members of the Advisory Committee should also be members of the Executive Board, so that the committee could have the benefit of the Board's background knowledge and experience.

(99) Mr. PRATT (Australia) urged that, in considering the rôle of the Advisory Committee, the Executive Board should bear in mind its importance to the work of the Programme and Budget Commission, and take into account not only its past work, but also the effect which its work during the present session would have on the Commission's task at the ninth General Conference.

(100) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was prepared to agree that the Advisory Committee should be mainly composed of delegates of Member States not represented on the Executive Board. It would be dangerous, however, to attempt to have a totally different membership in the two bodies, as that might give rise to unfortunate clashes between them. It would be very

much better if there were friendly collaboration between the Executive Board and the Advisory Committee.

(101) The French delegation accordingly proposed that the following sub-paragraph be added

"The Commission further recommends that the majority of members of the Advisory Committee be chosen from among Member States not represented on the Executive Board."

(102) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) supported the proposal of the delegate of New Zealand to include on the committee at least two members of the Executive Board.

(103) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) proposed that the number should be definitely two.

(104) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) saw no reason to bind the Conference and the Executive Board in that way and thought that the procedure he had suggested would satisfy most Member States.

(105) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) felt that the Commission was going back on the decision it had taken when it deleted the last part of the third paragraph.

(106) The CHAIRMAN replied that the new proposal was concerned only with a recommendation of the Commission.

(107) Mr. MATIC (Yugoslavia) thought that the point called for very careful handling. He seconded the proposal of the New Zealand delegate, as he thought it would be helpful if the number of Member States represented both on the Executive Board and on the Advisory Committee were formally laid down. He added that the Executive Board would later be able to make a thorough examination of the programme as a whole, and that Member States not represented on the Board should also be given an opportunity of studying the draft programme in detail.

(108) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) supported the proposal of the French delegate, which allowed for flexibility in determining membership.

(109) Mr. AWAD (Egypt) urged acceptance of the French proposal; there was danger in too much precision.

(110) Mr. ZAMORANO HERNANDEZ (Chile) said that, where numbers were concerned, he did not favour flexibility. If it was thought that two members of the Executive Board should also sit on the Advisory Committee, it should be clearly stated.

(111) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) suggested fixing the number of Executive Board members to take part in the work of the Advisory Committee at a maximum of 5.

(112) The proposal was seconded by Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece).

(113) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out one detail in the discussion which was not very clear. Was it desired to fix the number of members of the Executive Board who would also belong to the Advisory Committee, or the number of Member States to be represented on both bodies?

(114) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) said that he would not dispute the number, as long as there was a small Executive Board representation for the reasons he had already stated. He did not think there was any danger of undue influence on the committee.

(115) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had never in its history been represented on a committee. The rôle of the Board was advisory and, while its members could attend a committee when necessary, or be called on to give advice, they could never be elected to membership.

(116) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) withdrew his proposal, which no longer had any point.

(117) The proposal of the French delegation was put to the vote and adopted by 16 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.

(118) The CHAIRMAN thanked his colleagues for the confidence they had given him during the work of the Commission. He was glad that a new system was to be introduced at the next session, and thought it should work smoothly and well to produce satisfactory results.

(119) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) had been struck by the Rapporteur's comments on the draft resolutions submitted during the session (document 8C/PRG/30 (prov.), page 9, sixth paragraph). If the Director-General were to have time to give his views on such proposals, the draft programme would have to be forwarded to Member States at an earlier date, for example, at the same time as to the Executive Board. As the document was prepared for the Executive Board, there should be no difficulty in carrying out that suggestion.

(120) Mr. Baugniet accordingly proposed the following text:

"The General Conference requests the Director-General to communicate to Member States the draft programme and budget which he submits to the Executive Board, in sufficient time to enable them to transmit to the Board any comments they may find it necessary to make on the draft, so that the Board may make use of those comments in considering the programme and the budget estimates."

(121) The CHAIRMAN thought it would be well to state exactly when the preliminary draft programme should be communicated to Member States. He also thought that the proposal should be referred to the Board, since it concerned the task it had been commissioned to do with regard to the reorganization of the Conference's work.

(122) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that there had been pressure on the Secretariat for some time to make the drafts available to Member States. There was, however, a danger of causing confusion to both

members of the Executive Board and Member States by a multiplication of documents.

(123) Nevertheless, if Member States wished to have the documents, he had no objection to sending them, but they could not be in any language other than the working languages of the Executive Board. The cost involved would not be very high.

(124) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) was entirely satisfied with the Chairman's reply and pointed out that there was no clause prohibiting Member States from making suggestions to the Director-General and the Executive Board. He proposed that the draft programme and budget in its final form should be sent out to Member States at least six months in advance.

(125) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that to lay down in the regulations that documents must be sent out at least six months in advance would force the Executive Board to alter its rhythm of meetings, in order that its work should be completed at a sufficiently early date, and might well cause scheduling difficulties. It would be better, he thought, to send the first draft to Member States at least six months before the opening of the Conference and the amended version later; it would be unwise to insist on the amended version being sent six months in advance.

(126) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that it was difficult to deal with a resolution submitted at so late a stage that there was not time to give it proper consideration. He proposed that it should be treated as a recommendation from a Member State and not as a formal resolution.

(127) The CHAIRMAN asked whether Mr. Baugniet would be agreeable to submitting his proposal merely as a suggestion to the Director-General, without having a vote on it.

(128) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said he was quite satisfied with the suggestions made by the Director-General.

(129) the DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed his willingness to follow the wishes of the Conference. He had no preference between a resolution and a recommendation, but he must have a definite decision from the Commission.

(130) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Director-General be merely asked to consider the feasibility of communicating the draft programme to Member States, as suggested by the Belgian delegate.

(131) Approved.

(132) Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) said that, now that the Commission's business was finished, she wished, as a representative of Uruguay, where the Conference was being held, to congratulate the Chairman and the officers of the Commission as a whole on the success of their work. She endorsed the tribute paid by the representative of the United States of America to the work of the Rapporteur, who had had the most thankless task of all.

(123) She also extended her congratulations to the women who had taken part in the work of the Programme and Budget Commission, and wished to mention, in particular, Mrs. Myrdal and the representative of the Philippines.

(134) The CHAIRMAN expressed his appreciation of the remarks of the Uruguayan delegate.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

# ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

## FIRST MEETING

*13 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman* : Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

(1) The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting and expressed appreciation of the honour of having been elected to preside over the Commission.
(2) He announced that he had been asked to draw members' attention to paragraphs 4 and 5 of Rule 78 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference.

**ITEM 9.1 OF REVISED AGENDA : ELECTION OF THE THREE VICE-CHAIRMEN AND THE RAPPORTEUR**

(3) The CHAIRMAN called for nominations for the three posts of Vice-Chairman.

(4) The delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador), nominated Mexico.

(5) The delegate of Czechoslovakia, seconded by the delegate of Poland, nominated the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

(6) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan), seconded by Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain), nominated Egypt.

(7) The delegate of Switzerland nominated Israel.

(8) The CHAIRMAN announced that, as there were four nominations for only three posts, the Commission would have to vote by ballot.
(9) The result of the vote was as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mexico | 32 |
| Egypt | 26 |
| Israel | 22 |
| Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic | 15 |

(10) As the absolute majority required under Rule 89 of the Rules of Procedure had been obtained by Mexico, Egypt and Israel, the Chairman proclaimed those countries elected to the posts of Vice-Chairmen and asked them to submit the names of their representatives in writing.
(11) The Chairman then called for nominations for the post of Rapporteur.
(12) Sweden, nominated by the delegate of the Netherlands, was elected to the post of Rapporteur.
(13) The Swedish delegation appointed Mr. Eriksson to act as Rapporteur.

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (document 8C/1 rev.)**

(14) The revised agenda was adopted.

**ITEM 9.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA - CONTRIBUTIONS: SCALE, CURRENCY AND COLLECTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER STATES AND**

**ITEM 9.4.3 OF REVISED AGENDA - ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS**

(15) The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in accordance with a resolution passed by the General Conference at its seventh session, the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions were as follows:
(1) Scale of contributions for 1955 and 1956:
(a) consideration of basis for computing the scale of contributions;
(b) consideration of basis of assessment of Member States not members of the United Nations;
(c) examination of special cases;
(d) preparation of draft resolutions on the above points.
(2) Currency of contributions:
(a) determination of currencies in which contributions may be made;
(b) examination of special requests regarding currency;
(c) preparation of draft resolutions on the above points.
(3) Collection of contributions:
(a) examination of general situation;
(b) examination of methods of collecting contributions;
(c) consideration of special requests from Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia;
(d) determination of percentage of contributions estimated as being unreceivable for 1955 and 1956;
(e) preparation of draft resolutions on the above points.
(16) The Chairman was not sure what the position was with regard to China, but would take the

matter up with the General Committee at its next meeting.

(17) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) announced that the relevant documents were the following:

8C/ADM/8 - Part I : Scale of contributions
Part II : Currency of contributions
Part III: Collection of contributions
Part III, Add.1 - Request from the Government of Hungary.
Add.2 - Request from the Government of Poland.
8C/12 - Letter from the Government of Czechoslovakia.

(18) Since the table in document 8C/ADM/8, Part III, showing arrears on 10 November 1954, had been drawn up, the following contributions had been received:

$ 7,385 from Syria for 1953
$ 35,638 from Czechoslovakia.

(19) As all the above matters were to be discussed by the Committee on Contributions, the CHAIRMAN proposed its establishment forthwith. He recalled that, as it was a technical committee, it was preferable to keep it small. He suggested the following tentative list of eleven countries, selected: (a) from those likely to pay over 3% of the total budget for 1955-56; (b) on the basis of regional representation; and (c) with a view to representing Member States not members of the United Nations.
(a) Canada, France, German Federal Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America.
(b) Colombia, Egypt, Pakistan, Thailand.
(c) Switzerland.
It was of course understood that the committee would discuss special cases with representatives of the countries concerned.

(20) The delegate of Australia, seconded by the delegate of the Netherlands, moved adoption of the Chairman's list.

(21) Mr. CHEN YUAN (China), seconded by the delegate of Belgium, proposed the addition of Japan to represent countries not members of the United Nations.

(22) The Chairman's list, with the addition of Japan, was adopted.

(23) The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to elect its own Chairman, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. He hoped that it would deal first with questions upon which the voting of Member States depended.

**ITEM 9.3.1 OF REVISED AGENDA - DRAFT AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION (STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD) (documents 8C/ADM/1 and Annexes; 8C/ADM/1 Add. and 8C/ADM/3, Parts II and IV)**

(24) In view of the fundamental importance of the question of the structure of the Executive Board,

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thought that delegations should be given time to discuss the matter among themselves and establish contacts. He therefore moved that the item be deferred until the Commission's next meeting.
(25) The delegate of Japan seconded the United States proposal.
(26) While not opposing the motion of the United States delegation, Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) drew attention to the fact that changes in the order of items were very inconvenient for small delegations.

(27) The CHAIRMAN assured the delegate of Denmark that he had every sympathy with his objection and would keep to the order of items whenever possible.
(28) The delegate of Belgium, seconded by the delegate of the Netherlands, proposed that the item be adjourned until Tuesday morning, 16 November.
(29) It was agreed, by 20 votes to 17, to take item 9.3.1 on Tuesday morning, 16 November.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

# SECOND MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

(1) The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretary to announce the names of the Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Huzayin (Egypt), Mr. Kibovy (Israel) and Mr. Gomez Robledo (Mexico).

**ITEM 9.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: FINANCIAL QUESTIONS. REPORTS OF EXTERNAL AUDITOR TO THE GENERAL CONFERENCE ON THE ACCOUNTS OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 1952 AND 1953 RESPECTIVELY. (documents 8C/ADM/4 and addendum and 8C/ADM/5)**

(2) The CHAIRMAN explained that the task of the Administrative Commission was to recommend the reports to the General Conference.

(3) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) said that the Finance Committee of the Executive Board and the Board itself had heard a verbal statement by the External Auditor. Their impression was that the accounts and finances of the Organization were in good order. The Board had made two comments on the report for 1952.

(4) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) proposed that the decision taken by the Executive Board should be immediately accepted.

(5) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Representative of the Director-General) said that the Auditors had made two comments on the report for 1952 (document 8C/ADM/4): (1) On unpaid contributions, the report, made nearly 18 months ago, was largely out of date. Part II (document 8C/ADM/8), which dealt with the subject, would be taken up by the Committee on Contributions later. (2) On the Headquarters building preliminary expenses incurred were now being refunded by the French Government.
(6) On the Auditor's Report for 1953 (document 8C/ADM/5) he made four points. (1) The accounts represented the first part of a two-year period, therefore there was an unobligated balance included in the appropriations for 1954. (2) There had been an improvement in the arrears of contributions.
(3) In the liquidation of obligations the Financial Regulations had been contravened by the Director-General, but that had been done in the interests of the Organization, and had not been criticized.
(4) He drew attention to the existing state of affairs in the arrangements with the International Commission for the Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.

(7) Miss LAISE (United States of America) appreciated the measures taken by the Executive Board to ensure stricter control over the payment of contracts. She queried the large transfer of funds to indirect personnel costs (1952). She also remarked, with reference to the arrangements made with the International Commission for the Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind, that stricter control appeared to be desirable, and suggested that a formula should be found by the Secretariat to cover the point raised, so that similar situations should not occur again.

(8) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) asked for time on the first question. On the second, he said there had been some discussion of the matter. In answer to a query by the Auditor, the Director-General had replied that the Commission, created as a result of a resolution proposed by the fifth session of the General Conference, was an independent entity, and should enjoy autonomy. There was no budgetary control by Unesco over its expenditure, as there was in the case of a number of other organizations with which Unesco had contractual arrangements. It was controlled by its own auditors, and their report, although not formally required, had been made available. Further control could take two forms: a more detailed study of the budget estimates and a more detailed report on the disposal of funds; and, more drastically, an examination of all the financial commitments of the Commission before they became facts, as took place in Unesco itself, where every project was thoroughly examined beforehand by the Comptroller. That was a duty which did not belong to Unesco, but to the Commission.

(9) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) was sorry to note that a comparison between the Working Capital Fund statement of deposits for 1952 and 1953, relating to Member States' contributions, revealed a considerable increase in unpaid dues.

(10) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the question raised by the delegate of Belgium would probably be considered as soon as the Committee on Contributions had presented its report.

(11) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that, although the report as it stood could be approved, the Administrative Commission should call the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission to the statement of the Auditor, so that, when appraising the programme for the future, some alteration could be made in the arrangement with the International Commission for the Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.

(12) That proposal, seconded by the delegates of Greece and Italy, was approved.

(13) The Administrative Commission agreed to recommend the two reports to the General Conference and, at the suggestion of the delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by the delegate of Pakistan, to qualify them as very satisfactory.

**ITEM 8.4.8.1 OF REVISED AGENDA : EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (document 8C/ADM/28)**

(14) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the audited accounts for 1952 were approved by the Executive Board, in accordance with the resolutions of the seventh session. It was necessary for those audited reports to be approved each year for forwarding to the United Nations. The 1953 accounts had not been submitted in time, owing to the clash in dates between the General Conference and the General Assembly.

(15) A resolution was proposed pro forma by the CHAIRMAN, and seconded by the United Kingdom, Greece, Israel, and Iraq, that the General Conference be recommended to authorize the Executive Board to examine and approve the report on the expenditure of technical assistance funds for 1955 and 1956.

(16) Agreed.

**ITEM 9.4.5 OF REVISED AGENDA. ADMINISTRATION OF THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND (document 8C/ADM/9)**

(17) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) summarized the contents of document 8C/ADM/9.

(18) The CHAIRMAN, taking each clause separately, moved a pro forma resolution recommending the General Conference to adopt the decision proposed under B (i) (page 2).

(19) The motion was seconded by the delegates of Belgium, the United Kingdom and France, and adopted.

(20) The CHAIRMAN then moved a similar resolution on B (ii).

(21) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether it was essential to move a resolution before a subject could be discussed. She hoped a precedent would not be created. A number of issues were for information only.

(22) The CHAIRMAN explained that his method of proposing resolutions pro forma, in cases where they had not been presented by the Executive Board, was merely intended to speed up procedure, but that nothing could stop delegates from speaking on whatever they wanted to.

(23) Miss LAISE (United States of America), on (ii), objected to the use of the word unpredictable as being synonymous with unforeseen, and proposed its replacement by the word extraordinary. Secondly, she thought it was not possible to take a final decision on a resolution of that sort before all the programme items had been considered. Sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) related to specific activities.

(24) The first proposal by the delegate of the United States of America was adopted.

(25) It was decided to defer the discussion of sub-paragraph (ii).

(26) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) pointed out that the use of the words objected to by the United States delegate need not prevent the Commission from adopting the resolution. For one thing, the word extraordinary, in connexion with the budget, had been in universal use for a long time. For another, rejection of the word unpredictable would leave the problem unchanged, since it would not affect the nature of such expenditure (which was useful precisely because it gave the Secretariat a free hand in its financial administration).

(27) The CHAIRMAN agreed that a decision had been taken too quickly on the word unpredictable in sub-paragraph (ii).

(28) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that what was unpredictable was not the event but the amount, for example in the case of salary adjustments.

(29) Miss LAISE (United States of America) saw the point but considered that the Working Capital Fund should not be used to create additional commitments unless the expenses were really extraordinary. It was not meant to cover cases of bad budgeting.

(30) Mr. KELLY (Australia) remarked that the resolution (sub-paragraph ii) was worded differently in the three languages. The Spanish referred to gastos imprevistos y extraordinarios, the English to unforeseen and unpredictable expenses, while the French talked of faire face à des dépenses imprévues ou à des dépenses dont le montant ne peut être évalué exactement. The French text was the most precise.

(31) Mr. EL-ZAYAT (Egypt) proposed that the three qualifying adjectives used in the different versions should all be included.

(32) That proposal was seconded by the delegate of South Africa and adopted.

(33) Mr. KELLY (Australia) raised a question of substance on sub-paragraph (ii). Why had special provision been made for salary adjustments from the Working Capital Fund for 1955-1956?

(34) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that that provision was linked with the common policy of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies in regard to salary adjustments due to rises in the cost of living index. A document on the subject would be debated later.

(35) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) wondered why the Director-General had submitted a separate resolution for each year. Adoption of a two-year basis left more room for unforeseen factors. It would surely be more natural to insert the two paragraphs in question in the Financial Regulations for the subsequent financial years, rather than to submit a single resolution for 1955-56 as a whole.

(36) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) replied that the financial regulations of Unesco were drawn up on a common basis with those of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies. However, the Director-General could be asked to discuss the position with the other agencies to see whether a regulation of the kind suggested could be inserted in the general framework of all of them.

(37) The delegate of Japan accepted that solution.

(38) Mr. EL-ZAYAT (Egypt) supported the remark made previously by the Lebanese delegate. There could be no fear (as suggested by the delegate of the United States of America) that resolution (ii) could become a pretext for the Director-General to impose a heavier burden on Member States, since, prior to any commitments, the approval of the Executive Board would have to be obtained. The Director-General should be allowed a margin of error. That amounted to no more than 3% of the budget. The delegate of Egypt moved that the (slightly amended) text should be adopted.

(39) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), replying to the remark by the delegate of Japan, did not want to see provisions adopted by the Administrative Commission at that stage incorporated in the Financial Regulations. Each General Conference would wish to consider the use of the Working Fund.

(40) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan), in reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, said that he would not go so far as to urge that the United Kingdom delegate's suggestion should become a formal resolution but hoped it would be passed to the Director-General for his consideration.

(41) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that the resolution should not be definitely recommended until the end of the proceedings of the Administrative Commission, as it might still be affected by the discussion on the cost of living, and other discussions.

(42) The resolution was approved, with the provision that any member of the Commission could bring it up again for discussion at a later stage.

(43) The resolution contained in sub-paragraph B (iii) was proposed pro forma by the CHAIRMAN and seconded by the delegate of Thailand.

(44) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) enquired whether any time-limit had been set for the reimbursement of the advances mentioned in the sub-paragraph.

(45) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) agreed that that could be done. It had not been found necessary up to the present.

(46) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) asked for a brief explanation of the kind of self-liquidating expenditures referred to, as he considered it essential for the Commission to have concrete information on the subject before it decided on a time-limit for the reimbursement of the advances in question.

(47) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that a number of items were met by the fund in connexion with work carried out with or on behalf of another United Nations Agency.

(48) Sub-paragraph B (iii) was adopted.

(49) Sub-paragraph (iv), moved pro forma by the CHAIRMAN and seconded by the delegate of the Philippines, was adopted.

(50) Sub-paragraph (v), seconded by the delegate of Lebanon, was adopted.

(51) The whole resolution (subject to the French text being found satisfactory) was adopted for recommendation to the General Conference.

**ITEM 9.4.6 OF REVISED AGENDA PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FINANCIAL REGULATIONS** (document 8C/ADM/10)

(52) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) said that these amendments had been examined and approved by the Board.

(53) The delegate of South Africa proposed their adoption by the Administrative Commission and was seconded by the delegate of Iran.

(54) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that surpluses arose on two occasions. At the end of each financial period there was a difference between the appropriations and the obligations entered into; and at the end of the period of time given for liquidation, another surplus arose: the difference between the amount disbursed and the amount recorded as an obligation. The original financial surplus was not distributed unless it was in cash. The distribution of a book surplus would create a sort of bankruptcy. The question was: should balances be returned to Member States and, if so, how? It had been done by deduction from the budget assessment, in the case of Member States who had paid their contributions. In the case of those who had not paid, it was distributed to them by reduction of their arrears. But the result of that procedure was that 100% was never collected.

(55) Mr. HARPER-SMITH went over the sample figures given in the annex to document 8C/ADM/10. It was proposed to alter the Financial Regulations so as to prevent the distribution of cash surpluses to members who had not paid. That would avoid the recurrence of failure to collect 100% in any given year.

(56) Mr. KELLY (Australia) appreciated the lucid

explanation given by Mr. Harper-Smith, but raised the question of a case in which a dispute over a trifling amount between a Member State and Unesco might show a small arrear from year to year which would prevent that State from receiving a share of a cash surplus. Was some form of pro rata distribution practicable? Could the Director-General amend his amendment in that sense?

(57) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) asked for time to think that over.

(58) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) thought that sounded a very sensible arrangement but he would like to have a few more details. Did the resolution as it stood make it quite clear that Member States which had not yet paid their contributions in full could, once they had done so, be credited retroactively with their share of surplus cash distributed? To avoid any misunderstanding on the point, Mr. Ammoun proposed to add the following:

"Member States are entitled to receive their share of the cash surplus for any financial year, once they have paid the whole of their contributions relating to that same financial year".

(59) The proposed amendment was seconded by the Egyptian and Argentine delegates.

(60) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) considered that the wording of the text covered the suggestion by the delegate of Lebanon. The surplus was to be surrendered to any Member State who had paid in full, the moment he had done so.

(61) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) pointed out that Regulation 4.4. referred to a twelve-month period dating from the end of a financial year, and suggested that such a time-limit might leave some doubt as to the general application of the arrangements.

(62) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the date was that on which the amount was fixed, not that on which the distribution was made. Some surpluses dated back to 1947.

(63) The delegate of Lebanon withdrew his objection.

(64) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) supported the phrase proposed by the Director-General, in spite of the sound objections of the delegate of Australia, because it contained an exhortation to pay up.

(65) Mr. KELLY (Australia) was all in favour of such exhortations but did not think their right place was in an amendment to the Financial Regulations.

(66) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) asked what was the practice in other international organizations on that question.

(67) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that after consideration he thought there could be no objection to a proportionate distribution of surpluses. Answering the delegate of Japan, he added that in spite of considerable effort they had not succeeded in making common financial regulations on that question, as the problems varied so much from agency to agency.

(68) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) suggested that all questions of distribution of surpluses and contributions by Member States who had or had not paid in full, should be settled by adding the total amount of each surplus to the next budget, under the head of extra-ordinary revenue, as soon as it became available. Distribution of surpluses would thus become automatic, as the amount of the contribution decreased for the following year.

(69) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that that had actually been the procedure for the past two or three budgets, but it did not give Member States their due, in proportion to what they had contributed. Taking up the suggestion by the delegate of Australia of a pro rata distribution, he said that would lead to the same situation as that which the document under discussion was intended to meet. He suggested that, if there were a dispute over an amount due, the Conference could decide that a Member State should not pay, and the amount would have to be added to the next budget estimates. On the whole, the proposal was best as it stood.

(70) The delegate of Australia was satisfied with that explanation.

(71) The CHAIRMAN proposed that, as it had a complicated legal aspect, it could be left until Wednesday when surpluses in general were to be taken up.

(72) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) suggested that surpluses be added to the Working Capital Fund.

(73) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) stressed the fact that a surplus was the rightful property of the Organization, and not of the countries which had contributed to it. He therefore considered that, if the sum were not to be added to the next budget, it would be more logical for the Organization to make use of it in attending to one of its many pressing needs, such as technical assistance.

(74) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that that practice had been followed, for instance in the Food and Agriculture Organization, but was not appropriate where the full amount of working capital had been called up.

(75) Miss LAISE (United States of America) objected to the implications of the proposal by the delegate of Guatemala, which would involve a departure from the present Financial Regulations, whereby a surplus was credited to Member States.

(76) The resolution was adopted for recommendation to the General Conference.

**ITEM 9.4.7 OF REVISED AGENDA: REQUEST FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN FOR THE WRITING OFF OF THE SUM OF $4,915.15, BEING A LOSS INCURRED BY THE IRANIAN NATIONAL COMMISSION ACTING AS A DISTRIBUTING AGENCY FOR UNESCO COUPONS (document 8C/ADM/29)**

(77) Mr. RAADI (Iran) said that, in view of the detailed nature of the document under discussion, he would give no more than a brief summary of the subject. He pointed out that the circumstances which had led to an altered exchange rate for the rial in terms of the dollar were exceptional, and stressed the fact that the National Commission's budget was in any case not large enough to meet the resultant situation. He accordingly submitted a motion to the effect that "the Administrative Commission recommend that the General Conference authorize the Director-General to write off the sum of $4,915.15 to the Iranian National Commission acting as a distributing agency for Unesco coupons."

(78) That motion was supported by the Colombian, Chilean, Belgian, Egyptian, Israeli and Italian delegates.

(79) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained, further, that it was not always easy for Unesco to accept payment for Unesco coupons in the currency of the country in which they were issued, of which it often had no need. Occasionally that problem was solved by negotiations with other Specialized Agencies who could use the currency. That had been the case with Iran. The United Nations had accepted Iranian currency and repaid Unesco in French francs, but it had specified a date for receipt of payment on the part of the Iranian National Commission: 1 November 1952, when the rate was 41 rials to the dollar. The proceeds were only deposited on 31 August 1953, by which time the rate had moved and $4,900 were lost on the exchange.

(80) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) was wholly in favour of the proposal submitted by the delegate of Iran, but wished it enlarged to cover similar losses incurred by other National Commissions ($5,700 had been lost in Israel, $1,600 in Yugoslavia in a similar manner).

(81) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) thought that each case should be studied on its merits.

(82) Mr. EL-ZAYAT (Egypt) supported the motion in the case of Iran, but felt that, if the concession were made general, Unesco would be the loser.

(83) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board), in reply to a question by the delegate of Ceylon, said that the Board had not been informed of the cases of Israel and Yugoslavia.

(84) Miss LAISE (United States of America) thought that the real problem was to avoid the occurrence of similar incidents in the future. Should National Commissions be entrusted with the distribution of Unesco coupons unless underwritten by their governments? She proposed that the discussion be postponed until all the facts had been presented.

(85) That proposal was supported by the delegates of the Netherlands and Australia.

(86) Mr. RAADI (Iran) said that the proposal submitted by the United States delegate was equivalent to a request to the Director-General to fix future policy. He was not opposed to that idea, but, since the Iranian request, which had been prompted by exceptional circumstances very unlikely to recur, had already been carefully examined, he repeated his request that the question be discussed immediately.

(87) Mr. EL-ZAYAT (Egypt) moved an amendment to the motion for postponement. He suggested that deferment should apply to the other two cases. The case of Iran should be considered at once.

(88) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) said he had no wish to complicate procedure, but he wondered whether it would not be helpful if any motion or draft resolution framed in the course of a meeting were submitted to the delegates in writing, so that they might have a definite text clearly in mind when they voted. If necessary, the mover might dictate slowly to his colleagues.

(89) Mr. RAADI (Iran) reminded the Commission that the question had only been brought before the Executive Board in order to obtain the latter's permission to include it on the Administrative Commission's agenda. He wanted to add, however, that after a study of that special case had been made, the Director-General had intimated, in the course of the discussion, that he would support the Iranian Government's request before the General Conference.

(90) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) remarked that only the request of the Government of Iran figured on the agenda; those submitted by the delegations of Yugoslavia and Israel were not included; there was therefore no need to decide whether or not the former should be dealt with. The Commission should proceed with it at once.

(91) Miss LAISE (United States of America) feared that, if a decision were taken, the Commission might be creating a precedent. It was not yet known why the National Commission of Iran had not made the payment at the arranged time. A fair decision could not be taken at that stage.

(92) Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that the delegate of the United States of America had raised a question of principle. He moved that the discussion be deferred until the afternoon meeting.

(93) Agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# THIRD MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.4.7 OF REVISED AGENDA: REQUEST FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN FOR THE WRITING OFF OF THE SUM OF $4,915.15, BEING A LOSS INCURRED BY THE IRANIAN NATIONAL COMMISSION ACTING AS A DISTRIBUTING AGENCY FOR UNESCO COUPONS (document 8C/ADM/29) (continued)**

(1) As the Iranian request had already been discussed in the morning Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) moved that a vote be taken on it without further delay.

(2) The motion was seconded by Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium).

(3) Mr. KELLY (Australia) was of opinion that the Iranian request raised a point of principle which called for a full discussion. He therefore opposed the motion for the closure of the debate.

(4) The Australian motion was seconded by Messrs POHL (Union of South Africa) and KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) on the grounds that they wished for further information.

(5) Mr. RAADI (Iran) thought that no decision need be taken on the closure motion; but if the latter were rejected he would be very willing to give the Commission additional explanations on the substance of the question, which had already elicited comment from previous speakers.

(6) The motion for the closure of the debate was put to the vote and rejected by 15 votes to 9.

(7) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that he sympathized with the request from the delegation of Iran; a purely distributing agency, not working for profit, should not be responsible for losses if these did not arise from its own management methods. That was a question of principle, and the case of Iran should not be regarded as a special and separate one. There were other similar cases; and the Commission should be concerned to establish a precedent, not to act casuistically. A general principle should be established for resolving that or similar questions fairly.

(8) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) did not consider it to be a matter of principle. The Iranian National Commission had simply been unable to make payment in time; there was no question of ill will.

(9) Mr. BLANCO ACEVEDO (Uruguay) said that the Commission should consider the request by the Iranian delegation sympathetically, but thought that the latter should explain in greater detail the sentence in the letter from the Iranian National Commission to the Director-General where it was said that the losses incurred by the Commission as distributing agency for Unesco coupons had been "unavoidable because of the administrative procedure applying, in Iran, to budgetary periods and dates of payment". The delegation of Iran should say exactly what those difficulties were.

(10) The case in point and others similar to it, should be settled in the light of the actual difficulties which had resulted in a loss of money that Unesco was being called upon to make good.

(11) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation was very much in sympathy with the difficulties of Iran and its National Commission. There was obviously a principle at stake, however. There was also a matter of procedure, and the question which he wished to put was not to the Iranian delegation but to the Secretariat. Had the whole scheme been set up in such a way as to minimize the danger of such an occurrence? Were there any rules laying down a time-limit for payments? At a time when there was too much instability of currency, such rules should exist; if they did not, some authority, such as the Executive Board, should try to work out a procedure whereby countries in a state of inflation could be saved from the present embarrassing situation.

(12) Mr. ZUCKERMAN (Department of Mass Communication) explained that, as a general rule, payments for Unesco coupons were accepted only in United States dollars, French francs or pounds sterling. An exception had been made, however, in the case of three countries - Iran, Israel and Yugoslavia - which were unable to pay in those currencies. They were supposed to pay for coupons within a given time.

(13) In the case of Iran, a delay had occurred, but Unesco had not been informed at the time and had not been aware of the loss until the United Nations credited the Organization with a sum less by $4,915.15 than that expected. As far as the danger of creating a precedent was concerned, all three cases went back to 1952 and, since then, the turnover had been increasing. At present, the monthly turnover was $150,000.

(14) Mr. KELLY (Australia) felt that in cases where there had been considerable delay in paying on the

part of a National Commission, the latter, rather than Unesco, should bear the loss involved; otherwise, Unesco would find itself in the position of subsidizing a particular National Commission. If a National Commission incurred a loss, it should look first to its own government and people. Unesco should not have to pay for the administrative inefficiency of National Commissions.

(15) While in sympathy with Iran, Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) was against prejudging the issue without sufficient evidence. If a country came to Unesco for relief, it should justify its request fully.

(16) Princess Souvanna PHOUMA (Laos) observed that the Iranian National Commission was not alone in having had to face financial difficulties resulting from currency devaluation in connexion with Unesco coupons. The National Commission of Laos, for instance, some time ago found itself in a similar position, from which it was able to escape only by great effor . The delegation of Laos was therefore keenly interested in the way the Iranian Government's request would be treated by the Conference.

(17) Although he was quite prepared to vote in favour of the request, Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) wished to know what steps the Secretariat intended taking to avoid other National Commissions having to make similar requests in future.

(18) Mr. ZUCKERMAN (Department of Mass Communication) replied that there had been devaluations since 1952, but that no loss had been incurred because it had been arranged that payment should be made in French francs. Further, National Commissions had been instructed not to issue coupons until they had actually been credited.

(19) Mr. RAADI(Iran) regretted that the Iranian Government had been obliged to bring before the General Conference a question to which the Commission had already devoted a fair part of its valuable time. But the Director-General himself had judged it advisable to submit the matter to the Conference.

(20) In reply to the various remarks made, Mr. Raadi observed that the problem facing the Iranian National Commission was in no way due to inefficiency on its part. For years, in fact, that Commission had succeeded in distributing Unesco's coupons under favourable circumstances. But it had recently been placed in an exceptional situation because the national budget had not been voted by the expected date, and the distributing agencies - which were mostly government organizations - had therefore been deprived of the funds which they needed to pay for the coupons forwarded to them.

(21) In any case, as Unesco coupons were designed to help institutions in certain countries to obtain books or material which they would normally have great difficulty in procuring, the Administrative Commission would only be showing itself faithful to the spirit of the system if it voted in favour of the Iranian request.

(22) The CHAIRMAN requested the Commission to vote on the following resolution:

"The Administrative Commission recommends that the General Conference accede to the request from the Government of Iran for the writing off of the sum of $4,915.15, being a loss incurred by the Iranian National Commission acting as a distributing agency for Unesco coupons."

(23) The resolution was adopted by 26 votes to 6.

(24) The CHAIRMAN observed that there was another request, and a further one was expected, but that there was no motion before the Commission. He therefore suggested that the Secretariat be asked to prepare a paper for a later meeting, covering both requests and showing the implications for future occasions.

(25) Agreed.

**ITEM 9.3.2 OF REVISED AGENDA DRAFT AMENDMENTS OF ARTICLE V AND ARTICLE VI OF THE CONSTITUTION, PROPOSED BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL** (document 8C/ADM/2)

(26) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) introduced document 8C/ADM/2 and drew attention to the draft resolution on page 2.

(27) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt), supported by several delegations, moved approval of the Executive Board's resolution.

(28) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) stated that his delegation was entirely in favour of the principle involved, but was not satisfied with the wording. The words "since the last ordinary session of the Conference" at the end of the first paragraph were confusing, and the words if necessary in the fourth line of the second paragraph seemed inappropriate. He therefore proposed the substitution of the following words at the end of the first paragraph: "which he is required to prepare in accordance with the terms of paragraph 3 of Article VI", and the deletion of the words if necessary in the second paragraph.

(29) The CHAIRMAN remarked that the drafting would be considered by the Legal Committee.

(30) In reply to the observations just made, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that one of the Legal Committee's tasks would be to make sure that the terms of the proposed amendments were really in line with the intention underlying them. Referring to page 2 of document 8C/ADM/2, he observed that in the fifth line the words 'all but the first sentence of' should be replaced by 'all but the first sentence ..... amended to read as follows:'. He also thought that, in the penultimate line, the words if necessary need not be deleted. If the General Conference in fact met immediately after the end of the financial year, the additional report in question would not be required.

(31) Mr. Saba next recalled that the essential purpose of the proposed amendments was that the periods covered by successive reports of the

Director-General should correspond with the two financial years during each of which specific activities should be completed. Such a method, he thought, was all the more to be recommended because Unesco had in any case to submit annual reports to the Economic and Social Council for the period beginning 1 January and ending 31 December.

(32) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) seconded the Board's proposed amendment to paragraph 9 of Article V, subject to any drafting changes which the Legal Committee might recommend. On the other hand, he was not sure that the proposed amendment to paragraph 3 of Article VI was necessary. He was against tying down the Secretariat to a period which might prove inconvenient in the future. His delegation therefore proposed that the intention behind the suggestion to amend paragraph 3 of Article VI be incorporated in a resolution of the General Conference. The Legal Committee could be asked to prepare the resolution for approval by the Commission.

(33) It was agreed to approve the Executive Board's resolution in principle, referring it to the Legal Committee, which would report back to the Commission.

**ITEM 9.3.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND OTHER PROVISIONS, RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF MEMBER STATES (documents 8C/ADM/6 and 8C/ADM/6 Add.)**

(34) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) outlined the main points in document 8C/ADM/6 and stated that Cambodia had been the only Member State to submit amendments (document 8C/ADM/6 Add.).

(35) Mr. RAADI (Iran), seconded by Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) and Mr. VITO (Italy), moved approval of the Executive Board's resolution in paragraph 4 on page 2 of document 8C/ADM/6.

(36) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought it very desirable that the question of withdrawal should be examined during the current session of the Conference. As no Member State was at the moment contemplating withdrawal from the Organization, the problem could be discussed freely - which was not the case at the seventh session and might not be at the ninth.

(37) If however, the Conference decided to postpone consideration of the question to the ninth session, Mr. Haguiwara felt that such postponement should not be based on any desire to await the revision of the United Nations Charter. The Constitution of Unesco was a separate and independent instrument, entirely different in character from the Charter of the United Nations - which, moreover, unlike Unesco, was a political institution.

(38) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) pointed out that the Board's resolution contained no reference to the United Nations.

(39) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) was in broad agreement with the delegate of Japan. He also supported the preamble on page 1 of the document: "The General Conference, hoping that Unesco will continue to adhere etc....". However, as Unesco and WHO were the only two Agencies which had made no provision for withdrawal, he felt that the omission should be repaired as soon as possible. To refer the matter to the General Conference at its ninth session would mean further delay. He also agreed with the delegate of Japan that Unesco's decision need not depend upon that of the United Nations. He therefore moved that the Commission reject the Executive Board's proposal.

(40) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) shared the views of the South African delegate. He thought it desirable that the question of withdrawal should be examined at a moment when it was not linked with any specific case.

(41) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) seconded the remarks made by the delegates of Japan, the Union of South Africa and Belgium. He agreed that it was far better to discuss the problem when there was no case before the Conference.

(42) For the reasons given by previous speakers, Dr. MUDALIAR (India) and Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) were against postponing consideration of the problem.

(43) The Executive Board's resolution on page 2 of document 8C/ADM/6 was put to the vote and rejected by 19 votes to 10.

(44) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the alternative clauses proposed by the Director-General at the top of page 2 and asked members whether they wished to refer them immediately to the Legal Committee, or to take a decision on the principle first.

(45) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that, although the Administrative Commission might agree to refer the matter to the Legal Committee, it would be interesting to exchange impressions on the substance of the question in the Commission itself. It was the most delicate of all the matters before Unesco at the current session of the General Conference. The Government of Guatemala had studied it with great interest and care, after it had been apprised of the text of the document issued by the Executive Board.

(46) The Guatemalan delegation considered that the Constitution of Unesco, like the Constitutions of other organizations, should contain an article regulating the way in which a government might exercise the right to withdraw from the Organization when circumstances demanded it. The first alternative draft in document 8C/ADM/6 was, from that standpoint, acceptable. The withdrawal of a State was a unilateral act, as was its entrance to the Organization. The first alternative draft contained, however, one point which might cause difficulties - that the right to withdraw should be subject, in its execution, to a time-limit of 12 months, which had been established in the light of the biennial Conference system. If that proved an obstacle, a time-limit of two years could be substituted, or

a waiting period until the subsequent session of the General Conference.
(47) The second alternative draft was unacceptable, and that must be said with the greatest emphasis. It embodied a principle which affected the sovereign rights of States. The question of belonging or not belonging to an international organization could not be dependent on a vote, still less on a vote which, in order to be effective, required a two-thirds majority. An act of sovereignty could not be made subject to the results of a voting procedure of that sort.
(48) Furthermore, if a State did not wish to remain a member of an organization and there was machinery blocking its withdrawal, the upshot would be self-defeating and lacking in all sense. It would create a situation of rebellion, since a Member State that took no part and did not pay, could not be made the subject of legal sanctions which would oblige it to remain in the organization, collaborate with it, and contribute to its financial expenditure. Even if such sanctions existed, they would be ineffective, as those who were forced to co-operate never co-operated well. Collaboration with international organizations must be based on goodwill and spontaneity.
(49) Mr. Mendoza concluded by expressing anxiety as to the possibility of the second alternative draft or a proposal similar to that submitted by the delegation of Cambodia, being approved.

(50) Mr. KELLY (Australia) stated that his delegation was in favour of the first alternative, subject to the addition of the following words at the end of the first paragraph: "or shall affect the continuing legal force of agreements concluded by the withdrawing State with Unesco." The second paragraph would remain the same. His delegation considered that it would be completely unrealistic for the Constitution to try to bind States to membership against their will. Unesco was bound to assess all Member States whether they accepted their obligations or not, and experience had shown that the assessment of Member States not wishing to remain members of the Organization led to extremely complicated financial procedures.

(51) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that amendments to the Constitution of a substantive nature had to be circulated six months in advance, and an amendment to an amendment, three months in advance.

(52) Mr. KELLY (Australia) pointed out tha his amendment was merely an enlargement of the last sentence of the proposed amendment, intended to make for greater clarity.

(53) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) presented a motion solely relating to procedure. He thought it would be a tactical error to opt for one of the two extremes - i.e., that the two alternative drafts should not be discussed before the Legal Committee had been informed of them, and that they should not be sent to the Legal Committee without any comment at all. The Commission should take a decision of principle on them and, if any change of detail should arise, it too should be communicated to the Legal Committee for the latter to pronounce upon it.

(54) At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion, Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved the adoption of the first alternative in principle.

(55) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) said that his delegation had previously voted against taking up a position, so as to support the Executive Board's resolution: the Argentine delegation accepted however the Guatemalan representative's standpoint without reserve, and therefore considered that Member States had a prior right which could not be made subject to a vote.
(56) He supported the Australian delegation's proposal with regard to Article II.6.

(57) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed with the views so far expressed. Anything but the principle of unilateral withdrawal would run counter to international law and would, in any case, be unpractical, leading to financial complications. He therefore supported the Australian motion.

(58) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) proposed that the Commission vote on the principle forthwith, leaving drafting amendments to the Legal Committee.

(59) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought the Commission could approve in principle - subject possibly to a few amendments of detail - the text appearing at the top of page 2 of document 8C/ADM/6, under the title of "First alternative providing for withdrawal by the decision of the withdrawing State alone". He emphasized that it was hardly possible to force a country to remain, against its will, a Member State of Unesco.

(60) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) pointed out that,as Unesco's aim was to be universal, it was desirable for it to have as many Member States as possible. It could happen that a Member State decided to withdraw from the Organization against the wishes of its own people, and such a situation should be guarded against. Further, from the financial point of view, if a State contributing a large sum to the budget decided to withdraw, it would have an adverse effect on Unesco's work. He was therefore in favour of the second alternative and of imposing a long period of notice between a government's request to withdraw and the acceptance of that request by the General Conference.

(61) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan), seconded by Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), moved the closure of the debate and the submission of the Australian motion to the vote.

(62) Adopted.

(63) The Australian motion to approve the first alternative in principle was adopted, with 1 abstention.

(64) The CHAIRMAN invited members to move the text of the first alternative in document 8C/ADM/6, or other amendments not contravening Rule 104 of the Rules of Procedure,

or resolutions for the guidance of the Legal Committee.

(65) Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved the amendment which he had proposed earlier.

(66) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) suggested that, in the text at the top of page 2, the words "Such notice shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt..." should be replaced by "Such notice shall take effect at the end of the year following the date of its receipt..." A country which had informed the Director-General of its wish to withdraw would thus be obliged to fulfil its obligations as a Member State for more than one year subsequent to such notification.

(67) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) moved the addition of another sentence, to follow on from that proposed by the delegate of Australia, namely: "The financial obligation to the Organization of a Member State or Associate Member State which has given notice of withdrawal shall include the entire financial period in which the notice takes effect".
(68) The adoption of that amendment would ensure that the two-year budget was not completely upset in the case of one of the larger contributors feeling unable to continue its membership. For example, if a country gave notice of withdrawal in April 1955, it would have to pay its contribution until the end of 1956.

(69) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to make it quite clear that, although his delegation was in favour of the principle of unilateral withdrawal, it could not consider itself bound by the considerations put forward since the vote on the principle had been taken.

(70) The CHAIRMAN explained that none of the suggestions at present being made was binding. They would all be referred to the Legal Committee and the Commission would have an opportunity to vote on them when the Committee reported back. With regard to the Belgian proposal that notice of withdrawal should not become effective until the end of the following year, he pointed out that a Member State giving notice, for example, in 1956, would have to contribute payment until the end of 1958.

(71) Mr. FERREIRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the question being postponed, in accordance with the line taken by the Executive Board. He thought that the problem could not be brought up at the present time, in view of the character of Unesco and the system by which Member States belonged to it.
(72) The question was being debated whether Member States could withdraw from the Organization unilaterally, when they thought it convenient, and not by a majority decision; but it should not be forgotten that such States would have contracted obligations prior to their decision to withdraw, and the Organization could require that such obligations be discharged.
(73) Article II of the first alternative was not correctly drafted; instead of saying "may withdraw from the Organization", it should read: "deciding to withdraw from the Organization, shall give notice ..." etc.
(74) Similarly, the proposal earlier submitted by the United States delegate represented a basic alteration to the draft. It could not be accepted, since Rule 104 of the Rules of Procedure stipulated that amendments of that kind must be presented at least three months before the opening of the General Conference. It was not a drafting or procedural amendment, but a basic amendment; and the Commission, therefore, could not examine it. Article II now being considered said that the withdrawal of a Member State should not affect the financial obligations owed by that State, and the United States proposal modified that substantially by fixing a time-limit of two years for the discharge of those obligations.

(75) Mr. NEVINSON (United Kingdom) proposed that the Australian, Belgian and United States' suggested amendments be submitted to the Legal Committee in writing, so that it could work out their implications and see whether they were compatible or incompatible and whether they were practicable.

(76) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) pointed out that notice of withdrawal was not tantamount to acceptance of it. The time element was therefore important. A Member State should be given time to reconsider its request to withdraw. With regard to the motions concerning financial obligations, he agreed that the Commission should not discuss them further until the Legal Committee had considered their admissibility.

(77) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) said that in the Spanish text of document 8C/ADM/6, where it spoke of the notice of withdrawal addressed to the Director-General, there appeared the word previa; that might give rise to doubts. The English text was clearer. In Spanish it was necessary to say no more than "mediante notificación al Director General" or "notificando al Director General", without including the word previa.

(78) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Commission would agree to the United Kingdom motion, worded as follows:

"The Administrative Commission resolves to inform the Legal Committee that it has approved in principle the unilateral withdrawal of Member States, and refers, without prejudice, notices of motion to it for consideration."

(79) The motion was seconded by several delegations and adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

# FOURTH MEETING

*16 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.3.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION (STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD) (documents 8C/ADM/1 and 8C/ADM/1 Add.)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN, introducing the documents, said that Annex 1 of document 8C/ADM/1 (proposal by the United States of America) had been withdrawn by its sponsors in favour of the amendment to Article V of the Constitution set forth in Annex 3, which amendment was also sponsored by Brazil, Australia and the United Kingdom. Annex 2 (draft amendment by Australia, the United States of America, Canada and Colombia) could be held over for later discussion.
(2) The Commission should therefore begin by considering Annex 3. The important question at issue was whether members of the Executive Board were to be private individuals acting on behalf of the Organization as a whole, as theretofore, or representatives of governments. Document 8C/ADM/1 Add. was an amendment by Japan to the proposed United States amendment to the Constitution. He reminded the Commission that any proposal for a change in the Constitution had to be adopted by a two-thirds majority.

(3) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan), raising a question of procedure, thought it would be better to start with a general discussion of the Japanese proposal (document 8C/ADM/1 Add.) for an increase in the membership of the Executive Board from twenty to twenty-two. If the Commission considered that such an increase was desirable, it could then go on to consider the question of election procedures, travel and daily allowances for members of the Executive Board, etc.

(4) The CHAIRMAN observed that the Japanese amendment had been put forward as an amendment to the United States amendment. Therefore after the United States delegation had formally moved its amendment, the Japanese delegation would have to move its own amendment thereto, which would be voted on before the United States proposal. As regarded the question of election procedures and allowances, he understood that a change in the principles governing membership of the Executive Board might be acceptable to certain delegations, provided certain conditions were fulfilled. Delegations which took that line should therefore make their position clear during the debate. At the same time it was difficult to discuss subsidiary matters like allowances until the basic point at issue had been decided on.

(5) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) proposed that the question of the membership of the Executive Board be taken first.

(6) The CHAIRMAN observed that any decision taken by the Commission had to be referred to the Legal Committee and was thus necessarily tentative.

(7) Mr. AVIDA (Israel) said that, in the Japanese amendment to the United States proposal, it was proposed that the membership of the Executive Board be increased from twenty to twenty-two. Would it be considered a substantive change if, in the course of the discussion, some other number were proposed?

(8) The CHAIRMAN referred the speaker to Rule 106 of the Rules of Procedure. It was for the Commission to decide whether a point of substance was involved, and for that the advice of the Legal Committee was required.

(9) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the draft amendment to the Constitution appearing in Annex 3 to document 8C/ADM/1 was being submitted on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, and with the full support of the United States National Commission, it was co-sponsored by the Governments of Brazil, Australia and the United Kingdom. Fundamentally, it was proposed that the Executive Board should no longer be composed of private individuals, but of government representatives, who would of course serve on behalf of the General Conference which had elected them and would be bound by its policies. An important consideration in favour of the proposal was that they would be aided by guidance and instructions from their governments. Even more important was the fact that governments would feel themselves committed by the actions of their representatives. Paragraph A.4 of the proposed amendment laid down that, in the event of death or resignation, a member of the Board should be replaced on the nomination of the government of the State the former member represented.
(10) Paragraph A.3 laid down that retiring members should be eligible for re-election. His Government felt that the Conference should not tie its hands and that in some cases re-election of the same government to membership of the Board might be desirable. At the same time, it strongly believed in the principle of rotation, holding as it did that in any democratically organized body every government should have the chance to serve. It was emphatically against the existence of permanent seats. It also believed that the cultural contribution of a small country might be

just as valuable as, or more so than, that of a large and powerful one. The best way of achieving rotation, in its view, was by informal agreement among the countries represented at the General Conference.

(11) Under B. Functions, the amendment proposed the deletion of paragraph 12 of Article V - the paragraph, namely, which specified that members of the Board should not act as representatives of their governments.

(12) Under C. Transitional Provisions, the United States amendment provided for the re-election of the entire Board at the eighth session of the General Conference.

(13) His Government could accept the Japanese amendment for an increase in the membership of the Board, with but slight amendments. But if the Conference rejected the United States amendment, the Japanese proposal, being an amendment to that amendment, would lapse too.

(14) There were several reasons for the proposal. In the first place, the responsibilities of the Board were very heavy, since it was responsible not only for the programme but also for the handling of administrative and financial matters, and might be faced with major political issues, such as the admission of new members. Since implementation of the programme was largely a matter for governments, it followed that a governing body enjoying the support of governments and able to draw on them for expert advice would be much better able to perform its task.

(15) The General Conference of Unesco met only every two years, and in an epoch of rapid change that was much too long a period over which to confide the fortunes of the Organization to a Board of individuals.

(16) The change proposed would make for greater stability and continuity. As it was, he had been disagreeably impressed by the number of recommendations made by the Board which had not been approved by the Conference. That reflected the fact that governments did not feel themselves bound by the decisions taken by the Board. The change proposed would mean that governments would feel a greater sense of responsibility for the Organization, since they would be represented in its key body, and would no longer consider it, as they had a tendency to do at present, as an unimportant step-child.

(17) His Government attached the very greatest importance to its proposal. The question of effecting a change in the membership of the Executive Board, on the lines just described, and the question of remodelling the programme were the two most important matters with which the Conference was faced. The whole future of Unesco might depend on them.

(18) He was fully aware of the anxiety felt in certain quarters lest the dead hand of bureaucracy descend on the Executive Board and men of lesser stature be appointed to serve on it. Those fears, he felt, were unfounded. If an unsuitable person were put forward as a candidate by any government, the Conference could always reject him. The United States Government, at any rate, would make every effort to put forward men of real eminence, and not just government officials. It was in fact putting forward a scientist and administrator of the very highest standing.

(19) It had been suggested that a decision on the matter be postponed another two years, but the issue had been raised as far back as 1951. Any further postponement would be highly undesirable.

(20) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) stated that the Spanish delegation seconded the United States amendment in principle. It agreed to the substance of the proposal, since it considered that the Executive Board's hybrid legal status needed changing.

(21) It was essential to proceed with the greatest care in such matters, but there should be no hesitation in trying out new formulas until a suitable one was found.

(22) As things were, there was on the one hand the General Conference, a purely intergovernmental body, and on the other the Secretariat, which could and should be completely international; mid-way between them stood the Executive Board, which exercised many of the powers of the Conference between the latter's biennial sessions and acted as a permanent supervisory body on its behalf.

(23) He did not think the suggested change was a radical one; it was, rather, a question of bringing the practical machinery of Unesco into harmony with the spirit of the Organization.

(24) Various objections might be raised. For example, it might be urged that the Executive Board should consist not of civil servants, but of men of outstanding scientific and cultural merit. Yet it should not be overlooked that the Board was basically an administrative body, and that 99% of Unesco's resources were the resources of governments. Another frequent argument against the proposed amendment was the possibility of changes in the governments of the various countries. But that was really an argument in its favour.

(25) For those reasons, the Spanish Government and delegation considered that the change proposed by the United States of America was a good one. As regarded points of detail, the Spanish delegation supported the Japanese amendment. There were other more difficult problems; on the question of complete re-eligibility, for instance, the Spanish delegation had certain reservations to formulate and would speak on the subject again later.

(26) Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that when, the day before, the Commission had discussed the right of Member States to withdraw from the Organization, it had reaffirmed two principles: firstly, that there must be respect for national sovereignty and autonomy and, secondly, that co-operation, to be effective, depended on the assumption of international obligations not by individuals, but by Member States.

(27) He would therefore invite the Commission to carry those principles into practice by adopting the United States proposal that members of the Executive Board, while continuing to act on behalf of Unesco, should be responsible to the Member States appointing them. Nor did he doubt that their own distinctive traditions would lead the USSR and Poland to concur in that matter.

(28) The United States proposal, if carried, would in no way impair the rights of the General Conference. The privileges and rights of different cultures would continue to be safeguarded by Article V, paragraph

A.2, which set forth the considerations governing elections to the Board.
(29) He was not going to criticize the present Board for lack of integrity or capacity. Far from it. The point, to put it frankly, was that the Board was not representative in character; it was a body made up of individuals acting in their private capacity in an organization made up of States. No other Specialized Agency, except (he believed) the World Health Organization, tolerated such a state of affairs. It was high time to bring Unesco into line with the other international organizations.
(30) The Board was not comparable to the autonomous governing council of an autonomous world university. In Unesco, Member States framed the policy of the Organization and financed it, and were ultimately responsible for carrying it into effect. Therefore the Board should be chosen by, and responsible to, them.

(31) Mr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) announced that the Uruguayan delegation opposed the amendments advocated by the United States delegation, because the experience so far gained by the Organization did not justify the introduction of such a change, and because, instead of remedying the defects which had been found in Unesco's functioning, it would merely aggravate them.
(32) The General Conference in London had been wise in providing scope, in an intergovernmental organization, for free expression of the trends of opinion among men who were devoting their lives to the cause of education, science and culture. The impression gained from a reading of the Constitution was not of undue emphasis on action by States. The question was, therefore, whether it was advisable to strengthen the position of the government authorities or to broaden the powers of the bodies representing society as a whole, and bringing their wisdom and experience to bear on the problems of science, education and culture.
(33) Moreover, there was no real cause for alarm about the action that the Executive Board might take. As a general rule, the Board was responsible for translating Unesco's programme and budget into practice. There seemed little likelihood that such administrative powers would offer scope for abuse. It was clear, on the other hand, that, although the rôle of the State was limited, they were still able to work effectively through Unesco.
(34) The distinction between society and the State was a fundamental tenet for Uruguay. The nation based its whole concept of sovereignty upon that idea. But sovereignty did not mean an absolute system of powers and authorities, subject to no control; sovereignty did not mean nationalism. The world had no need to strengthen the authority of government, for it was already suffering from the tragedy of unbridled authoritarianism. Delegates should consider carefully whether the influence of governmental authority within Unesco should indeed be further strengthened.
(35) The idea behind the United States proposal, he added, was sound enough. But the Uruguayan delegation did not consider that, since the competence of the Executive Board was quite clearly defined, its members needed to be government representatives. No Uruguayan could believe that the mainspring of creative action was authority; he would look for it, rather, in the free expression of public opinion. If there were any question of increasing powers, Uruguay would favour increasing those of the men who were working independently in the cause of culture. The powers of the Executive Board as it stood gave no cause for alarm. It had been suggested that two years was a dangerously long term. No doubt the principle of rotation in the membership of national and international bodies was a good one, but two years could hardly be considered an excessive period. Moreover, during those two years, the States were not out of touch with the conduct of affairs by the Executive Board.
(36) In the opinion of the Uruguayan delegation, members of the Executive Board should remain responsible only to the General Conference, working for the international community and not as the agents of States. For the rest, although it was proposed to delete paragraph 12 of Article V, that provision was not superfluous. It was, on the contrary, of the highest importance, it contained the legal safeguards of the independence of members of the Executive Board. Uruguay wished members to be independent of the governments that had helped to elect them, because it believed that all the members of Unesco should be respected as the servants of a cause which was of the greatest international significance.
(37) He considered that, far from being a step forward, the adoption of the reform proposed by the United States delegation would be a retrograde measure. It would aggravate the existing defects. The Uruguayan delegation would deeply deplore the transformation of Unesco into an Academy of Letters subject to despotic control.

(38) Mr. GOMEZ HOYOS (Colombia), seconded by Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina), proposed that discussion of the matter be adjourned for two days in order to enable delegations to consider the question amongst themselves.

(39) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) was against such adjournment, on the grounds that the views expressed in the Commission would guide delegations in their private deliberations.

(40) The CHAIRMAN observed that in any case no final decision could be taken until the views of the Legal Committee had been obtained.

(41) The Colombian proposal to adjourn debate for two days was put to the vote and rejected by 18 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.

(42) Mr. GOMEZ HOYOS (Colombia), seconded by Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina), then proposed that no vote should be taken on the matter for the next two days.

(43) The CHAIRMAN observed that no final vote could in any case be taken before the matter had been referred back from the Legal Committee. Perhaps a vote might be taken on the principle involved, subject to any comments by the Legal Committee.

(44) Mr. SOLH (Lebanon) asked what the Commission meant by final vote and vote on the principle. He was not very clear on the difference between the two terms and wondered whether, once a vote on the principle had been taken, the Commission would have anything left to do but to put the final touches to the drafting.

(45) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) was afraid that such a decision might curtail the discussions. It seemed to him that, if the Colombian delegate's proposal were adopted, it should be made quite clear that the discussion was to be continued at the meetings scheduled for that purpose, and at an additional meeting, if necessary.

(46) Finally, it was agreed by 29 votes to 1 that no vote should be taken on the major issue before the afternoon of Thursday, 18 November.

(47) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark), a member of the existing Executive Board, said that the Danish Government, and the Danish National Commission, would prefer the existing status of the Board to be maintained. That status had been agreed to by a majority in 1945, when the Constitution was adopted, and the United States of America had given it vigorous support. It had been agreed that, even in the governing organ of Unesco, the various world cultures should be able to make their influence felt, and that the best way of ensuring that was to endow the Board with its present status.
(48) In certain quarters it had been doubted whether the members of the Board were really free from pressure on the part of their governments. All he could say was that his country had never tried to influence him, and the same, no doubt, was true of other members.
(49) Those in favour of the United States proposal had been careful to say that the change would involve no pressure from governments or National Commissions on members of the Board. But it was to be feared that, if the proposal were adopted, the Board would receive political briefing to such a point that any real discussion would become difficult or impossible. The Board would degenerate into the tool of national foreign ministries. Nor could he agree with the delegate of Spain that the Board was just an administrative organ; the proposals submitted to the Conference by the Board showed that it was more than that.
(50) The major part of Unesco's work was unpolitical, or ought to be. Besides, it was false to say that, under the existing arrangement, Member States were debarred from airing their views. The Director-General often went out of his way to invite their comments.
(51) There were, in addition, practical difficulties to be considered. Suppose the government of a member of the Board were replaced, for any reason at all; would that member continue to sit, and must he go on voicing the opinions of the defunct government?
(52) In Annex II of document 8C/ADM/1, paragraph B.11, it was stated that "although the members of the Executive Board are representatives of their respective governments, they shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole." That sounded fine. But would it mean anything in practice?
(53) The delegate of the United States of America had stressed the advantages accruing from the fact that governments would feel bound by the decisions of the Board if it were made up of their representatives. But would a government feel bound by a majority decision taken by the Board, if its own representative had voted against?
(54) He therefore continued to believe that, ideally, members of the Board should work together as a team in the interests of Unesco as a whole, and that they should not be briefed by individual governments.

(55) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) said that he had found the arguments put forward during the discussion extremely interesting, but would be glad if the delegates of the United States of America and Spain would elucidate a point which he thought obscure. According to the proposed amendment to Article V of the Constitution, the Executive Board would be responsible to the Conference, but would be composed of representatives of various governments. The Lebanese delegate wondered whether the adoption of that principle might not lead to a deadlock. As an example, he asked the Commission to suppose that the Conference were to ask the Executive Board, which was responsible for drawing up the Conference agenda, to consider including some particular question, such as unemployment among intellectual workers; what would happen if all twenty or twenty-two members of the Board rejected the suggestion? Could the General Conference thus be controlled by a few governments who would, in that way, enjoy special privileges?
(56) The Lebanese delegate understood that other organizations, such as the Security Council, had circumvented that difficulty. He thought it imperative that, before the Commission came to a decision, it should consider closely whether the proposed amendment was legally compatible with Unesco's structure.

(57) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) saw no contradiction in saying that a Board composed of government representatives would be bound by the decisions of the General Conference. It could not, in fact, fail to implement those decisions. It would be unthinkable, for example, that the Board should refuse to put a particular item on its agenda if it had been requested to do so by the Conference.
(58) The Security Council had very special functions, and was not a comparable body. The real parallel lay between the Executive Board and the Council of FAO or the Governing Body of ILO, which worked as bodies of government representatives along lines dictated by the conferences of those organizations.

(59) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) pointed out that the amendment of paragraphs 3, 4, 12 and 13 of Article V of the Constitution did not involve amendment of the clauses contained in section B. Only the method of election and the representative status of members of the Board were affected, not the Board's powers or functions, in respect of which it was still responsible to the General Conference.

(60) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon) said that the arguments in support of the proposal had been most ably presented by the delegate of the United States of America. There were three basic reasons for the amendment. Firstly, it was the governments of countries which applied for membership. Secondly, it was governments which nominated the delegates sent to conferences. In fact, in his delegation, he had a colleague who did not represent the government at all, but the National Commission and the university. Nevertheless, all were required to produce credentials from their governments. Thirdly, it was from governments that Unesco drew its funds, "no taxation without representation". Accordingly, he wholeheartedly supported the United States proposal.

(61) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) gave his Government's reasons for submitting an amendment to the amendment to the original motion of the United States Government. The transitional provisions, set out in Section C of Annex III to document 8C/ADM/1, provided for the re-election by the Conference of all the members of the Executive Board, with the stipulation that the members should no longer be elected for their personal qualifications alone, but as representatives of their respective governments. The Japanese Government felt that such a measure perhaps went too far: the existing members of the Executive Board had been chosen from among the delegates of Member States, and were therefore persona grata with their governments and could be assumed still to enjoy their confidence; any of them who did not desire to continue in office as a representative of his government was free to resign. Election of all the Board members was therefore unnecessary; it would be perfectly possible to retain, in their new capacity, the ten members whose term of office did not expire in 1954, and to replace the ten outgoing members by electing 12 new members, to bring the total membership up to 22. That procedure would make the election easier and provide for continuity in the Board.

(62) The Japanese delegate also considered that his Government's proposal to raise the number of Executive Board members from 20 to 22 was justified by the increase in the number of Member States. In similar circumstances, other Specialized Agencies had already taken that consideration into account. If there were more Board members, it would be easier to ensure the representation of all groups of States and an equitable geographical distribution. Incidentally, the Chairman of the Executive Board himself had first mooted the suggestion, which had been supported by all the members when it had come up for discussion. Owing to the time-limits laid down by the Rules of Procedure for the submission of new proposals, it had had to be presented as an amendment to an existing proposal, but it was none the less of the utmost importance. Mr. Haguiwara thought that the change suggested in the number of members was not simply a drafting change. The Japanese delegation consequently hoped that its amendment would be accepted with the original proposal put forward by the four governments.

(63) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) wanted a ruling on whether the Japanese amendment stood or fell with the United States proposal, or whether it might be taken separately.

(64) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) said that the Japanese amendment might be considered to stand separately, since it did not affect the substance of the United States proposal. The question should be carefully considered in the Legal Committee.

(65) Mr. AVIDA (Israel) said that the Legal Committee should also consider whether it would be in order to increase the membership of the Board if the motion were accepted.

(66) The CHAIRMAN said that the points in question would be referred to the Legal Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

# FIFTH MEETING

*16 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman* Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt)
*later:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.3.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION (STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD)** (documents 8C/ADM/1 and 8C/ADM/1 Add.) (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN called on the delegate of Switzerland.

(2) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) thought it would clarify the situation if, before dealing with the substance of the question, he explained that, even if the United States amendment were adopted, the Swiss Government would still nominate Professor Jean Piaget, the retiring member, who, although he preferred the status quo, would not decline re-election.
(3) His Government had instructed him, however, to defend the present system governing the composition of the Executive Board, on the grounds that followed.
(4) What would become of the privacy of certain Board meetings, if the Board were changed into a senate of government representatives obliged to report to their governments? Would that not mean a return to debates cluttered up with purely administrative considerations, which a recent decision had transformed into direct and fruitful discussions? Was not the present method the best, leaving, as it did, complete freedom to the members of the Board to speak on their own behalf as well as on that of their governments? The procedure now under consideration would surely compel them to come to the meetings armed with instructions from their own ministries. Lastly, was there anything in the Executive Board's existing set-up to prevent members from remaining in close touch with their governments, even if they were not in fact official government representatives?
(5) Room must be left for a certain measure of diversity, so as to give the Board's proceedings that non-political character which was basic to the success of Unesco.
(6) Weighing the proven advantages of the existing system against the risks of the new one proposed, Mr. Barbey wondered whether the General Conference really wished, or would be well advised, to attempt a constitutional reform at a time when, even if it were too early to know the tree by its fruits, the quality of the current programme, which gave prospects of good future programmes, showed that the Organization was constitutionally sound.
(7) Accordingly, the Swiss delegation, while not closing its mind to possible reforms which more prolonged experience might show to be desirable, favoured maintaining the status quo and would vote against the amendment presented by the United States of America.

(8) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) supported the amendment submitted by the United States delegation, giving his reasons. Unesco was made up of Member States, and its organs - including the Executive Board - should therefore represent their governments. The Board's task was to interpret and give effect to the collective desire of the General Conference, within which the governments expressed their opinions. Members of the Board were not experts preparing and implementing a programme. Their nominations depended on the approval of their respective governments; indeed, the governments supported those nominations. Particularly in the intervals between General Conferences, the members of the Board were genuine representatives of their governments, and interpreted and followed out the policies which the latter laid down. The Board should be backed by the confidence of the General Conference, just as the Conference relied on the confidence of the Member States. Thus government confidence was extended indirectly to the members of the Executive Board, and influenced their activities. It was impossible to separate a member of the Executive Board from his government. The Board was an international body; the governments looked upon its members as their envoys and delegates. Furthermore, every member could be replaced by a substitute, who, however, was always drawn from the same nation as himself. The Guatemalan delegate explained that his support of the United States amendment was in respect of principle, since when the time to vote came he would do so in agreement with the Latin American countries. He expressed his agreement with the amendment submitted by the Japanese delegation, and added that he would even agree to the number of Board members being raised to 24; in that way, more adequate representation of the various countries of the world would be secured. His Government was opposed to re-election of members of the Executive Board, and to the holding of practically permanent positions there; it favoured a policy of election by rotation, so that all Member States should at some time be represented on the Board.

(9) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan), on the understanding that voting would not take place until Thursday, deferred making a statement at the present stage. He asked, if the United States amendment were adopted, whether the members of the Executive Board

would be allowed to accept travel expenses from Unesco, or would governments be responsible for such expenses?

(10) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the issue should be settled first and problems of detail discussed later.

(11) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) associated himself with the principle of the United States amendment. He recalled that the same principle had been advocated independently four years previously by the United Kingdom delegation. During those four years events had confirmed the opinion then expressed. Before attending the current session of the General Conference, he had carefully studied all questions relating to the Constitution and had been surprised to see how the Executive Board was constituted. He had not been able to see how Unesco could expect to carry out its work effectively when the members of the Executive Board did not have the official support of Member States. He thought that a Board composed of independent members, each having the official support of his government, would be the best source of help to the Director-General in his preparation of the programme. The General Conference was itself totally different from an Executive Board of official character and could prevent such an Executive Board from stifling the programme. He pointed out that the greatest enthusiasm for the work of Unesco was to be found amongst government officials, who, under the United States amendment, would be able to be members of the Executive Board.
(12) With reference to the remarks made by the delegate of Uruguay at the previous meeting, he thought that the argument put forward would only apply if there were a world federation. He would have less confidence in the United States amendment if Article V.A.2 of the Constitution were removed.
(13) Finally, he could see no valid reason for deferring discussion of the principle of the United States amendment indefinitely.

(14) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) first explained that the Italian Government had left members of the National Commission and of the Italian delegation the greatest discretion in regard to the question, which was so important for the future of the Organization. He then went on to say that those members had, after some hesitation, decided to vote for the amendment submitted by the United States of America.
(15) The question was in fact less crucial than appeared at first sight. It was not a matter of voting for States instead of individuals, but of electing candidates put forward by States, on the understanding that the candidates would be chosen from among persons distinguished in the various branches of culture, education and science, whose reputation and competence would be a guarantee against any attempt to replace them arbitrarily.
(16) The essential difference between the two methods lay in the fact that under the present system the decisions of Board members, who were elected with their governments' approval, did not commit their countries, whereas the object of the proposed amendment was to increase the responsibility of Member States. That point was very important indeed, for since the biennial conference system had been introduced it had become necessary for the Director-General (he himself had said so and put it in writing) to rely, more surely and directly than ever before, on the support of the Member States.
(17) It had been objected that it was difficult to reconcile the fact of Board members being government representatives with the fact of their receiving their mandate from the General Conference. But was the Conference itself not an Assembly of States? There was no incompatibility there, either legal or political.
(18) The Italian delegation had never lost sight of the desirability of having the various spheres of culture well represented on the Executive Board. That consideration was well to the fore in paragraph A.2 of the amendment, and the method of recruitment would not militate against it; if those elected were distinguished persons, it would be they who would influence their governments, not the reverse. If that were not to be so, could it be doubted that such persons would be independent minded enough to resign?
(19) For those reasons the Italian delegation would vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

(20) Mr. MAYER (France) reminded the Commission that the United States delegate, in submitting his amendment, had emphasized the extreme importance of the question, saying that the fate of the Organization would largely depend on the decision taken. He, Mr. Mayer, fully agreed that the problem was a serious one, and its seriousness was a prime factor in determining the French delegation to combat the proposal.
(21) Article V of the Constitution stated that "The Executive Board shall consist of twenty members elected by the General Conference from among the delegates appointed by the Member States .....". Was that not a sufficient guarantee, which should give complete satisfaction to the supporters of the amendment?
(22) What would be the practical consequences of electing members on a basis of rotation, as had been said could be done by means of unofficial agreements?
(23) If a candidate were nominated by his government, one of two things would happen: either the General Conference would give way to pressure, which would be all the more intolerable, the greater the nation that exercised it; or, by refusing, it would precipitate a painful conflict, from which the rejected candidate's country would retire humiliated.
(24) Under the terms of A.4 (in Annex III) which referred to nomination twice in the singular, such a conflict might well increase in seriousness. With one foot planted on the firm ground of scientific and cultural activities, and the other on the moving sands of fluctuating domestic policies, whom would such a member, representing at once Unesco and a single government, obey?
(25) There again the alternatives would be painful: if he were a weak character, he would be the tool of his government; if he were forceful, he would stand out against his orders, and be compelled to resign - and such a resignation could not fail to deal a blow to both the Executive Board and Unesco.
(26) Mr. Mayer then instanced grave eventualities, independent of the Organization, which might produce mass resignations; the General Conference might then, after placing its confidence in twenty

candidates, suddenly find itself faced with a Board of a completely different composition.
(27) Referring to the Italian delegate's statement that the adoption of the amendment would inspire greater confidence in the Organization on the part of governments, the speaker commented that what Unesco most needed was the confidence of the peoples, and independence of thought. Was sufficient importance being attached to the possible moral consequences of a change of structure, especially in countries possessing a large number of independent universities?
(28) Had not the Executive Board, moreover, already made it quite clear that it hoped for the rejection of the amendment? The Board should not be a piecemeal collection of State representatives; it should be an entity serving one and the same ideal, an ideal based on changeless cultural values, free from political passions and fluctuations.
(29) It was a question, Mr. Mayer concluded, not of converting Unesco into a supra-national authority, but of avoiding a return to the concept of the all-powerful State. In rejecting the change of structure proposed, the French delegation was satisfied that it was remaining faithful to the principles set forth in the preamble to the Constitution. It therefore proposed that the status quo be maintained; that system had stood the test of time, whereas the one now proposed carried within it the seeds of the indirect introduction of political factors which must inevitably constitute a danger for Unesco.

(30) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) was in favour of the United States amendment, both for reasons of law and principle and on practical grounds. The mandates of members of the Executive Board originated with the Member States; their credentials should therefore be those of their respective governments. They were elected "from among the delegates appointed by the Member States", in accordance with Article V of the Constitution. Paragraph 12 of the same Article, which stated that members of the Executive Board should exercise the powers delegated to them "on behalf of the Conference as a whole and not as representatives of their respective governments", contradicted earlier paragraphs of that Article. It would be unrealistic to imagine that members of the Board could break their ties with their respective governments. There was no fear that the United States amendment would destroy the international character of Unesco.
(31) The amendment made no mention of the rotation principle; but the latter had been explicitly advocated by the United States and Australian delegations, and should be incorporated into Clause 3 when the Legal Committee drew up the final text. The speaker agreed that the membership of the Board should be raised to 24. The present members should cease their functions forthwith, in order that a better representation of all countries should be arrived at.

(32) Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua) disagreed with the remarks made during the morning meeting by the delegate of Uruguay. It was unfair to suggest that the General Conference would deserve the name of Assembly of Despots if it approved the United States amendment. The General Conference could not set itself up as a judge of peoples and States so far as their internal systems were concerned. The Uruguayan thesis would lead to the issue of delegates' credentials not by the Foreign Ministers but by the National Commissions. Unesco had been created and was maintained by States and governments, not by scientists and thinkers. If the group of intellectuals composing the Executive Board did not propagate the atmosphere of freedom and human dignity that the world desired, the same danger would be present as with anti-democratic States. Governments should not be deprived of the possibility of maintaining close relations with the Organization through their representatives on the Executive Board.

(33) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) expressed regret at having to oppose the amendment submitted by the United States delegate. But both the Government and the National Commission of Belgium considered that the change in structure would be calculated to imperil the Organization's very operation.
(34) If the members of the Executive Board were to become government representatives, they would clearly have to follow instructions and obey orders, instead of having only the interests of Unesco itself at heart. Even eminent figures in science, education and culture would find themselves bound by their obligations to the State. There was no doubt that men of truly independent intellectual and moral stamp would in many cases be unable to submit to that form of pressure.
(35) In any case, although Unesco by virtue of its Constitution was an organization of separate States, it did not follow that the Executive Board must of necessity consist of government representatives.
(36) On the contrary, Mr. Baugniet thought that the principle of State sovereignty found its place better in the existing system, which safeguarded more effectively the Member States not represented on the Board. It had been claimed that the present procedure might face a member of the Board with the dangerous necessity of having to take decisions contrary to his government's wishes. The proposed amendment would not change that, since a majority of members might take decisions at variance with those acceptable to a particular State, in which case the representative of that State would be placed in exactly the same position.
(37) Finally, the system proposed offered States not represented less assurance that they would not one day see a Board member forced to resign because of serious disagreement with his government, and be replaced by someone less independent.
(38) Before concluding, the Belgian delegate reminded the Commission that the confidence felt in Unesco, particularly in intellectual circles, was not unreserved. Would it not in the end create widespread mistrust if the Executive Board, instead of being a body of outstanding people responsible only to the General Conference, were converted into a group of government servants?
(39) In the light of the foregoing considerations, the Belgian delegation would vote against the adoption of the modifications proposed.

(40) Mr. CHENG CHI-PAO (China) supported the United States amendment. The substance of the motion was not revolutionary and did not constitute a marked

departure from past procedure. In the past, members of the Executive Board had been elected from delegations but no member had served without the confidence of his government. The United States motion made the concurrence of governments more specific, in order to strengthen the member's individual position and that of the Board as a whole. The Executive Board had not been as strong in the past as had been imagined and there was ample reason for strengthening it. He thought that the proposed rotation of representatives would provide a remedy for the objection that, if the Board were composed only of government representatives, then only the governments having members on the Board would be represented. The proposal submitted by the delegate of Japan to increase the number of members on the Executive Board would also help to allay fears. He hoped that it would be possible to increase the number even beyond that proposed by the delegate of Japan. The objection that no work could be done by the Executive Board without lengthy government consultations could be countered by the knowledge that there was always sufficient time to study the agenda. On any major matters arising, there would always be time for members to consult their governments.

(41) Mr. PAGE (Canada) indicated that the Canadian delegation had given much study to the question and stated that he fully supported the principle of the United States proposal. He supported the principle that the Executive Board should be responsible to the General Conference for the execution of Unesco's programme and would like to see that principle stated in a separate clause. There was no conflict between the two principles. What Unesco had accomplished had been done with the interest and support of Member States. The governments giving intellectual and financial help were responsible to their people for the proper use of that help. The only way of carrying out that responsibility effectively would be to have a representative on the Executive Board. Government representation would increase the interest of Member States in the work of Unesco. There was a distinction between the principle and its application, but the degree of application would not affect the principle. In his opinion, the concept of having permanent members on the Board was bad. He appreciated the arguments which had been put forward both for and against the motion, but urged that the Commission should accept the principle of government representation on the Board as being in the best interests of Unesco and its programme. He proposed that the proposal should be referred to the Legal Committee for study and subsequent recommendations concerning its application.

(42) Mr. STAHL (Sweden) supported the United States amendment. He thought that the main argument in favour of the amendment was that it would establish a stronger link between Unesco and individual governments.

(43) The CHAIRMAN then asked the meeting to decide whether the debate should be closed at that stage, or left open until Thursday.

(44) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) preferred to close the debate at once and pass on to the voting on Thursday.

(45) Mr. KELLY (Australia) opposed the suggestion. The Commission should retain its right to hold an open discussion after the Legal Committee had reported on the two points which had been referred to it: (1) whether the proposal submitted by the Japanese delegation was a motion or an amendment; (2) whether an increase in the number of members of the Executive Board was a matter of form or a matter of substance.

(46) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that a general debate could be closed, while the discussion of specific items was left open.

(47) Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved that the general debate be resumed after receipt of the advice of the Legal Committee on Thursday afternoon.

(48) The motion was seconded by the delegate of Israel.

(49) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain), on the question whether the Japanese amendment should be taken separately or not, suggested that the Commission should follow Rule 85 and Rule 36, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Rules of Procedure, under which it should be taken separately.

(50) The CHAIRMAN said it was important to decide whether the Japanese proposal was a motion or an amendment, for one reason only: if the amendment to the Constitution contained in the motion submitted by the United States and other delegations were rejected, the Japanese amendment would fall or stand on its own, according to the decision taken.

(51) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that it was impossible to modify the structure of a Constitution approved by an assembly unless special considerations of procedure were observed.
(52) A substantive change had to be submitted six months before it was to be discussed by the Conference; the amendment proposed by the United States of America had fulfilled that condition. For an amendment to an amendment only three months' notice was necessary, and the Japanese motion had been submitted in accordance with that requirement.
(53) As to whether it was possible to take a word out of the Japanese amendment and transfer it to the American motion, while discarding the Japanese amendment as a whole, that point should be submitted to the Legal Committee, which would be glad to answer it, and any other relevant question which delegates wished to bring to its notice.

(54) Mr. KELLY (Australia) reminded the meeting that there was also a Canadian amendment to the four power proposal (document 8C/ADM/1, Annex II). In which order should those different motions be taken?

(55) The CHAIRMAN replied that no decision could be taken on the order of priority until it was known whether the amendment presented by the Japanese delegation was an amendment to the Constitution

or an amendment to an amendment of the Constitution.

(56) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) was surprised that the Japanese amendment should call for so much legal consideration. Since the Legal Committee's answer could not be given immediately, even though it was most desirable that it be obtained as quickly as possible, Mr. Haguiwara asked for the Administrative Commission's meeting scheduled for the following morning to be cancelled.
(57) The Japanese delegate then stated that, in his Government's view, the amendment he was submitting was intended not to be independent but, on the contrary, to be very closely linked with the United States amendment; and that if the latter were rejected the other would ipso facto be rejected too.
(58) Should the Legal Committee voice the opposite opinion and treat the Japanese amendment in a way contrary to its author's intentions, Mr. Haguiwara would have to consult his Government in order to ascertain whether it would not prefer to withdraw its amendment altogether.

(59) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) added that it would be very useful if the Legal Committee could supply the necessary answers on the following day. His delegation's opinion had been that it was not necessary to refer the question on the Japanese amendment to that Committee. The delegate of Japan had just confirmed the fact, already contained in document 8C/ADM/1 Add., that the promoters of the amendment looked upon it as an amendment to a motion, not as a motion in itself, since, if it were a motion, it could not be discussed until six months after it had been presented. Mr. Kotschnig thought the difficulties involved in the Canadian proposal could be solved if the one sentence in which it differed from the four power proposal were taken out and presented as an amendment to it (document 8C/ADM/1 Annex II, paragraph 4, "or when in special circumstances it becomes necessary for a Member State to change its representative on the Board"). If that were done, work on the proposal as a whole could proceed.
(60) There was a four power amendment to the Constitution, a Japanese amendment to it and a Canadian amendment to it. A decision on principle could be reached on those three proposals, which could then be sent to the Legal Committee for analysis and proper drafting. If additional amendments that did not apply to questions of substance were put forward in the meantime, they also could be referred to the Legal Committee, which would then formulate the precise texts to be voted on.

(61) Agreed.

(62) The CHAIRMAN asked for a reply to the motion put by the Australian delegate to adjourn the debate until Thursday. He announced that it had been arranged that the Legal Committee would be meeting the following morning.

(63) At the suggestion of the delegate of Japan, Mr. KELLY (Australia) agreed to propose adjournment not necessarily until Thursday, but until the Legal Committee had given its answers.

(64) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) remarked that there was some confusion in the discussion, and asked for clarification. He had originally understood that the question would be referred to the Legal Committee; subsequently, that decisions of principle would be taken before such reference to the Committee. He wished to know what the Legal Committee was to be consulted about. He considered that the same procedure should be followed in regard to the amendment in question as in regard to other amendments. The Administrative Commission should decide its attitude to the United States amendment, and then consult the Legal Committee. It was not necessary to consult the Legal Committee on whether the Japanese amendment was or was not an amendment to the United States one. Nor did the Guatemalan delegate consider it necessary to consult that Committee on whether the membership of the Executive Board should be raised to 22. Accordingly, he wished to submit a formal motion.

(65) The CHAIRMAN regretted that it was impossible at that stage to discuss a new motion. The motion for adjournment had precedence.

(66) It was agreed to adjourn the debate until Thursday afternoon.

**ITEM 9.3.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE** (documents 8C/ADM/3 (I) and 8C/ADM/3 (III))

(67) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that Rule 106 of the Rules of Procedure had been frequently criticized for its lack of clarity. The text before the Commission (8C/ADM/3 (I)) was an attempt to improve its wording; the sense of the Rule remained, naturally, unchanged.

(68) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) recommended that the discussion on document 8C/ADM/3 (I) be referred to the Legal Committee.

(69) Seconded by the delegate of Israel and adopted.

(70) At the request of the delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by the delegate of Egypt, document 8C/ADM/3 (III) was also referred to the Legal Committee.

(71) It was agreed that the Commission would not meet on the following morning, and that the Legal Committee would be asked to deal with the questions referred to it by the Commission at that time.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

# SIXTH MEETING

*17 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

(1) The CHAIRMAN announced that the main business for the day was to consider the Report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. He had hoped that the Commission would also be able to deal with the means of financing the budget, but unfortunately it had been found that the question was so closely connected with that of the scale of contributions that it was impossible to consider it until the report on the latter was available. The report on the scale of contributions had been promised for Friday morning and the Chairman suggested that, if the Commission agreed, it be considered on Friday afternoon (19 November).

(2) Agreed.

**ITEM 9.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PARTS I, III AND IV OF THE BUDGET, AND REPORT TO THE PROGRAMME COMMISSION** (documents 8C/5, 8C/5 Corrigendum, 8C/5 Corr.2 and 8C/BUD/1).

(3) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) presented the first report of the Advisory Committee, contained in document 8C/BUD/1, and drew attention to the points of direct concern to the Commission, to which Parts I, III and IV of the draft programme and budget were referred.
(4) After disapproving the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board, the Committee had considered the use of Russian as a working language of the General Conference and of the Executive Board (documents 8C/DR/2 and 8C/DIV/78). It had been informed at its meeting that morning that the Soviet delegation did not intend to press for the immediate adoption of Russian as a working language of Unesco. The Committee had recommended that it be adopted as a working language of the General Conference on the same footing as English, French and Spanish, but not as a working language of the Executive Board. With regard to the publication of documents in Russian, the Committee had agreed that the best solution would be for the Soviet delegation to raise the question under each individual project.
(5) With regard to Part III, the Committee had discussed the staffing pattern of the Secretariat and had heard suggestions regarding the Office of the Director-General. It had been agreed to make no proposals, as the Director-General was to submit a paper on the subject at the appropriate time. The Committee had been glad to note that it would be possible to expand the Organization without increasing expenditure, but some concern had been felt at the administrative pattern, the Committee deprecated the division of the Secretariat into watertight compartments and the rigid symmetry of the programme departments. It recommended a saving of $23,000 on the total budget for staff costs.
(6) In conclusion, Mr. Gardner Davies paid tribute to the Secretariat's constructive collaboration throughout the Committee's discussions; the Committee's work had also been facilitated by its widened terms of reference. The aim of its report was to assist the Administrative Commission in examining certain items of its agenda, the most urgent being the scale of contributions and the method of financing the budget. The question of the use of Spanish and Russian as working languages was also urgent.

(7) The CHAIRMAN thanked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee for his extremely lucid and helpful report. He reminded the Commission that the item on the financing of the budget had not yet been formally referred to the Committee on Contributions.

(8) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America), seconded by Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt), moved that the matter be referred to the Committee on Contributions.

(9) Adopted.

(10) The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Committee on Contributions was considering the theoretical probable percentage of Member States not members of the United Nations. That afternoon would be the last opportunity for States which had not yet done so to make representations to the Committee. Turning back to the report of the Advisory Committee, the Chairman requested members to study it item by item, taking account also of the relevant sections of the main programme and budget documents.

**PART I – GENERAL POLICY** (document 8C/BUD/1, page 4)

**CHAPTER 1 – GENERAL CONFERENCE**

(11) As a Brazilian delegate, Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) was very much in favour of accepting the Indian invitation and would vote for it,

but, as Chairman of the Headquarters Committee, he felt that the Committee should give the Commission some additional information on the building in Paris. He suggested that the Committee might meet on Monday morning (22 November).

(12) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) stated that the general feeling in the Board had been that Unesco should be extremely grateful to India for its invitation. No other invitation had been received, so that the choice of the seat of the ninth session was limited to New Delhi and Paris. The difference between the estimates for a session in New Delhi and the estimates for a session in Paris was $214,042, so that, if possible, the session ought to be held in Paris. However, the Board had been informed by the Secretariat that the new building would not be sufficiently ready in 1956, which would mean that parts of the old building would still have to be used by the Secretariat. After some discussion, the Board had therefore decided to recommend acceptance of the Indian Government's generous offer.

(13) Mr. MONTAGNIER (Chief, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) gave the Commission the latest information - which was unlikely to change - received from the Headquarters Office responsible for following the progress of the work of construction. After recapitulating the difficulties involved in holding the General Conference's ninth session at the present headquarters, where there was insufficient space, he said that the buildings in the Place Fontenoy could not be erected and completely fitted up in time for all the services to be installed by October 1956. The work would probably not be finished before the first months of 1957. The Conference building, the whole of the basement, the ground floor and the Ségur wing of the Secretariat's building could be finished and fitted out by 30 September 1956 without additional outlay. In those circumstances, it would be impossible to install the whole of the Documents and Publications Service in the accommodation allotted to it on the first and second floors of the new buildings. Some services could be installed in the Ségur wing for the duration of the Conference, but they would have to be moved later to their permanent offices.

(14) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to an error in paragraph 3 on page 6 of document 8C/6: the additional cost of using a fourth working language in New Delhi would be $40,000 only. He asked if any delegation would move the adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

(15) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) thought it suitable that a representative of Latin America should propose a formal motion for acceptance of India's invitation. Representatives of distant countries had not hesitated to go so far afield as Montevideo, and it was now for Latin America to return their courtesy by enthusiastically accepting that invitation and showing the same desire for mutual acquaintanceship and assistance as those other representatives had displayed by going to Uruguay.

(16) The CHAIRMAN explained that under the Rules of Procedure the Brazilian delegate's proposal must be put as a formal recommendation from the Commission to the General Conference to accept the Indian Government's invitation to hold the ninth session at New Delhi.

(17) Mr. RAADI (Iran) was delighted that a representative of Latin America had made that suggestion, which he, on behalf of the Middle East countries, warmly supported. The General Conference had held sessions in every continent except Asia, and Unesco could not but be grateful to India for its invitation, which would enable the Organization to complete its tour of the world. Once the new buildings were finished, however, the Conference should invariably meet in Paris, although regional meetings of experts might be held elsewhere.

(18) Mr. BARBEY (Switzerland) thought that acceptance of the Indian proposal would afford Unesco an opportunity of acquiring a wider perspective and valuable experience, but that before coming to a decision it would be advisable to give some thought to the hesitations expressed by certain countries. An extra outlay of $300,000 within a period of two years might place too great a burden on the Organization. Although he was well aware of the difficulties involved in holding the Conference in Paris, he would like, before he made up his mind, to know whether the Indian Government would be prepared to postpone its invitation until 1958.

(19) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) heartily supported the motion of the delegate of Brazil. He pointed out that financial considerations were far less important than the beneficial effect which a session held away from headquarters had both on Unesco itself and on the country and region concerned. Unesco needed to be known by the peoples of the world, and the Indian invitation provided a magnificent opportunity for Unesco to draw nearer to the peoples of South and South East Asia. Moreover, it would be of immense benefit for delegates and members of the Secretariat to see and understand something of India - its past and present and its great contribution to the common heritage of mankind. The delegate of Egypt therefore hoped that the invitation would be accepted with gratitude and enthusiasm.

(20) Mrs. HEFFELFINGER (United States of America) warmly seconded the proposal to accept the Indian invitation, but hoped that the tenth session of the General Conference would be held in the new headquarters building in Paris in the spring of 1958.

(21) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) stated that, since Unesco had held its sessions in almost all regions except Asia, the desire of the Asian countries to have a conference held in that region was understandable and, in view of the fact that the new buildings of Unesco in Paris would not be quite ready, he associated

himself with that proposal and recommended its acceptance.

(22) While feeling in some sympathy with the remarks made by the delegate of Egypt concerning the mutual impact of sessions abroad on Unesco and the region concerned, Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) recalled that his delegation had opposed the erection of a costly new headquarters building in Paris. That was past history; but, at the present time, his delegation felt that, as far as possible, sessions of the Conference should be held in that building, if only because of the considerable saving involved. However, if the building were not ready in 1956, he could think of no other place in the world where it would be more appropriate, valuable and pleasant to hold the Conference than in New Delhi. His own delegation would look forward with great pleasure to the contacts with the Indian Government and people which would be forthcoming.

(23) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) agreed that it would be impossible to hold the ninth session of the General Conference in Paris, and warmly accepted the invitation from the friendly peoples of the East. Their representatives had already paid a tribute to Latin America by taking the long road to Uruguay, and it would be only right and proper to make the return visit. The difficulties in the way of holding the next session in New Delhi could be easily overcome. Consequently, the Argentine delegation supported the Brazilian delegation's proposal.

(24) Mr. PETROVIC (Yugoslavia) supported the proposal to accept the Indian invitation, which would please not only India but all the Asian countries. Even if the new building were finished in time for the ninth session, it would be a good idea to hold it in New Delhi.

(25) The Brazilian motion to recommend acceptance of the Indian Government's invitation to hold the ninth session of the General Conference in New Delhi was put to the vote and adopted by 42 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

(26) On behalf of his Government, the Indian National Commission and the Indian delegation, Dr. MUDALIAR (India) expressed his gratitude for the generous manner in which the Commission had recommended acceptance of the invitation. He greatly appreciated the sentiments which had been expressed, and assured all members that the invitation came from the heart. Unesco would be warmly welcomed, for all that the Organization stood for was deeply appreciated by the sub-continent of India and neighbouring countries.

**CHAPTER 2 – EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(27) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan), referring to Chapter 2 and the adoption of the budget for the Executive Board, said that at the previous meeting, during the discussion on the possible change to be made in the composition of the Board, the Pakistan delegate had asked if acceptance of the United States amendment would entail any changes in the reimbursement of travel and per diem for the members of the Board. Mr. Haguiwara saw no point in raising that question, since with the acceptance of Chapter 2 of that part of the budget any misunderstanding on that point would be cleared up. Besides, in other international organizations with an executive board or some similar organ composed of government representatives, it was usual for the organization to defray members' travelling expenses. He concluded with the suggestion that the Commission ask the Secretariat for information at the following meeting about precedents existing in other Specialized Agencies.

(28) The CHAIRMAN replied that it would be possible to obtain the information requested by the following day.

(29) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) explained that the Board had already examined the possibility of reducing the number of questions with which it had to deal, but had come to the conclusion that its burden could not be lightened unless previous decisions of the General Conference, various regulations and certain provisions of the Constitution were modified.

(30) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) asked for an explanation of Chapter 2 of document 8C/BUD/1, which, in its present form, contradicted itself. While the first sentence said that "steps should be taken to lighten the Board's obligations", the last sentence asked for a reduction in the number of meetings.

(31) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget) said that the Committee hoped that the Administrative Commission would investigate the matter fully, seeing if it were possible to modify various regulations and previous decisions of the Conference, with a view to freeing the Executive Board from some of its responsibilities in the fields of administration and finance.

(32) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) reminded the Commission that the Executive Board kept that point constantly in mind. As it was quite impossible for the Commission to improvise any precise suggestions for an immediate modification of the Conference's rules of procedure or the Executive Board's responsibilities, he suggested that the Commission should ask the Board to make proposals for any changes or amendments which would satisfy both its own and the Organization's requirements. Workable suggestions could not be made without a close knowledge of the Board's responsibilities and functions.

(33) The CHAIRMAN's own feeling was that the item might be deferred until a decision had been taken on the structure of the Executive Board.

(34) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) did not

think that the situation would be modified by a change in the structure of the Board. He felt strongly that no decision should be taken by the Administrative Commission without previous consultation with the Board itself.

(35) At the suggestion of Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan), it was agreed to adjourn for half an hour to enable members to study the relevant parts of the Advisory Committee's Report. The items of direct concern to the Commission were the following:

Part I, Chapters 1 and 2 (page 4),

Part III, Chapters 1 and 3 (page 23),

Part IV, (39) - Remuneration of Secretary of Staff Association (page 23),

DR/50 - Creation of a post of Assistant Director-General (page 24),

document 8C/ADM/7 - Adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board (page 24),

The oral report of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the use of Russian as a working language.

(36) The meeting having reassembled, Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) described the practice of other Agencies in respect of payment of travel and per diem to members of their governing bodies or executive boards.

FAO - Travel and per diem of members of the Executive Board paid by the Organization.

ILO - Governing Body divided into three sections (government representatives, workers and employers): travel and per diem of government representatives paid by governments; travel and per diem of workers and employers paid by the Organization.

United Nations - Travel and per diem of all delegates paid by governments. Travel and per diem of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (members appointed in an individual capacity) paid by the Organization.

(37) With regard to the Brazilian motion, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Commission had no right to communicate direct with the Executive Board, but it could do so through the General Committee.

(38) It was agreed that the Chairman should bring the Brazilian proposal to the attention of the General Committee, with a request that it be referred to the Executive Board.

**PART III – GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**
(document 8C/BUD/1, page 23)

**CHAPTER 1 – OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

(39) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) referred members to pages 203-206 of document 8C/5, where the manning tables for the Office of the Director-General were set out. The first amendments to those manning tables were to be found on pages 27-29 of document 8C/5 Corrigendum. Those amendments involved the abolition of one P.D. and one D.1 post and provided for one post of Deputy Director-General and one post of Assistant Director-General. Document 8C/5 Corr. 2 contained one further and final proposal, namely that there should be no post of Deputy Director-General, but a second post of Assistant Director-General. There were no changes in any other part of the structure of the Director-General's Office. Paragraph 4 of document 8C/5 Corr. 2 showed the saving effected by the Director-General's final proposal.

(40) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) asked for an explanation of the machinery proposed for the replacement of the Director-General when absent; and which officer would assume his responsibilities?

(41) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said that he too felt concern at the successive changes involved. He wanted to know whether acceptance of the Director-General's proposal would mean a change in the regulations and what the new officer's exact title would be. Whereas in the draft programme and budget mention was made of a "Directeur général adjoint" (Deputy Director-General), the new proposal spoke of "Deux sous-directeurs généraux" (two Assistant Directors-General). There would have to be some agreement on terminology, and Mr. Baugniet, for his part, favoured "Directeur général adjoint".

(42) Mr. KELLY (Australia) agreed that there was a need for clarification of the duties of the two Assistant Directors-General, which seemed to lack precision and to overlap to some extent. He asked who replaced the Director-General in case of enforced absence.

(43) Replying to the delegate of Belgium, Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that the correct French title was "Sous-Directeur général". In the past, "Directeur général adjoint" had always been used for "Deputy Director-General".

(44) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) remarked that the official to be named would be either the Director-General's deputy - i.e., the "Directeur général adjoint" - or someone below him, who would therefore not be required to replace him completely in his absence. In that case, according to the proposal, the official would be a "sous-directeur général", but Mr. Baugniet still felt that that unusual formula was unfortunate; as there was a post of Director-General, the title Director without any further qualification would be more appropriate.

(45) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that his first idea had been to have two Deputy Directors-General; he had, however, subsequently yielded to the Executive Board's suggestion that the existing post of Deputy Director-General be abolished and that there be two posts of Assistant Director-General. He thought of both of them as highly placed assistants to himself in the fields described in document 8C/5 Corr. 2, who would concentrate all their time on duties above the level of Principal Directors. He had drawn the Board's attention to the fact that the Director-General and his two

Assistants would have to travel a great deal, attending meetings of ACC, the Economic and Social Council, TAB, TAC and the other Specialized Agencies. Therefore, taking account also of the need for vacations, it was impossible to run the Organization efficiently without two high level people in addition to the Director-General. As for the duties of the Assistant Directors-General, they could not be considered apart from the individuals concerned, and he was sure that the combination of duties proposed was the best for those in question. The creation of Mr. Maheu's post had been approved in Venice by the Executive Board, acting on behalf of the General Conference. It was a provisional arrangement effective only until the end of 1954 and its continuation thereafter would depend upon the approval of the General Conference. Mr. Adiseshiah's appointment would not take effect unless the Conference approved the relevant budgetary and organizational provisions. Mr. Maheu was to concentrate on the diplomacy of the Organization - relations with Member States, the United Nations family and governmental and non-governmental organizations. Mr. Adiseshiah would concentrate on the technical assistance programme, the integration of the technical assistance programme with the regular programme, and co-ordination of the administration of programme activities. It was quite clear that their duties were interlinked and that they would have to act as a team. As time went on, he intended to allocate certain duties to each of them which could be carried out without consulting the Director-General or the other Assistant Director-General. Both of them would have to give him advice, in consultation with Directors of Programme Departments, on the programme as a whole. When he himself was absent from headquarters, the two Assistants, in rotation, would take precedence over the Department Directors as Acting Director-General. If the Director-General and both Assistants were absent from Paris, the Directors of Programme Departments would, as in the past, serve in order of seniority, as Acting Director- General.

(46) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) seconded the proposals in document 8C/5 Corr. 2 for three reasons: (a) because the arrangement was very economical; (b) because the Director-General advocated it and Mr. Salim had confidence in him as an administrator; (c) because Mr. Adiseshiah, with his profound knowledge of countries' needs, was eminently qualified to direct the new programme of technical aid designed to meet the felt needs of Member States.

(47) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thanked the Director-General for his explanations, from which it appeared that the new official for whom a post was to be created would act both as the Director-General's assistant and as his representative when he himself was unable to perform his functions. He concluded by formally proposing that the French text be amended so as to read "directeur général adjoint" instead of "sous-directeur général".

(48) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) warmly supported the Director-General's proposals in document 8C/5 Corr. 2, and felt that the oral explanation which the Director-General had given should dissipate all doubts. Mr. Maheu had always rendered very valuable service to the Organization and was obviously well fitted for the post. Mr. Adiseshiah's immense activity and devotion to duty, coupled with his insight and understanding of the various countries' needs, qualified him admirably for the other post of Assistant Director-General.

(49) Mr. KHADRA (Saudi-Arabia) fully concurred with the delegates of Jordan and Egypt.

(50) Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua) said that, as the debate continued, the subject, which had initially been quite clear, was becoming more and more obscure. In his view the title of Assistant Director-General was suitable because it designated in all languages the officer holding powers equal to those of the Director-General whenever the latter authorized him to act in that capacity. He asked why, under paragraph 8, did the Director-General himself have to lay down the functions of the Assistant Director-General, without their having been fixed beforehand. The Director-General was at present entitled to have himself replaced during his absence in whatever way he thought most suitable without there being any need for a fixed roster of his subordinates to deputize for him.

(51) To avoid terminological difficulties, that officer could be called "Subdirector General" in Spanish, the "Directeur général adjoint" in French and by whatever was the most suitable title in English.

(52) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) wondered whether the question of who should serve as Acting Director-General in the Director-General's absence could not be dealt with under existing regulations; that was to say, the Director-General, before going away, would simply state who was to act in his place. As for the figures at the bottom of document 8C/5 Corr. 2, they seemed to Mr. Pohl to be almost too good to be true. He asked if the economy was to be a permanent one.

(53) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied in the affirmative. The economy was the result of bringing one post of Deputy Director-General down to the level of Assistant Director-General. He added that the staff regulations enabled him to do as the delegate of the Union of South Africa had suggested, but it was a matter of custom for the Programme Directors, in order of seniority, to serve as Acting Director-General, should the Director-General and Assistant Directors-General be absent at the same time.

(54) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) formally proposed that the Commission approve the Director-General's suggestion and leave it to the Executive Board, with the help of the Secretariat, to settle the question of terminology, which was difficult to decide in a meeting of the Commission.

(55) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) seconded the Brazilian delegate's proposal. He too thought it futile to discuss questions of terminology in the

Commission. It was enough for the latter to decide on the substance of the proposal before it.

(56) Mr. KELLY (Australia) did not think that the new proposals really involved a saving. It seemed to him that it was merely a question of spending less money on one scheme than it had been proposed to spend on another, but that both estimates represented an increase over expenditure for 1953-54, when there had been no post of Assistant Director-General. He asked if his interpretation was correct.

(57) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the economy was a real one: two posts, namely D.1 - Head of External Relations - and P.5 - Director of the Office of the Director-General - had been suppressed and replaced by one post of Assistant Director-General and one P.5 executive officer. That operation had resulted in a saving. Thenceforth, it was proposed to abolish the post of Deputy Director-General and set up a second post of Assistant Director-General, which would entail a further economy.

(58) Mr. AL-HILLI (Iraq) supported the Director-General's proposals, for, as Unesco expanded, it seemed normal for the number of Assistant Directors-General to increase. He greatly approved the choice of Mr. Adiseshiah, who had great vision and looked after the needs of every country.

(59) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) stated that the Director-General had consulted the Board in private meeting. The discussion had been very cordial and the Board had agreed to the new proposal before the Commission.

(60) The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to vote on the proposal of the delegate of Jordan, seconded by several delegations, that the Director-General's proposals relating to his own Office, in documents 8C/5, 8C/5 Corrigendum and 8C/5 Corr. 2, be approved.

(61) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) recalled that he had formally proposed amending the French text so as to use the term "directeur général adjoint". If the proposal were adopted, it was essential to decide on the proper title, and he would be glad of the French delegation's opinion on that point.

(62) Mr. GAYET (France) was definitely against the expression "sous-directeur général", which should be ruled out. It was not used in any administration to his knowledge. He thought that "adjoint au directeur général" would be the best expression. However, if that raised difficulties with the other United Nations Specialized Agencies, he was prepared to fall in with the Brazilian delegate's proposal and leave it to the Executive Board and the Director-General to find the title for those officials. He had no comment on the substance of the proposal.

(63) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) stated that in correct Spanish and in view of very numerous precedents the expression "Vicedirector" was the most suitable for designating the Director-General's deputy.

(64) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) wondered if the delegates of Belgium and France would agree to ask the Director-General, in consultation with the Executive Board, to decide upon the terminology to be used.

(65) Agreed.

(66) The motion of the delegate of Jordan that the Commission recommend approval of the Director-General's proposals was adopted by 38 votes to 0.

**PART IV – COMMON SERVICE COSTS**

Paragraph 39

(67) The Advisory Committee recommended that the provision for remuneration of the Secretary of the Staff Association ($4,439 a year) be deleted.

(68) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the question had been raised whether it was good practice for an international organization to pay the salary of the secretary of its Staff Association, whose purpose was to negotiate with the administration on the subject of personnel matters, including some in which the Head of the Organization found himself in conflict with the Staff Association. There was precedent for the payment by the administration of the salary of such a secretary.

(69) The Director-General pointed out that a truly satisfactory, competent international civil service must be composed of people with an international spirit and a sense of security and just dealing; Unesco could not be successful unless it had a fine staff of international civil servants with the necessary machinery for the formulation of their views, and the feeling that their claims would be heard with an open mind. It would be an onerous charge upon the staff if the secretary's salary had to be paid by private subscription. If that were in posed on them, he suspected that the officers of the Staff Association would have recourse to the method of using the time of employees who should be working for the Administration, which would prove more costly to Unesco than a post for the secretary in the budget. Although the Staff Association and the Administration in Unesco had been in conflict over a number of matters, he did not wish that to obscure the fact that the Staff Association was an essential element in a good international civil service. It had been pointed out that it might seem to the public that, in paying the salary of the secretary of the Staff Association, the Administration was approving the latter's activities; but that was not a valid argument, for the Administration paid the salary of the secretary of the Appeals Board, but that did not mean that it took responsibility for the latter's activities.

The Director-General felt that it would be a gesture of confidence in the doctrine he had outlined, and

of faith that the Staff Association would respond to its high obligations, if the Conference accepted his recommendation, rather than that of the Advisory Committee.

(70) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought that, in the light of the Director-General's explanations, the Conference would be wise to reject the Advisory Committee's proposal and to retain in the budget the amount proposed for the remuneration of the Staff Association's secretary.

(71) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) endorsed the Director-General's recommendations and was against the Committee's recommendation. Leaving aside any question of personalities, he had observed in his capacity of permanent delegate to Unesco that the post rendered great services not only to the staff but to the Organization as well, since thanks to it savings could be made far in excess of the salary involved, many disputes being amicably settled through its agency. Nor should it be forgotten that the secretary of the Staff Association also acted as secretary of the Appeals Board and thus worked directly for the Organization itself.

(72) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) observed that he had formally proposed rejecting the Advisory Committee's recommendation and that his proposal had just been seconded by the Italian delegate.

(73) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) also seconded the Belgian delegate's proposal and suggested that the reasons given by the Director-General should be regarded as valid in that particular case, since circumstances differed in the different organizations.

(74) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) seconded the delegate of Belgium.

(75) In reply to a question from Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) stated that membership of the Staff Association was voluntary, and that members paid subscriptions ranging from 350 to 1,000 French francs a year. The funds were used for a great variety of welfare activities.

(76) Mr. GAYET (France) thought, after listening carefully to the Director-General's comments, that the Director-General's proposal should be accepted. The Staff Association, which had existed since 1948 and included 95 per cent of the staff, was in his opinion essential to the efficient working of the Bureau of Personnel, with which it closely collaborated. He concluded by emphasizing the necessity for constant contact between the Administration and the staff and thus came to the conclusion that the Advisory Committee's recommendation should be rejected.

(77) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked if the post was a full-time job. She pointed out that the Staff Association of the United Nations, with a larger number of members, had a part-time secretary only. Her delegation agreed with the Director-General's remarks regarding the rôle of the Staff Association, but she pointed out that, if the Administration continued to pay for the post, Member States would have the right to expect staff members, individually and collectively through their Staff Association, to adhere to the standards of conduct laid down by the International Civil Service Advisory Board and, in that connexion, to refrain from action of a political character or action relating to issues which were solely within the jurisdiction of Member States.

(78) Mr. KELLY (Australia) proposed, with some regret, that the Advisory Committee's recommendation be retained. The Staff Association should be encouraged by its own members; he had been shocked to hear that many were paying less than 1,000 francs a year and that a great deal of the money was being spent on recreational activities.

(79) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) explained that with a staff composed of people of 48 different nationalities, most of them living away from their home countries, the Staff Association did a great deal of welfare work, helping staff members to adjust themselves to their new environment. The money was not spent on recreational activities, but on various welfare services and on artistic activities, designed to help the staff to understand the culture of other countries. Moreover, representatives of the Staff Association served on many joint committees with the Administration, involving work for which secretarial assistance was necessary. The post of secretary was consequently a full-time one.

(80) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he would call the attention of the officers of the Staff Association to the statement just made by the delegate of the United States of America.

(81) The motion to reject the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget was adopted by 25 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

# SEVENTH MEETING

*18 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.3.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION (STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD)** (documents 8C/JUR/1. 8C/ADM/1. Annex III and 8C/ADM/1 Add.) (continued)

**FIRST REPORT OF THE LEGAL COMMITTEE** (document 8C/JUR/1)

(1) Having announced the order of business for the afternoon, the CHAIRMAN called upon the Rapporteur of the Legal Committee to present the Committee's first report (document 8C/JUR/1).

(2) Speaking as Rapporteur of the Legal Committee, Mr. BAUGNIET said that the Committee had replied in the following way to the two questions put to it by the Administrative Commission:
(3) The Committee had expressed the opinion that a change in the number of members of the Executive Board could not be regarded purely as a matter of drafting.
(4) It had also expressed the view that the amendment communicated to the Director-General on 11 August 1954 by the Government of Japan constituted a draft amendment to the amendments sponsored jointly by the United States of America, Australia, Brazil and the United Kingdom (CL/943, Annex 1) and could not therefore be regarded as an independent amendment to Article V of the Constitution.
(5) The Legal Committee's first report which Mr. Baugniet read out, supplied incidentally all the supplementary information required on the subject.

(6) Having thanked the Rapporteur for his report, the CHAIRMAN reminded members that the decisions of the Legal Committee, which was an advisory body, were not binding on the Commission. If, however, it decided to disagree with the Legal Committee on the first point, for example, and say: "The Administrative Commission considers that the change in the number of members of the Executive Board can be regarded purely as a matter of drafting", the decision would have to be adopted by a two-thirds majority.

(7) In reply to a question from Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) concerning the precedents which might be invoked and the procedure which had been followed when the number of members of the Executive Board was increased from 18 to 20, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the draft amendment making that change in the Constitution had been communicated to Member States within the statutory time-limit, since the relevant circular letter (CL/639) had been despatched on 12 May 1952, six months before the seventh session of the General Conference opened.
(8) However, it would be remembered that a question of figures was raised at that seventh session in connexion with a draft amendment for changing the Article of the Constitution which stated that the General Conference could meet in extraordinary session at the request "of at least one-third of the Member States". Most of the delegates had then agreed that such an amendment could not be regarded purely as a matter of drafting.

(9) So far as concerned the Japanese amendment sent to the Director-General on 11 August 1954, Mr. MAYER (France) doubted whether Member States could have been communicated with three months before the opening of the eighth session of the General Conference, which, as was known, was convened to begin work on 12 November.

(10) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the amendment had been sent to Member States by circular letter on 12 August. It was for the Commission to decide whether the three months' notice provided for under Rule 104 of the Rules of Procedure should be counted from the date of despatch of such a communication or from the date when it was received.

(11) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) moved the adoption of the report of the Legal Committee in two parts, first, the adoption of opinion number (1) and then the adoption of opinion number (2).

(12) The motion was seconded by Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico).

(13) After a prolonged discussion on (intricate) legal points, the CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to vote on the motion of the delegate of the United States of America.

(14) Opinion number (1) was adopted by 43 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

(15) Opinion number (2) was adopted by 51 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions.

(16) The whole of the report of the Legal Committee in document 8C/JUR/1 was adopted.

(17) The Commission then resumed discussion of

the United States' draft amendment in document 8C/ADM/1, Annex III.

(18) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) asked the delegate of the United States of America whether the adoption of his amendment would affect the Executive Board's budget.

(19) The CHAIRMAN remarked that, from the purely legal point of view, the passing of the amendment would not bind the Conference in any way in respect of the payment of delegates' expenses.

(20) Mr. KELLY (Australia) seconded the amendment of the United States delegation for the reasons which had already been so eloquently expressed at an earlier meeting. Further, in order to give small countries a greater chance of sitting on the Executive Board, the Australian delegation would support the Japanese proposal that the number of members of the Board be increased from 20 to 22.

(21) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation was not in a position to vote on the principle of the United States' amendment that day. He therefore hoped that the final vote on that principle would be adjourned until the following day.

(22) Mr. PETROVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the matter had been discussed at formal meetings and in the lobbies for several days, and his delegation, weighing both sides of the question, had come to the conclusion that there was no real need for the proposed changes. There were no sufficient reasons for changing the Constitution in that respect, and it was unnecessary to revert to the arguments which had already been put forward.
(23) The question was a practical one, and nothing would be gained by amending texts. There were no complaints about the functioning of the Executive Board in its existing form; it performed its task punctually and efficiently. It was unnecessary to reform an institution which was already working adequately.
(24) There were reasons for that view in Yugoslavia; since the reforms to the country's Constitution carried out a year and a half back, the State had intervened less and less in cultural and other activities. Complete autonomy had been granted to the relevant organizations and associations, which, taking the place of the Ministries, performed their tasks of leadership without State intervention.
(25) The Yugoslav delegate, therefore, opposed any change in the Constitution and supported the status quo.

(26) In reply to a remark by Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) concerning the procedure suggested in paragraph C of the Japanese amendment (document 8C/ADM/1 Add., page 2), for elections to the Executive Board, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that those were purely transitional provisions, as was indicated by the heading of the paragraph in question.

(27) The CHAIRMAN requested the delegate of Lebanon to raise his point when the Japanese amendment came up for discussion.

(28) Mr. BRIGHT (Liberia) had received no definite instructions from his Government in connexion with the United States' amendment, but had been asked to try to ensure that certain principles were safeguarded. It seemed to him that the wisdom of the existing arrangement had been proved by experience of the past ten years, and he could see no reason to change it in a hurry. He proposed that, in order to give Member States more time for reflexion, the matter be adjourned until the ninth session of the General Conference.

(29) Replying to various questions raised both at the current and at earlier meetings, Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, when he had submitted the amendment, he had tried to anticipate some of the arguments which would be advanced against it. He was sorry that he had not been sufficiently convincing. However, he was sure that neither those who were for the amendment nor those who were against it would wish him to repeat himself. He would therefore confine himself to two brief answers and two general observations.
(30) With regard to the question from the delegate of Pakistan, Mr. Kotschnig fully concurred with what the Chairman had said: his amendment would not entail a change in present practice, nor did he think that there should be a change.
(31) The delegate of Denmark had asked whether, in his view, governments would be bound by the actions of a Board composed of governmental representatives. Obviously a government would be bound by the statements of its own representative on the Executive Board, but governments would not be bound by the decisions of the Executive Board as a whole.
(32) It had been suggested by three speakers that, if the amendment were passed, Unesco would be invaded by power politics, that there would be more lobbying and compromising. Mr. Kotschnig submitted that the situation would not be really different from what it was at present. Preliminary discussions among delegations had to take place before elections; it had always been the practice and, whether the amendment were passed or not, it was unavoidable that it should continue, for it was necessary, under the Constitution, to ensure that members of the Board corresponded to certain standards and that there was an equitable geographical distribution. The amendment would not change those requirements. The delegate of Denmark had suggested that the Board, in its new form, would no longer reflect the various spheres which were Unesco's particular responsibility, namely, education, science and culture. The delegate of France had put the same idea differently, saying that the new Executive Board would reflect only the wishes of governments and not those of the peoples of the world. Mr. Kotschnig could not accept those views; the General Conference would still be voting upon individuals and, if it considered that a government was proposing an unsuitable candidate, it could vote against him. Secondly, even if members of the Board represented their governments, they could still represent education, science and culture also, for a truly democratic government reflected the achievements of

its educators, scientists, artists and writers. The United States delegation believed that the new Board would be even more representative than in the past, for it would represent no longer certain disciplines only, but the peoples of the world and their highest aspirations. Further, the new Board would be a stronger body, better able to advance the great aims of Unesco. That did not mean, however, that Mr. Kotschnig wished in any way to belittle the existing Executive Board; he considered that it had done excellent work for many years and that everyone should be grateful to it.

(33) With regard to the proposal that a decision be postponed until the ninth session, Mr. Kotschnig did not think it a sound suggestion. He reminded the Commission that the matter had been before the Conference for three and a half years, and it seemed to him that it should now be able to make up its mind.

(34) He therefore proposed that the Commission vote forthwith on the principle embodied in paragraph A.1, and applied again in paragraph A.4, namely, that the Executive Board be elected from among the delegates of Member States and that each member represent the government of his State. The question of the number of members would be decided when the Japanese amendment was considered.

(35) Mr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) asked for a vote by roll-call, in order that those who supported the proposal should receive all the merit for it and that those who, like the Uruguayan delegation, opposed it, should accept the responsibility for their position.

(36) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) pointed out that, if there was to be a real vote on paragraph A.1, the Japanese amendment, being further from the original text, should be put to the vote first.

(37) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) wondered whether closer consideration should not be given to the way in which the work of the Administrative Commission and that of the Legal Committee should be co-ordinated on the question at issue.

(38) In view of the numerous procedural problems which had been raised, the CHAIRMAN, with the Commission's approval, decided to suspend the meeting for a few minutes in order to allow delegates to confer with each other regarding the possible solutions which might be found for those problems.

(39) The meeting having reassembled, Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) suggested a change of procedure. He withdrew his original motion and proposed that the Commission vote, not on the principle, but on the entire text of his amendment. The wording could then be referred to the Legal Committee for approval. Proceeding in that way, the Commission would first consider the relevant amendments to each paragraph of the United States amendment, and would then vote on the paragraph as a whole.

(40) The above proposal was seconded by Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom).

(41) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) said that the Japanese proposal was based on a consideration of principle. It was not incompatible with the amendments submitted, which should be studied and decided upon before the proposal itself was dealt with.

(42) It was agreed to proceed as proposed by the delegate of the United States of America and to vote on the amendment, paragraph by paragraph, taking first the relevant amendments to each paragraph.

(43) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), referring to Article XIII, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, asked the Chairman whether he considered that the amendment about to be put to the vote came within the provisions of that paragraph, which stated: "The General Conference shall have power to adopt by a two-thirds majority rules of procedure for carrying out the provisions of this Article".

(44) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Article mentioned by the delegate of Mexico did not apply on that occasion, since the proposal did not modify the aims of the Organization or affect its basis.

(45) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) said that the proposal did not indeed affect the aims, administration or future trend of the Organization. The existing structure of the Executive Board was more dangerous than the reforms which had been asked for, since under the existing system difficulties might arise between countries' representatives and their respective governments. Acceptance of the change would cause those governments to display greater interest in the Organization and would not affect the quality of members of the Board, since the latter would be selected by delegations composed, one could be sure, of eminent men, effective defenders of the true interests of culture.

(46) The Colombian delegation would vote for the proposal to modify the structure of the Executive Board, and would also vote for the Japanese amendment increasing the number of Board members. The delegations that took that view were quite united and had no reason to fear a vote by roll-call.

(47) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to make it quite clear that his delegation would vote in favour of the Japanese amendment, but would be obliged to abstain if a vote on the paragraph as a whole were taken that afternoon.

(48) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that it was open to any delegation to move that a vote be deferred.

(49) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) moved a vote on the first paragraph of the Japanese amendment, increasing the number of members of the Executive Board from 20 to 22.

(50) That motion was seconded by Messrs. AVIDA (Israel) and BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil).

(51) Dr. MUDALIAR (India), seconded by Mr. SOENARJO (Indonesia) moved that the Commission vote on paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 together, as the principle in paragraph 1 affected the other two paragraphs.

(52) Rejected.

(53) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) recalled that, when it had been proposed to raise the number of members of the Board from 18 to 20, his Government had been in favour of retaining the number of 18. Similarly, at the present time, his delegation would be against increasing the number.

(54) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) recalled that his delegation had been against an enlargement of the Board in the past. However, with the increased number of Member States, it was felt that an increase in the number of members would be justified. He accordingly supported the Japanese amendment.

(55) Mr. CHIRIBOGA TERAN (Ecuador) expressed his agreement with the Japanese proposal. It should, he thought, be considered not from a financial but from a cultural point of view. In other international organizations the executive boards usually consisted of one-third of the organization's membership. According to that principle, Unesco's Board should consist of 24 members, there being 72 Member States; but that was at present not possible, for reasons of procedure. The figure should however be raised to 22, in order that States which had recently joined Unesco should have access to the Board, and in the interests of a better geographical distribution of seats.

(56) Mr. MAYER (France) explained that, although the French delegation favoured increasing the number of seats on the Executive Board, it would abstain from voting on the proposed amendment, because the latter was bound up with what it considered a dangerous change in the method of election. That alteration could not fail to transform the very nature of the Board completely and, despite the explanations furnished by the United States delegate, the French delegation remained strongly opposed to such a change.

(57) If the text were rejected when put to the vote, however, the French delegation would be prepared to frame jointly with the Brazilian and Japanese delegations a new draft amendment for increasing the number of members of the Executive Board for submission in due time to the ninth session of the General Conference.

(58) Mr. PETROVIC (Yugoslavia) concurred with Mr. Mayer and said that he too would abstain from voting on the proposed amendment.

(59) Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark) did not agree with the delegate of France. He considered it perfectly logical to vote for the Japanese amendment but against the proposal as a whole, for, even if the Board became a governmental body, it would still be desirable to increase its membership.

(60) The Japanese amendment to paragraph 1 of the United States amendment, consisting of substituting the figure 22 for 20 in the second line, was adopted by 52 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

(61) It was agreed to proceed to a roll-call vote on paragraph 1 of the United States amendment, as amended by the Japanese delegation.

(62) The result of the voting was as follows:

Voted for: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Burma (Union of), Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Korea, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi-Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Viet-Nam.

Voted against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Haiti, Switzerland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Abstentions: Byelorussian SSR, Ecuador, India, Lebanon, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Absent: Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Laos, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Syria, Venezuela.

(63) Paragraph 1 of the United States amendment, as amended by Japan, was thus adopted by 44 votes to 7, with 6 abstentions and 10 Member States absent.

(64) Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua) dissented from the paragraph in the United States amendment on the re-election of members of the Board who were due to retire. He considered that re-election ought not to be allowed more than once, in order that all countries might have the possibility of being represented on the Board.

(65) Mr. RIANO JAUMA (Cuba) referred to Article V of the Constitution, which laid it down that members of the Board "shall not serve consecutively for more than two terms". That provision had been made for reasons of geographical distribution. The thesis put forward at the seventh session of the General Conference referred to the appointment of members of the Board on their merits as individuals and not on grounds of nationality. That system made equitable geographical distribution impossible; it had incidentally borne hardly on Cuba, which, as a result of it, had never been able to achieve its ambition of being represented on the Board, despite the fact that it had been a founder member of Unesco.

(66) In reply to a question from Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan), Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that "members" of the Executive Board must mean individuals and not States, since paragraph 4 began with the words "In the event of the death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board..."

(67) Mr. AVIDA (Israel) pointed out that the words "Retiring members shall be eligible for re-election" (paragraph 3) was against the principle of rotation.

(68) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) asked, in accordance with Rule 85 of the Rules of Procedure, for a separate vote on the last sentence of paragraph 3 of the proposal. His delegation was opposed to any form of re-election.

(69) The CHAIRMAN observed that it had been proposed to take two votes, the first on paragraph 3 without the last sentence, and the second on paragraph 3 with the last sentence.

(70) Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua) asked for a five minutes' suspension of the meeting, to enable delegates to exchange their views, as they had successfully done at an earlier stage.

(71) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) asked for an explanation of the Chairman's views on the result of a separate vote, as asked for by the Guatemalan delegate. If the last sentence of paragraph 3 were rejected, while the rest of the paragraph were adopted, the vote would not make sense. Would paragraph 3, in that case, remain in force? If not, the result would be extremely confusing.

(72) The CHAIRMAN explained that the position was that, if the sentence were eliminated, it would leave the matter open; it might be possible, of course, to deal with it in the Regulations instead of having a provision in the Constitution.

(73) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) understood the anxiety shown by some of the delegates, in particular the delegate of Nicaragua, with regard to the last sentence of the paragraph under discussion. Nevertheless the fear that the new system might not permit the election of Member States in rotation, or that such rotation might not take place with sufficient speed, was unfounded. There was another aspect of the question to be taken into account - the need for continuity within the Executive Board, so that the more important States might go on being represented and continue to promote the progress of the Organization.

(74) Moreover, the election of members to the Board generally resulted from agreements between countries of a given cultural and geographical area, e.g. Latin America. Such private and internal agreements would facilitate the drawing up, every two years, of lists of candidates for the Board.

(75) The Colombian delegate concluded that the paragraph should be approved in its entirety.

(76) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that, under general principles of law, anything not expressly forbidden remained permissible and that therefore, in the absence of any rule concerning the re-election of former members, those members should normally be re-eligible.

(77) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), referring to Article V.C. 13 (d) of the Constitution, asked how that provision would be affected if the last sentence of paragraph 3 were adopted. Would it continue in force?

(78) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that the "*transitional provisions*" *which were the subject of* section C were intended to replace those contained in the existing text of Article V.

(79) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom), seconded by several delegations, moved the adjournment of the meeting.

(80) Adopted.

The meeting rose at 7.5 p.m.

# EIGHTH MEETING

*19 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.3.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION (STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD) (documents 8C/ADM/1 and 8C/ADM/1 Add.) (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to resume its consideration of the draft amendments to the Constitution to revise paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 12 and 13 of Article V concerning the membership of the Executive Board, as submitted by the delegation of the United States of America in document 8C/ADM/1 Annex III and co-sponsored by the delegations of Australia, Brazil and the United Kingdom.

(2) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said he had reconsidered the matter and believed that the needs of the Organization would be better served if the proposal to amend paragraph 3 were withdrawn. The paragraph as contained in the Constitution meant that no individual member of the Executive Board could be elected for more than two consecutive terms of office; there was, however, nothing to prevent the Conference from electing as a member of the Executive Board a national of the

same country as the one of the outgoing member. The principle of rotation would be facilitated.
(3) He believed that the co-sponsoring delegations were not opposed to the withdrawal of the amendment, and made a formal proposal that it be withdrawn.

(4) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) agreed that the proposed amendment should be withdrawn and expressed the hope that a similar solution would be adopted with regard to the proposal to amend Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure.

(5) It was agreed to retain paragraph 3 of Article V unamended.

(6) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) expressed his delegation's agreement with the withdrawal of the amendment to paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution, as proposed by the United States delegation, the existing paragraph 3 remaining in force.
(7) He did not clearly see how the rest of the amendment would be drafted in regard to continuation of the membership of a country which had already been elected, there being, as he understood, no fresh text designed to modify the existing paragraph 3 in that respect.

(8) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that any final decision in the matter lay not with the Administrative Commission but with the General Conference. If there were no further objections, he would consider the amendment to paragraph 3 of Article V as having been withdrawn.

(9) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that, in view of the official interpretation that Member States could be re-elected for more than two consecutive terms, his delegation must formulate the most explicit reservations.

(10) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) stated in what way the word "resignation" in paragraph 4 should be interpreted.
(11) Although a member of the Board represented his Government, he should tender his resignation to the Board (which could accept or refuse it) personally, as a member of the Board, that resignation had nothing to do with the resignation a government representative handed in to his Government. It should be made clear that the resignation of a Board member could not be handed in by the member's government.
(12) Mr. Haguiwara asked for his statement to be recorded in the minutes.

(13) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) supported the Japanese delegate's statement and asked the Australian and United Kingdom delegates whether, as co-sponsors, they agreed with that interpretation.

(14) Mr. KELLY (Australia) thought that the new text of paragraph 4 as proposed was an improvement on the corresponding clause in the Constitution, since it contained an indirect reference to the considerations which should be taken into account when electing members to the Executive Board.

(15) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) dwelt on the dangers inherent in the new provision. He thought that the existing text, of which one clause stipulated that the substitute would be chosen from among the former delegates of the State concerned, and another clause that the choice would be submitted to the General Conference at the following session, contained more safeguards for the Organization.

(16) The CHAIRMAN, in the absence of further comments, put to the vote the text of paragraph 4 of Article V of the Constitution as amended by the United States delegation.

(17) Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted by 47 votes to 4 with 1 abstention.

(18) Mr. PAGE (Canada) said that his delegation had always pursued the aims of the Organization as a whole. Although his country was not represented on the Executive Board, his delegation was concerned with ensuring its smooth working. He thought the Constitution should state that the Executive Board exercised its powers on behalf of the General Conference. In that connexion he proposed that paragraph 12 should be replaced by the new text under B. Functions, as proposed by the delegations of Australia, Canada, the United States of America and Colombia in Annex II of document 8C/ADM/1.

(19) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thought the proposal of the Canadian representative reflected a majority opinion in the Commission. Subject to the agreement of the co-sponsors, he would be in favour of the Canadian proposal and would not insist on the deletion of paragraph 12.

(20) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) supported the Canadian proposal, which he found entirely satisfactory.

(21) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) supported the Canadian delegate. He felt that the amendment in question would lead to a better implementation of Unesco's programme.

(22) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Canadian proposal that paragraph 12 of Article V should be altered in conformity with the text proposed by the delegations of Australia, Canada, the United States of America and Colombia in Annex II of document 8C/ADM/1.

(23) The proposal was adopted by 51 votes in favour, with one abstention.

(24) The CHAIRMAN said the amended text of paragraph 13 proposed by the delegation of the United States of America was intended to replace entirely the existing text of the paragraph.

(25) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) asked that the two paragraphs of the Japanese amendment should be considered, and voted on, separately.

(26) With regard to the Japanese amendment, Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) explained that the difference between documents 8C/ADM/1 Add. and 8C/DR/67 was purely a difference of drafting; it was for the Legal Committee to choose between the two.
(27) As it had been decided that members of the Executive Board should henceforth be government representatives, the most logical way of renewing the Board would possibly be to adopt the United States solution, whereby the whole of the Board would be changed.
(28) However, since the members of the Executive Board had received a four-year mandate from the General Conference at its seventh session, there was some objection to that course, even if it were legally practicable.
(29) It would perhaps be better to arrange for the non-retiring members, provided they were so authorized by their governments, to be able to remain on the Board for the transitional period. That policy would contribute towards continuity in the direction of the Organization, which was highly desirable.
(30) For those reasons, the Japanese delegation regarded the renewal, at present, of half the Board as the best solution.
(31) Reverting to the problem involved in the increase of the number of Board members, Mr. Haguiwara thought it would be preferable to elect twelve new members, of whom one, chosen by lot, would have a mandate expiring at the end of the ninth session (not the eighth, as erroneously stated in document 8C/DR/67).
(32) In answer to a question from the Belgian delegate, Mr. Haguiwara explained that paragraph (a) in document 8C/DR/67 only replaced paragraph (a) of the transitional provisions as they appeared in document 8C/ADM/1 Add.

(33) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom), while appreciating the arguments presented by the representative of Japan, was unable to agree with his proposal as a whole. The co-sponsored draft ensured continuity. Furthermore, there was nothing to prevent a government from nominating to the Executive Board another of its nationals who had thitherto been serving in another capacity.
(34) Also it would be inelegant to place a member of the Executive Board in the position of having to consider resignation from the Board merely because of the modification of its structure.
(35) Finally, the procedure outlined by the representative of Japan was too complicated.
(36) For the reasons he had stated he would urge the Commission to adopt the co-sponsored draft.

(37) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) drew the Commission's attention to certain problems raised by the proposed Japanese amendment.
(38) The purpose of the amendment was to give Board members whose terms of office had not yet expired an opportunity of remaining on the Board, but - and the point was important - in the capacity of government representatives.
(39) That amending effect on a vote previously given could only be legal to the extent that all parties concerned accepted it. The question therefore arose by what method the agreement between the governments and those concerned on the continuance of those mandates should be signified.
(40) If the agreement of the governments and the members concerned were given at once, the Conference could take note of it before voting on the renewal of half the Executive Board.
(41) The alternative was to consider that the silence of the governments and persons concerned implied consent, and that the Executive Board had only to appoint a substitute in the event of a member indicating that he was unable to continue in office. To avoid any difficulties in the future, the Administrative Commission would have to adopt a very clear position on the subject.
(42) Mr. Saba considered that the new paragraph (a) submitted in document 8C/DR/67 implied something more than a mere drafting change, since it entailed the drawing of lots between the twelve new members instead of between the two extra members.

(43) Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) concurred with the judicious remarks of the United Kingdom delegate. If the Japanese proposal were accepted, the Executive Board would become a mixed body, which would prove difficult to work. Half its members would represent the governments and the other half the General Conference, with resulting disadvantages for the attaining of Unesco's objectives.

(44) Mr. KELLY (Australia) agreed with the views expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Guatemala. He believed that the Commission should recommend that the Executive Board be composed of representatives of Member States, but that it should be responsible to the General Conference. The latter should therefore elect the 22 members of the Executive Board.
(45) The Japanese proposal, if adopted, might give rise to conflicts within the Executive Board or between members of the Board and Member States. He therefore urged the Commission to adopt the revised text proposed jointly by the United States of America, Australia, Brazil and the United Kingdom.

(46) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought it was a mistake to see in the new paragraph (a) more than a drafting change; on that point he disagreed with Mr. Saba.
(47) With regard to the implications of the Japanese amendment, he saw no legal obstacle to the simultaneous presence, on the Board, of members with two different kinds of mandate.
(48) Some people even considered that scheme preferable to the one which had finally been adopted.
(49) Consequently, Mr. Baugniet was opposed to the adoption of paragraph (b) of the Japanese amendment.

(50) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) supported the United States amendment, although he appreciated the helpful intentions of the Japanese delegation in submitting its own amendment. The latter, if voted, might result in legal complications.
(51) The United States proposal did not violate the principle of continuity in the Organization, since the Secretariat was permanent and maintained that continuity.

(52) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) joined the delegates of Guatemala, the United Kingdom and the Philippines in seconding the United States proposal. He considered that the rejection of the Japanese amendment would simplify the problem.

(53) Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) thought the discussion was becoming involved with over-rigid principles. Realities must be kept in view: between the Board members representing their governments, and the National Commissions and various governmental bodies there would be close contact and practical working agreement, and that argued for a complete renewal of the Board.
(54) However the Monsignor did not deny the advantages of coexistence - assuredly peaceful - between two categories of members, as favoured by the Belgian delegate; and he recommended the adoption of paragraph (a) of the Japanese amendment.

(55) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) did not wish to go into the legal implications of the problem but thought it was important, if the structure of the Executive Board were to be modified, to determine the position of those of its members who had already served a number of years under the old system. In his opinion the procedure outlined by the Japanese representative should be adopted, since it recognized the principle of continuity and also introduced a greater element of fairness; it would, furthermore, contribute to the efficient working of the Executive Board.

(56) Mr. RAADI (Iran) stressed two important aspects of the question.
(57) Firstly, the United States proposal, unlike the Japanese amendment, was in the nature not of a transitional provision, but rather of a draconian measure.
(58) Secondly, the Japanese amendment was the only one likely to ensure a transition which would safeguard both the human aspect of the problem and the requirement that the Organization's new programme should be carried out under the part control of those who had played so large a part in drawing it up.
(59) Morevoer, the United States delegate himself favoured the Japanese amendment.

(60) In the opinion of Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua), the votes already registered required the changing of twenty members of the Board and the election of twenty-two. The changing, logically, should be complete and not partial, since a real constitutional reform had been carried out.

(61) Mr. TREJOS DITTEL (Costa Rica) thought that the Executive Board should be renewed completely, since in that way a fair and equitable geographical distribution would be achieved. In the nine years of Unesco's existence, the American continent, and more particularly Central America and the Antilles, had never been adequately represented on the Board.

(62) Mr. JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia), remarking that his delegation had followed the discussion with care, said that he appreciated the Japanese delegation's desire to maintain established tradition. He thought however that tradition could be preserved in other ways, and that it would be more logical to proceed to a complete renewal of the Board.

(63) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation found itself in a somewhat difficult situation, since it fully appreciated the strong arguments put forward in favour of the Japanese proposal. It was true that the latter guaranteed the principles of fairness and continuity, but the proposal of the United States of America was less complicated. He firmly believed that, if the United States proposal were adopted, the principle of fairness would be safeguarded, but he would vote for the Japanese draft and would propose the United States text only if the former were rejected.

(64) Mr. KELLY (Australia), speaking as one of the co-sponsors of the text submitted by the United States delegation, said that withdrawal of United States support for the text did not imply that the co-sponsors were in agreement with that decision and were also willing to abandon their text.

(65) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil), likewise speaking as a co-sponsor of the United States amendment, reminded the Commission that it had made its choice, by a big majority, between the two types of mandate, and that it should draw the logical consequences from that action.
(66) He thought it would be difficult for the Board to work harmoniously and effectively if it were composed of members with different responsibilities and votes of unequal weight, some members being freer and others more tied, although they would all have to answer to the General Conference in the same way.
(67) Mr. Berredo Carneiro agreed therefore with the Latin American delegates, and would not support the Japanese amendment.

(68) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan), emphasizing the need for transitional provisions, asked for the United States proposal to be adopted in the event of the Japanese amendment being rejected.
(69) He then reminded the Commission that, according to a resolution adopted by the General Conference at its seventh session, ten days' notice of elections to the Board should be given, in order to allow time for candidates to be put forward.
(70) Mr. Haguiwara wondered whether that provision was compulsory or not, i.e. whether it meant that no further candidates could now be nominated.
(71) Governments whose nationals on the Board were not due to retire would want to nominate candidates if the United States amendment were adopted as it stood. But, as some governments would have to consult the National Commission, or the ministry or university to which the proposed candidate belonged, a certain time would be required before he could be nominated.
(72) That could cause confusion when the election took place, and the governments that had already put forward their candidates would thus have an advantage over the others.

(73) Mr. Haguiwara asked whether that provision regarding the election of the Board was compulsory or not.
(74) He also asked for information as to the effect which the adoption of the United States amendment would have on the provisions governing re-eligibility.

(75) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) read out the resolution which the Japanese delegate had alluded to (7C/Resolutions, res. 42.2 - 42.24, p.107) and explained that it was only a recommendation, despite the fact that some delegations had wanted it to be otherwise at the time when it was discussed.
(76) In any case, Rule 95, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure was perfectly clear: "Only delegates nominated ... before the ballot, may stand for election." Nominations could therefore be accepted up till the last moment.
(77) In connexion with re-eligibility, Mr. Saba considered that members of the Board could receive two successive mandates, no matter what the duration of those mandates happened to be. Under the existing texts, which the proposed amendments sought to modify, members who, under the transitional provisions, had had their mandates somewhat extended would not be re-eligible.
(78) Under the new transitional provisions, unless stated to the contrary, re-eligibility should be taken as meaning re-eligibility without any limit of time, no matter how long the previous term or terms happened to be.

(79) The CHAIRMAN recalled that paragraph (a) dealing with transitional provisions as submitted by the Japanese delegation in document 8C/DR/67 was intended to replace only paragraph (a) of the Japanese draft amendment contained in the Annex to document 8C/ADM/1 Add.
(80) He put paragraph (a), in its amended form, to the vote. It obtained 21 votes to 19 against, with 14 abstentions.

(81) The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the amended text of paragraph (a) as submitted by the Japanese delegation was not adopted.

(82) The CHAIRMAN said that, since paragraph (a) of the Japanese proposal had not been adopted, there was no need to vote on paragraph (b).
(83) He put to the vote the amended text of paragraph 13 of Article V as proposed by the United States of America in Annex III of document 8C/ADM/1, which obtained 47 votes against 1, with 5 abstentions.

(84) The required two-thirds majority having been obtained, paragraph 13, as amended, was adopted.

(85) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal of the United States of America (8C/ADM/1, Annex III) as a whole and as amended in the course of the discussion. The proposal received 46 votes in favour and 6 against; there was 1 abstention.

(86) The required two-thirds majority having been obtained, the draft amendment as a whole and as modified was adopted.

(87) The CHAIRMAN said that the Administrative Commission had still to consider the amendments to the Rules of Procedure consequential upon the amendments to the Constitution adopted by the Commission.

(88) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) proposed that, since the amendments to the Rules of Procedure were entirely consequential upon the amendments to the Constitution adopted by the Administrative Commission, their consideration should be left to the Legal Committee. In order to facilitate such a measure his delegation agreed to withdraw its proposal to delete paragraph 3 of Rule 30 on the functions of the Nominations Committee (document 8C/ADM/3 (II)).

(89) Mr. FERRARA MARINO (Cuba) said that, in order to expedite matters, his delegation would also withdraw its proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure (document 8C/ADM/3 (IV), Annex I).

(90) The CHAIRMAN said that the Administrative Commission would be in a position to adopt the Rules of Procedure as amended after the Legal Committee had considered the matter. If the Commission agreed that the amendments to the Rules of Procedure were entirely consequential upon the amendments to the Constitution it had adopted, he proposed that consideration of the amendments to the Rules of Procedure should be referred to the Legal Committee.

(91) It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# NINTH MEETING

*20 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONTRIBUTIONS: SCALE, CURRENCY AND COLLECTION OF MEMBER STATES CONTRIBUTIONS (document 8C/ADM/31)**

(1) *The Commission proceeded to the study of the* second interim report of the Contributions Committee (document 8C/ADM/31).

(2) Mr. BOW (Rapporteur of the Committee on Contributions) said that his Committee had been conscious of the desire of the Commission to consider the Committee's report at an early stage. It had also realized that it was under an obligation to protect the financial structure of the Organization.
(3) In the first place, the Committee had decided that the Unesco scale of contributions should be based on the United Nations scale.
(4) As regarded the question of a ceiling on contributions, the Committee had confirmed a decision taken at the third session of the General Conference, to the effect that, in principle, no single Member State should contribute more than one-third of the budget appropriations.
(5) The Committee had been of the opinion that the question of minimum contributions should be reconsidered at the ninth session of the General Conference.
(6) *It had decided that, for 1955-56, the principle* of a per capita limitation on the contributions by Member States should apply.
(7) As regarded special percentages, the Committee was recommending that Austria's theoretical percentage for 1955-56 be 0.33%, on the understanding that in 1957-58 it should be brought up to whatever was the full United Nations figure recommended for that period. China had requested that its contribution be reduced to $14,000 a year; the Committee had decided that the matter ought to be reconsidered at the ninth session of the General Conference.
(8) The Committee had decided to recommend that the contributions of Associate Members should be assessed at 60% of the minimum percentage assessment of full members.
(9) The above-mentioned principles had been applied in the draft resolution to be found on page 5 of the report. In paragraph 5 of the original draft resolution, it had been stipulated that the United States contribution should remain at 33.33% of the total. That stipulation had been deleted by the Committee.

(10) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines), seconded by Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), then formally moved that the Commission should recommend the General Conference to adopt the resolution on page 5.

(11) Mr. SOLDATOV (*Union of Soviet Socialist* Republics) considered that the percentage contributions fixed for the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR were too high, and that, in establishing them - as had occurred previously in the United Nations - three facts had been overlooked: (1) the enormous losses suffered by Soviet economy during the second world war; (2) the difficulties encountered by the USSR in procuring foreign currency; (3) the contribution made by the USSR to other Specialized Agencies or programmes of the United Nations (such as ILO and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance).
(12) The percentage contributions of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR should not exceed 10% and 1% respectively, and that of the Byelorussian SSR should be 0.45% of the total budget figure decided by Unesco. There was, on the other hand, no reason for reducing the contribution of the United States of America.
(13) His delegation accordingly requested the Administrative Commission to bear that opinion in mind, and moved the amendment of the draft resolution put forward by the Committee on Contributions (document 8C/ADM/31).

(14) The Commission then proceeded to discuss the resolution paragraph by paragraph.

(15) Paragraph 1 was adopted and the meeting passed on to paragraph 2.

(16) Mr. DUDNIK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), referring to the remarks made by the delegate of the USSR, emphasized the difficulties his country was experiencing in procuring foreign hard currency.
(17) He therefore asked that the scale of contributions in use at the United Nations should not be taken as the basis for the establishment of the scale of contributions applicable to the Member States of Unesco.
(18) He thought it right that his country's contribution should not exceed 1 per cent - the percentage accepted by the International Labour Office.

(19) Mr. KAVALEVSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) endorsed the foregoing statement and, for the same reasons as those given by Mr. Soldatov, asked that his country's contribution should not exceed .45 per cent.
(20) He believed that every just measure was likely to contribute to international friendship and

understanding, even though it might apply in a field that was not of the highest importance.

(21) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) admitted the cogency of the arguments put forward by the delegates of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR; he was far from underestimating the efforts those countries were making to redress their national economies.
(22) However, it seemed to him that, in departing from the strict principles on which the United Nations scale was based, the Commission might find itself on the dangerous ground of arbitrary notions drawn from inaccurate statistics.
(23) For identical reasons, the Brazilian delegation would agree neither to the USSR proposal nor the United Kingdom proposal, whatever their respective intrinsic merits.
(24) The speaker wondered, however, whether it would not be possible, for the period 1955-56, to find a transitional compromise that would be satisfactory to the Soviet delegation whilst taking account of the United Nations scale, and to revert to the question at a later date when that organization's Committee on Contributions had had an opportunity of reviewing the existing scale on the basis of new data.

(25) The CHAIRMAN understood that the delegate of the Soviet Union was proposing a formal amendment to paragraph 2 of the resolution, to the effect that the contributions of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR should not represent more than 10%, 1% and 0.45% respectively of the total appropriations.

(26) Mr. BUSTAMANTE (El Salvador) admitted the weight of the reasons adduced by the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR in support of their claim for a reduction of their contributions. He added, however, that a number of small countries which were in a position to use similar arguments had refrained from doing so because they were aware that a request of that kind would be disastrous for Unesco; it was to be hoped that the three delegations which had made the request realized its implications.

(27) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) said that he, too, understood the reasons for the Soviet amendment. It would, however, be a mistake to depart from the United Nations scale without fuller information.

(28) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) said that the Committee had considered the points raised by the Soviet member of the United Nations Committee on Contributions (page 3 of the report). The Committee had agreed with the view expressed in the report by the United Nations Committee on Contributions, namely, that dislocation of a country's national economy due to the effects of war was reflected in that country's statistics for the national income. It had, therefore, by a majority vote, rejected the Soviet motion.

(29) Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua) thought that the Soviet proposal was illogical and that the contributions at present assigned should be maintained. If the small countries of Central America were making real sacrifices in order to pay their contributions, there was no acceptable reason why countries belonging to a continent in full economic development and master of its own fate should not be able to do so.

(30) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that it was obvious that neither the Committee on Contributions of the United Nations - where the question of the contributions of the USSR had been debated in great detail - nor Unesco's Committee on Contributions had paid sufficient heed to the difficulties encountered by his country in procuring foreign currency, or to the fact that it was already contributing considerable sums towards the operation of other Specialized Agencies of the United Nations.
(31) The Soviet Union was of course aware of the economic and currency difficulties encountered by other countries, especially the smaller ones. But it trusted that the enormous difficulties and numerous problems that its people had had to face as a result of the second world war would be taken into account by the Administrative Commission.

(32) The CHAIRMAN thereupon put to the vote the *Soviet amendment to paragraph 2 of the resolution.* The amendment took the form of a motion: "That the Administrative Commission should recommend the General Conference to decide that the contributory shares of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR should be fixed at 10%, 1% and 0.45% respectively."

(33) The amendment was rejected by 37 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

(34) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) moved the inclusion of a paragraph to the effect that the United States contribution remain fixed at 33.33%.
(35) In deciding on the scale of contributions, Unesco should be guided by the highly technical work already done in the United Nations Committee on Contributions. That Committee had decided that the following factors should be borne in mind in assessing a country's contribution: (1) the comparative income per head; (2) any temporary dislocation to its economy caused by the second world war; and (3) its ability to procure foreign currency.
(36) If those criteria were applied, the United States contribution would be no less than 48%. The United Nations had arbitrarily decided to limit the United States contribution to one-third of the total on the general grounds that it was undesirable for any one State to finance an international organization to so great an extent.
(37) His delegation considered that the Commission should follow the United Nations example, and decide that the United States contribution should remain one-third of the total. Any reduction below that figure would obscure the relation between a country's contribution and its capacity to pay.
(38) In the Committee on Contributions, the delegate of France had said that it would be inequitable if the United States of America were the only country not

to benefit by a reduction of its percentage made possible by the admission of new Member States. But that point would only be significant if the new countries joining were not members of the United Nations. On page 4 of the report there was a list of such countries. Their total contribution amounted to 12.57% of the total. Even if 12.57 were subtracted from 48, the result still exceeded 33.33. Hence no arguments based on the fact that Unesco had more members than the United Nations would hold water.

(39) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) seconded the United Kingdom motion.

(40) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) recognized the merits of arguments put forward by the United Kingdom delegate. Nevertheless, he again urged the Commission not to open the door to considerations that were too far removed from the criteria hitherto applied.
(41) He was certainly not pleading in favour of the request from the United States of America for a reduction in the rate of their contribution - far from that - but it seemed to him difficult to yield at that juncture to arguments which, although they worked in the opposite direction, were nevertheless similar to those he had a short while ago opposed.
(42) He therefore would be glad if the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions or the Director-General's representative could give some explanations on the method of calculating the contributions, so that he could, if need be, revise his present interpretation.

(43) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) referred the Commission to the terms of reference of the United Nations Committee on Contributions. It was specified that, while United Nations expenses should be apportioned according to the capacity of the various countries to pay, it was, nevertheless, difficult to effect such an apportionment by statistical means; it was further stated that national income seemed to be the best guide, but that other factors (income per head, temporary dislocation due to the war, and ability to procure foreign currency) had to be borne in mind.

(44) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) said that, as regards the basic principles advanced by the delegate of the United Kingdom, he was in complete agreement. It was not appropriate for the Commission to revise the calculations already made by the United Nations, and it should therefore abide by the existing United Nations assessment.

(45) Mr. SCOTT (United States of America), as a newcomer, welcomed the opportunity of joining in the Commission's deliberations, and expressed his conviction, as a former aide to the President of the United States of America, that mutual understanding would lead to a lasting peace.
(46) He was much impressed by the thorough study underlying the recommendations now before the Commission. His interest in the point at issue was no mere academic one, since he would be called on to justify the decisions taken at the Conference before the Congress of the United States of America.
(47) The United States of America was glad to see, in the resolution before the Commission, that it had been possible to implement the principle that no country should pay a higher per capita contribution than the country paying the highest contribution.
(48) The lack of any specific mention of a percentage figure for the United States of America meant that the United States contribution would be adjusted to allow for the difference in membership between the United Nations (60 members) and Unesco (72). It would, that is to say, be reduced to 30% of the total.
(49) The delegate of the United Kingdom had proposed that, come what might, the United States of America, as the largest contributor, should always have to pay 33.33% unless there was a radical change in the relative capacity to pay. His arguments might seem plausible, but he (the speaker) agreed with the delegate of Brazil in thinking that they were seriously inequitable.
(50) While fully recognizing that capacity to pay was a relevant consideration, it was surely important that rights and obligations should be equitably shared and that no one country should have a preponderance of power in any international organization. It was for that latter reason that a ceiling of 33.33% had been set for the contribution of any one Member State, but there was no reason why that figure should not be reduced if there were a substantial increase in the membership of the Organization.
(51) If the United Kingdom proposal were adopted, and the United States contribution remained at 33.33%, then, if the budget stayed at the existing figure of $18,000,000 for two years, the contribution of every country would be reduced, except in the case of the United States of America and perhaps in the case of those countries the contributions of which were assessed at the minimum level of 0.04%. The United Kingdom contribution would be reduced from nearly $2,000,000 to roughly $1,400,000.
(52) If the budget were increased, as recommended by the Director-General, to approximately $21,000,000, only the United States contribution would be definitely increased, and that by more than a million dollars. At the same time the United Kingdom contribution would be reduced from nearly $2,000,000 to $1,550,000. He could supply figures to show the reductions for all other Member States.
(53) The adoption of the United Kingdom proposal could hardly be considered equitable, nor would it be in the interests of Unesco, since it would render Unesco considerably more dependent than in the past on the contributions of one country, the United States of America.
(54) It was important to realize that, if the proposal were adopted, the friends of Unesco in the United States of America would have great difficulty in justifying the Unesco budget before Congress and in securing the necessary funds.
(55) He earnestly hoped that the Commission and the Conference would be able to support the view that the United States of America should share in the adjustment of percentage contributions made possible by the accession of new Member States, i.e. that the United States contribution for the following two years should be reduced to 30% of the total budget. In so requesting, he was not asking that the ceiling figure of 33.33% should be abandoned - merely that the

United States of America should be allowed to benefit from an adjustment made possible by circumstances.
(56) Only if such an adjustment were made could his delegation accept any increase in the budget, having been given emphatic instructions to vote against any budget increase requiring a larger cash contribution from his country than was being made at that moment.

(57) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) agreed with the points made by the various speakers who had opposed the United Kingdom proposal. It was impossible to separate the question at issue from the question of a possible increase in the budget. The fact that it would be exceedingly difficult or impossible for the United States delegation to accept any budget increase if the proposal were adopted had to be given due weight.

(58) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that the principle that no one Member State should contribute more than a third of the budget did not mean that a State could be compelled to pay a third of the budget no matter what the circumstances.
(59) Several new Member States had joined Unesco, with the result that every Member State, except those paying the minimum contribution, would enjoy some reduction in its contribution. Under the United Kingdom proposal, the only country not so affected would be the United States of America, which would be most unfair. There was no doubt about the United States capacity to pay, but at the same time it had to be borne in mind that the United States of America was spending a lot of money on purposes allied to those of Unesco, and that the very large United States contribution to the finances of Unesco was to some extent a voluntary one.

(60) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) agreed with what had been said in favour of a reduction in the United States contribution.
(61) He was specially concerned by paragraph (b) on the first page of the report (minimum contribution). What were the reasons which had prompted certain members of the Committee to take the view that a contribution of less than 0.04% would be unreasonably small?
(62) His country's capacity to pay was very slight. Out of the total population of Jordan, nearly one-half were refugees, and, of them, only 11,000 could subsist without aid. Jordan was dependent on the United Kingdom for foreign currency, and Jordan's contribution to Unesco was frequently criticized in the Parliament of Jordan as being excessive. He very much doubted whether his Government would agree to pay a larger one.
(63) It was not fair to class Jordan with other countries which were richer and could better afford the minimum contribution.

(64) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that there was no minimum in the Unesco scale. The figure of 0.04% had been arrived at by converting the lowest United Nations figures into the Unesco scale in the same way as had been done for all the other Member States. The coefficient applied did not affect the smaller percentages as it did the larger ones.

(65) Mr. RIANO JAUMA (Cuba) was opposed to any increase in the scale of contributions, and supported the proposed adjustment, not only with regard to the United States of America but also with regard to other members which, like Cuba, were already contributing large sums.

(66) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) asked whether the minimum rate of 0.04 per cent was at that time applied or whether it was simply a recommendation; whether, in other words, the percentage for certain countries was likely to be higher than the theoretical percentage obtained by calculation.

(67) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) referred the Commission to paragraph (b) on page 1 of the report. There was no fixed minimum percentage, although the Committee on Contributions had recommended that, for 1955-56, the minimum Unesco contribution should be reached by converting the minimum percentage (United Nations scale) into the Unesco scale.
(68) The first column in document 8C/DIV/83 showed the percentages in the United Nations scale for 1955. Column 3 showed the United Nations scale adjusted for per capita income. The figures in Column 3 had then been added to give a total of 111.06%, and in Column 4 had been converted into the Unesco scale (100%) by a process of simple mathematics. The coefficient applied to the figure 0.04% in Column 3 had not been sufficient to bring it down to 0.03%. He would repeat that the figure of 0.04% was not a fixed minimum; it had merely been arrived at by calculation.

(69) Mr. BRICHET (France) thought the suggestion made by the United Kingdom delegate extremely dangerous, for it was likely to jeopardize any increase in Unesco's budget.
(70) As he had already said in the Programme and Budget Commission, it would not be fair if the United States of America were the only country not to benefit from the general reduction made possible by the admission of new Member States.
(71) The French delegation's argument, however, was based on considerations peculiar to Unesco, and it should not be used as a precedent for the fixing of scales of contributions in other Specialized Agencies.
(72) Hence, the French delegation could not accept the USSR delegation's argument concerning parity with the International Labour Office.
(73) In conclusion, Mr. Brichet said that he would reject the motion submitted by the United Kingdom delegate and would approve the draft resolution contained in document 8C/ADM/31.

(74) Mr. BARRIOS (Nicaragua) remarked that, since the main issue to be considered was the life of Unesco itself, it would be best to maintain contributions at the present level, and to use the resources brought in by new Member States in order to strengthen the technical assistance activities.

(75) Mr. PRATT (Australia) said that there was already a great disparity between 48% and 33.33% and there was no justification for a further reduction

to 30% in the United States contribution. The proposal, if accepted, might well open the way for further requests for reductions at a later date.

(76) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) said that, in estimating minimum contributions, the United Nations had not made use of any reliable survey of the national income in countries not members of the United Nations. He did not see why the Committee on Contributions had not carried its calculations to three places of decimals, which would have been fairer to the countries at the bottom of the scale.

(77) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) said that only the accession to Unesco of countries not already members of the United Nations might conceivably be used as an argument to justify a reduction in the United States contribution. That point, however, had been made by nobody.
(78) The Soviet proposal for a reduction in the contributions paid by the USSR and the Byelorussian and Ukrainian SSRs had at least invoked the principles adopted by the United Nations Committee on Contributions, namely, dislocation due to war, ability to pay, etc. He could not agree that his delegation was guilty of any inconsistency in opposing the Soviet proposal while at the same time opposing any reduction in the United States proposal.
(79) He sympathized with the difficulties experienced by the United States of America in securing funds for its contribution to Unesco. But if the United States of America were allowed to reduce its contribution other Member States might follow suit and say that they too, could agree to a higher budget if they were not required to pay more themselves.

(80) The United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 2, for the addition of the words "The United States contribution shall be fixed at 33.33%" was put to the vote and rejected by 34 votes to 15, with 2 abstentions.

(81) The CHAIRMAN said that any motion in connexion with minimum rates of contribution could appropriately be submitted.

(82) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan), referring to the passage in the report of the Committee on Contributions dealing with the Chinese Government's request for its contribution to be reduced to $14,000 a year, asked whether the Committee, when it had decided to defer examination of that question until the ninth session, had at least received an assurance of part payment.
(83) He also wished to know in which category of receipts that reduced contribution would be included.

(84) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) confirmed that the Chinese delegation had offered to pay a token contribution of $14,000 a year. Under the Financial Regulations, any payment from a Member State had to be to pay off the amount owed to the Working Capital Fund. That had been done with the $14,000 received for 1954.

(85) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) reminded the Commission of the difficulties experienced in previous years owing to the considerable difference between the theoretical budget and the real budget of the Organization.
(86) Since it was expected that all the Member States except China would pay their contributions in full for the financial period 1955-56, the budget would be greatly simplified if it included the exact sum China could pay, and not its theoretical contribution.
(87) Mr. Haguiwara accordingly submitted a motion, in the form of an addition to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which read: "The contribution by China for 1955-56 shall be 0.16 per cent without prejudice to any decision that may be taken by the ninth session of the General Conference."

(88) The CHAIRMAN asked whether there were any seconders for that motion.

(89) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium), Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil), and Mr. SCOTT (United States of America) supported the motion.

(90) It was decided to resume discussion at the afternoon meeting.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# TENTH MEETING

*20 November 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONTRIBUTIONS: SCALE, CURRENCY AND COLLECTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER STATES (documents 8C/ADM/31 and 8C/ADM/32) (continued)**

(1) The Committee continued its examination of the second interim report of the Committee on Contributions (document 8C/ADM/31).

(2) The CHAIRMAN read out the proposed amendment by the delegate of Japan to paragraph 2 of the resolution (English text p. 5 of the document), which had been submitted at the previous meeting:

"The contribution of China for the period 1955-56 shall be 0.16% without prejudice to any decision which may be taken by the ninth session of the General Conference."

(3) Mr. SCOTT (United States of America) supported the proposed amendment on the grounds that it would provide more money for the Organization. Although the reduction of China's contribution would mean a corresponding increase in the contributions of other members, Unesco would be given its anticipated working budget.

(4) Mr. EL-ZAYAT (Egypt) pointed out that the Financial Regulations would require that any contributions from China should be set against the advance from the Working Capital Fund, and at the rate of $14,000 it would take more than two hundred years to write off China's debt. If the Commission was going to recommend that China's arrears should be written off or frozen, it must be prepared to face requests for similar action in respect of other Member States.

(5) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) said that the force of the proposal by the Committee on Contributions lay in the fact that it followed the same principle in assessing the contributions of all countries. He did not see why China should not be assessed on the basis of what it could pay.

(6) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) opposed the Japanese delegate's amendment. The Commission had already taken a decision to assess Member States on the basis of the United Nations scale, and it had been pointed out that it was not possible to take into account the ability of individual members to pay their contributions. He did not understand the argument of the United States delegate, since one member's contribution could be reduced only at the expense of other members.

(7) Mr. HU CHING YU (China) said that, as he understood it, the new assessment for China proposed by the Japanese delegate was a temporary measure and subject to review by the ninth session of the General Conference, the percentage of 0.16% representing the sum that the Chinese Government proposed to pay Unesco annually until it was in a position to meet its obligations in full. Its adoption would not therefore solve the problem facing the Commission. The Chinese Government had made two proposals to Unesco: one, that China's contribution should be reassessed and reduced to a figure not exceeding $14,000; the other, that payment of arrears should be subject to negotiation when China's financial position had improved. The Japanese delegate's amendment only dealt with the first.

(8) Nevertheless, if the Commission was prepared to adopt the resolution in order to give the Organization a more satisfactory budget, the Chinese delegation, although not benefiting by the proposal, would support it, in the wish to be co-operative.

(9) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) wanted to know if the proposal under consideration implied increasing the amount in dollars of each Member States's contribution or reducing the budget as a whole. The Polish delegation had already drawn the Conference's attention to the absurd fiction upon which China's representation rested. It could hardly approve a proposal that would result in the other States having to bear the financial consequences of that fiction.

(10) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) admitted that for several years the payments made by China had not corresponded with that country's quota. The General Conference had recognized the principle of token contributions in China's case. On the other hand, he did not think it would be possible to change China's United Nations quota.

(11) Nevertheless, he favoured the Japanese delegation's proposal. It seemed to him preferable to take some practical step rather than to make two calculations, one based on China's normal quota, one on the token contribution of $14,000 paid into the Working Capital Fund. The Japanese delegation's proposal would mean that that sum would be included in the normal budget, it being understood that it was only a token payment. China's unpaid contributions were another matter and had nothing to do with that proposal.

(12) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) said that there was a divergence of opinion on the implications of the amendment. He asked if the Secretariat could explain its effect on the contributions of other Member States.

(13) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that a reduction in the percentage of China would cause a corresponding increase in the percentage of other members. In the case of the Union of South Africa, for example, the assessment would rise to 0.74%.

(14) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reiterated the view of the Soviet delegation, stated in the Credentials Committee, the Committee on Contributions, and the plenary meetings, that the Chinese delegation did not represent China. He accordingly opposed the amendment.

(15) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) considered that the Japanese delegate's proposal concerning a country which had defaulted for many years would impose an unfair burden on other members. He therefore opposed the amendment.

(16) Mr. PRATT (Australia) also opposed it, because it was in direct contradiction to the procedure which the Commission had, after much discussion, agreed to adopt.

(17) Mr. ATTAGARA (Thailand) supported the amendment, provided it would not prejudice China's position in Unesco. It would be better, as the United States delegate had suggested, to maintain the budget ceiling of $18,000,000 and calculate on the contributions which the Organization was certain to receive, even though the percentages for other members than China would be increased.

(18) Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand) opposed the amendment for the reason stated by the Australian delegate, namely that it had already been agreed to recommend assessment of China on the basis of the United Nations scale. However, he would favour consideration of how China might be given voting rights without paying her full contribution.

(19) Mr. DE HOOG (Netherlands) reminded the Commission that it had been decided to bring the United States contribution down to 30 per cent. Could the proposal under consideration affect the decision made at the morning meeting? Mr. de Hoog also wanted to know what the Netherlands' percentage would be if the proposal were adopted.

(20) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the United States assessment would vary according to the assessment adopted for China, probably by about one per cent.

(21) In reply to the second question, if the Japanese amendment were adopted, the Netherlands quota would be 1.19% instead of 1.13%.

(22) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) appreciated the reasons for the Japanese proposal, but said that there were more important considerations to be taken into account. The proposal to reduce China's assessment to 0.16% raised the question how far it was possible for an unrealistic scale to be maintained without interference with the general principles adopted in laying down Unesco's scale of contributions. As the delegate of Egypt had pointed out, if Unesco accepted a change in the scale of assessment for one country, it could not refuse to do so for others. In an organization like Unesco, it was essential to keep to principles and he therefore opposed the amendment.

(23) In reply to the previous speakers, Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) drew attention to the data given in document 8C/DIV/93. On the basis of a percentage of 5.06 and a total budget of $18,000,000, China's contribution would be $910,800. But, as things were known to be, that sum would not be paid, and Unesco's budget would be brought down to $17,089,200.

(24) The Japanese delegation's proposal would change China's percentage, and consequently those of the other Member States. But the Japanese delegation thought that the real budget total ($17,089,200) should be taken as a basis of calculations, not the fictitious figure of $18,000,000. In that case, although the other Member States' percentages would be slightly raised, their actual contributions in dollars would be exactly the same, and the Organization would have the same budget as it had under the existing scheme.

(25) On the other hand, the Programme Commission might decide to adopt the higher budget ceiling. But the United States delegation had stated that its country could not pay more than it was paying already, i.e. $6,000,000 for the two years. The higher budget ceiling was approximately $21,000,000. If the United States percentage had to be 30, and if their contribution could not exceed $6,000,000 it would be impossible to take a total of more than $20,000,000 as a basis for calculations. From that sum, $1,000,000 representing China's contribution at the existing rate, would have to be deducted. That would leave a real budget of $19,000,000. It was on that basis that contributions should be calculated, at the percentages altered to take account of China's new coefficient. The Japanese delegation's proposal would therefore give the same results as would be obtained by the existing scale if applied to a total of $21,000,000.

(26) Accordingly, Mr. Haguiwara considered that, after the decisions that had been taken that morning, it would be best not to use the fictitious quota of 5.06 per cent for China. He admitted that his delegation's proposal entailed changing the percentages but he emphasized that the actual contributions depended on the budget ceiling decided on - as he had just shown. Moreover, that proposal was intended only to make budget and contributions easier to calculate, without prejudice to China's legal status.

(27) Mr. DE HOOG (Netherlands) found Mr. Haguiwara's explanations very valuable, and said he would be glad to have them confirmed by the Chairman and the Director-General's representative.

(28) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that, if the contribution scale in document 8C/DIV/93 were adopted and the budget fixed at $18,000,000, the non-receipt of China's contribution of $910,000 would reduce the amount for spending to $17,000,000. If, on the other hand, China's contribution were reduced to 0.16% and credited to the current budget instead of against arrears, the percentage for other members would increase, but the spending budget would still be $18,000,000.
(29) Confirming a clarification by the delegate of Japan, if a ceiling of $17,000,000 were adopted, the percentages of contributions would remain more or less the same as in document 8C/DIV/93.

(30) The CHAIRMAN put the Japanese amendment to the vote and, the results being even, proposed a vote by roll-call in accordance with the provisions of Rule 84 of the Rules of Procedure.

(31) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) said that, as the result of the vote was not in doubt, but showed an equally divided vote, Rule 90, and not Rule 84, should be applied.

(32) In reply to the Pakistani delegate, who proposed an adjournment for consultation, the CHAIRMAN stated that, as a vote had been taken, the Commission must act in accordance with either Rule 90 or Rule 84 of the Rules of Procedure.

(33) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) pointed out that, if there had been any doubt, the officers of the Commission would have said so; as they did not, action must follow Rule 90.

(34) A vote was then taken by roll-call and the results were as follows:
Voted for: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, France, German Federal Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Japan, Korea, Lebanon, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Thailand, United States of America, Yugoslavia.
Voted against: Australia, Burma (Union of), Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, India, Iraq, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, Union of South Africa, USSR, United Kingdom.
Abstentions: Austria, Italy, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland, Uruguay.
Absent: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Laos, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nepal, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, El Salvador, Saudi-Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Venezuela, Viet-Nam.

(35) As the voting was 17 in favour, 17 against, with 6 abstentions and 27 delegations absent, the CHAIRMAN ruled that, in accordance with Rule 90 of the Rules of Procedure, a second vote would be taken in the course of the next meeting of the Commission.

(36) On behalf of the delegate of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, who was unable to be present, Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq) moved the following proposal:
"That the scale of contributions be calculated to the third decimal figure instead of the second decimal figure."

(37) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of Egypt.

(38) In reply to a question from the delegate of New Zealand, Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the effect of the proposal would be to reduce the percentage for the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan from 0.04% to 0.036%, which, on a budget of $18,000,000, would represent an amount of $6,480 instead of $7,200; a reduction of $720 for the two years or $360 for each year.
(39) He pointed out, however, that such a basis of calculation would have an adverse effect in the case of certain countries, as one country could only benefit at the expense of another.

(40) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) did not think that the proposal would make much difference to the country concerned. The United Nations figure was already a round one, but it would be preferable to adopt a minimum scale of 0.035 per cent, while taking the other figures to two decimal places only.

(41) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that in that case the total scale would not reach 100%, since twelve countries were involved. The change could only be made in respect of all members.

(42) The proposal of the delegate of Jordan was put to the vote and rejected by 13 votes to 7 with 14 abstentions.

(43) The Commission passed on to paragraph 3.

(44) In reply to a question from the delegate of Japan, Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that adoption of the theoretical percentages in the United Nations scale would not prejudice his proposal concerning China's contribution. The calculations for the Unesco scale would be affected, but, as could be seen from document 8C/DIV/93, the United Nations percentages were necessary as the basis of calculation for the Unesco scale.

(45) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) reminded the Commission that at the seventh session of the General Conference the Committee on Contributions had inserted the following clause in its report:
"In view of the consultations which had been undertaken by the United Nations but not yet completed in connexion with these theoretical probable percentages, it was agreed that in those cases where the Director-General is notified prior to 1 January 1953 of a change in these percentages, such changes will be taken into account in computing the Unesco scale for 1953 and 1954." (7C/Resolutions, page 85, paragraph V. (d)).
(46) Mr. Haguiwara wanted to know whether the consultations between the appropriate United Nations body and non-Member States were over. If not, he thought that a provision similar to the one adopted at the

seventh session should be included in the Conference's resolutions.

(47) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) said that the report of the United Nations Committee on Contributions stated that the rates of contribution for Unesco members who were not members of the United Nations were subject to consultation with the respective governments. The subject had been included in the agenda of the Administrative Commission, because no information had yet been received on the progress of such consultations.

(48) The proposal of the delegate of Japan, seconded by the delegate of Ceylon, was adopted.

(49) Paragraph 3 was approved.

(50) The Commission went on to examine paragraph 4.

(51) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) asked whether the reduction of the United States contribution from 33.33% to 30% would affect the per capita limitations.

(52) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the figures in paragraph 4 were correct in accordance with the new United States percentage.

(53) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) asked whether the figures would be affected by the fact that the United States percentage would be 31% instead of 30% as a result of the deletion of the Chinese contribution.

(54) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that it would be difficult to reply definitely, but he thought there would be no alteration, because the contributions of other Member States would be increased at the same time.

(55) Paragraph 4 was approved.

(56) Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 were approved without comment and the Commission passed on to paragraph 8.

(57) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) had no objection to the proportion of 60% of the minimum percentage assessment proposed for Associate Members but disapproved of their contributions being accounted for as Miscellaneous Income. Associate Members were a new feature of Unesco, and in breaking new ground it was important to start off with the right procedure, even if the initial sums involved were small. He proposed that paragraph 8 should be amended by deleting the last five words and substituting: "included for the purpose of calculating the scale of contributions for Member States".

(58) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of Belgium.

(59) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) asked for an explanation of paragraph 8, in which the minimum contribution of Associate Members was laid down as 60% of that of Member States.

(60) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that it was not possible to work out what 60% of the minimum percentage of 0.04 would be until the Unesco scales had been calculated on the basis of the United Nations scale. For that reason the last Conference had decided to exclude them from the scale.

(61) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) reminded the Commission that the question of Associate Members would have to be examined again when another document included on the Commission's agenda was discussed. Could the decision they were about to make prejudice that discussion?

(62) Mr. Haguiwara also wanted to know whether adoption of the South African proposal would mean that Associate Members' assessments would be reduced to the basic percentage before the balance was distributed amongst the Member States.

(63) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) proposed that discussion be postponed until the legal implications had been investigated.

(64) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) did not consider that the legal status of Associate Members could be affected by the way in which their contributions were dealt with.

(65) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) agreed with the South African delegate. As to the financial implications, it would have to be borne in mind that, if the contributions were placed in Miscellaneous Income pending calculation, they would not be made use of until the succeeding financial period; and that, if they were fitted into the Unesco scale, they would cause a slight reduction in the figures which had been approved for full Member States. The amount involved, however, was so small that there would be little difference either way.

(66) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) pointed out that, even if the contributions were placed under Miscellaneous Income, they would be used in the current financial period, since allowance was made for them in the budget.

(67) The proposal of the South African delegate was put to the vote and rejected by 18 votes to 10 with 5 abstentions.

(68) Paragraph 8 was approved.

(69) Mr. CHEN YUAN (China), observing that there was no reference in the report of the Contributions Committee to the statement by his delegation on China's right to vote, wanted to know when that question would be discussed by the Commission.

(70) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) replied that the Committee had decided not to deal with the question of the right to vote. In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, the reference in the First Progress Report of the

Contributions Committee concerned the possibility of that Committee pronouncing on certain financial conditions on which the right to vote might depend.

(71) After some discussion, in which it was explained by the representative of the Secretariat that the question of China's right to vote was a matter relating to Unesco's Constitution and could only be dealt with by the full Commission and the Plenary Conference, Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that the question of the right to vote of all members whose rights were under consideration should be included in the agenda of the next meeting of the Commission.

(72) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to his previous statement, said that the Soviet delegation did not recognize any lawful representative of China in Unesco. He asked if the States to which the United States delegate's proposal referred could be named, and a vote taken on each one separately.

(73) Miss LAISE (United States of America) amended her proposal as follows: "That the question of voting rights for China should be taken up on Monday morning."

(74) The proposal of the United States delegate was adopted by 28 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

(75) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) proposed that the Secretariat should obtain the necessary information and draw up a chart comparing the contributions made to Unesco by Member States and their respective national incomes and, if possible, another chart comparing the contributions with the currency availabilities of each State. For many countries, he feared, the payment of their contribution to Unesco meant doing without a new school, a hospital or a tractor.

(76) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that it had been stressed during past Conferences and in the present Contributions Committee that Unesco did not possess the machinery for examining the statistical data necessary to establish the capacity of a Member State to pay its contributions. The responsibility was left to the United Nations statistical office and every effort was made by Unesco to see that Member States knew where to submit their problems in that field. Several members had already availed themselves of the services of that office.

(77) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile), explaining his proposal, said that, as Unesco had to be paid in hard currency, the currency availability of each Member State or, in other words, the dollars at its disposal, should be known.

(78) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether the delegate of Chile could hold back his proposal until a further report had been received from the Contributions Committee, since the question of setting up a committee to deal with such problems was under discussion.

(79) It was agreed that the delegate of Chile should submit his proposal in writing to the Rapporteur of the Contributions Committee and refer it back to the Commission if he was dissatisfied with the action taken.

(80) The Commission next examined the Report of the Committee on Contributions on Methods of Financing the Budget (document 8C/ADM/32).

(81) Mr. BOW (Rapporteur of the Committee on Contributions) said that the Committee had considered how the budget for 1955-56 could be financed and had agreed that the two principal methods were: (1) in accordance with the Financial Regulations and (2) under special financing measures. It had decided to recommend the first method in principle but to point out that there would be a low assessment for 1955-56 compared with 1957-58 and to suggest that the Commission might wish to consider holding over all or part of the contributions received from new members in 1953-54, to avoid such exceptional fluctuations in contributions.

(82) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) moved that the budget be financed in accordance with the Financial Regulations in practice as well as in principle. The practice suggested by the Committee in paragraph 6 of the document would not benefit Member States in the long run, and in the view of the United Kingdom delegation the variation was not large enough to justify a departure from the Financial Regulations.

(83) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegate to delete the words "in principle" in the second line of paragraph 6 (page 3, English text) was seconded by the delegate of Australia and supported by the delegates of Belgium and Mexico.

(84) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) said that it was incumbent on the Organization to apply the Financial Regulations, which were the same for all Specialized Agencies and which had been drawn up for good reasons. The spreading over of contributions was less important than adherence to the Regulations and, moreover, involved two dangers: first, it might induce those framing the budget to exceed priorities; and, secondly, it might make Member States less concerned about paying their contributions.

(85) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said that he had not had time to study the document in detail, for it had just been distributed. Nor did he know what the Committee on Contributions or the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget had decided should be done with the contributions of States admitted during the financial years 1953-54. There were several possible courses:

To use those funds to finance 1954 expenditure.

To redistribute them amongst Member States.

To set up a special fund, to be put at the disposal of the Executive Board for unforeseen requirements.

(86) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the contributions from new Member States for 1953-54, as set out in paragraph (b) on page 3 of the document, amounted to $1,228,216. If the recommendation of

the Contributions Committee were adopted, that sum, together with the other items in paragraph (b), would be deducted from the total budget estimates before calculating the assessments of Member States.

(87) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) wanted to know whether there were any provisions in the regulations for the use of those funds, or whether exceptional income could be used as was thought fit.

(88) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) quoted Financial Regulation 5.2, in accordance with which the sum in question, together with miscellaneous revenue, would be deducted from the budget appropriations for 1955-56.

(89) Mr. CARRERA MOLINA (Guatemala) proposed that the miscellaneous revenue and budget surpluses mentioned on page 3 of the document should be earmarked for financing technical aid and covering the expenses of technical experts attached to institutions within the technical aid programme.

(90) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) asked whether, without prejudice to the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate, the Guatemalan delegate could recommend that for the time being the sum in question should be placed in a reserve fund, the purposes of which should be decided by the Contributions Committee in accordance with the Regulations, and might include, for example, repayment of the loan from the French Government for the new headquarters building.

(91) The CHAIRMAN said that the wording of the Guatemalan delegate's proposal referred to miscellaneous revenue and budget surpluses, but made no mention of contributions from new members.

(92) Mr. CARRERA MOLINA (Guatemala) accepted the suggestion of the United States delegate that the Contributions Committee should decide the purposes for which the funds in question should be used.

(93) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) said that he had had in mind a proposal similar to that of the Guatemalan delegate, which he was seconding, pending consideration by the Contributions Committee of possible uses of those funds other than their redistribution amongst the Member States.

(94) Mr. BRICHET (France) said that his delegation too was not in favour of redistributing funds amongst the Member States. It might be a good idea to set up a reserve fund for repayment of the loan made to Unesco for the building of its new headquarters.

(95) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) emphasized that the last sentence of paragraph 6 indicated that many members of the Committee on Contributions had considered placing the whole or part of those $1,228,216 in a reserve fund. Moreover, it constituted exceptional revenue. As the main problem facing the current session of the Conference was the remodelling of the programme, and as the Executive Board had been in favour of stabilizing continuing activities and extending activities in Member States, it might be advisable to use those credits for strengthening that part of the programme.

(96) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) was doubtful whether the action being considered was not contravening the Financial Regulations, which gave specific instructions. It would be more correct to discuss the matter in connexion with a proposal to amend the Regulations.

(97) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that, while the statement made by the South African delegate was to the point, it had been the practice in the past two financial years for the Conference to make decisions which were contrary to the provisions of the Financial Regulations. The summary records of the seventh session of the Conference would show that it had done so to finance the budgets for 1952, 1953 and 1954.

(98) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) cited the legal axiom that the fact of having made a mistake once was no justification for doing so again.

(99) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) pointed out that the Financial Regulations were not part of Unesco's Constitution: they were drawn up by the Conference and could therefore be amended by it.

(100) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) explained that he was not thinking of any illegal step. It was because the Conference was entirely free to decide how funds would be used that he had taken the liberty of seconding that proposal.

(101) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) suggested that the Guatemalan delegate's proposal might be amended to include also the other item given on page 3 (Assessments on new Member States), in which case the total obtained would be $2,221,430.

(102) Mr. CARRERA MOLINA (Guatemala) accepted the suggestion of the delegate of Chile.

(103) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) supported the proposal of the delegate of Guatemala as amended by the delegate of Chile.

(104) Mr. GIUSTINIANI (Italy), while favouring the use of the funds to repay the debt to the French Government, pointed out that unforeseen needs might arise during the coming two years and that the final decision should therefore be left to the next General Conference.

(105) Mr. EL-ZAYAT (Egypt) supported the proposal for a special reserve fund and the reference of the question to the Committee on Contributions, to be studied in consultation with the Director-General. He hoped that the Committee would, in particular, examine ways of using the special fund to help Unesco in projects connected with technical aid during the coming two years.

(106) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Contributions Committee would have to report back to

the Commission since it had no direct contact with the General Conference.

(107) Mr. PRATT (Australia) asked whether the proposal of the Guatemalan delegate was an amendment to that of the United Kingdom delegate or a substantive proposal.

(108) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) said that the Commission had been asked to make recommendations to the Plenary Conference on the financing of the budget. The Guatemalan delegate's proposal appeared to be in direct opposition to that of the United Kingdom delegation, and the suggested submission to the Contributions Committee would delay presentation of recommendations to the Plenary Conference. He proposed that a decision should be taken immediately.

(109) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) wondered how a special reserve fund could be set up without a specific object. Moreover, it was difficult to recommend that such a fund should be used for any particular project. Finally, the Committee on Contributions could hardly make recommendations on that subject - for which the Programme and Budget Commission was responsible. The proposal was vague, and serious doubts could be maintained as to the Contributions Committee's competence in the matter.

(110) It was finally decided, on a motion of Mr. FORSYTH (New Zealand), to adjourn the discussion until the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 7 p. m.

# ELEVENTH MEETING

*22 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF Mr de THIBAULT (OF THE BELGIAN DELEGATION)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN said it was his painful duty to announce the sudden death, in tragic circumstances, of Mr. de Thibault, of the Belgian delegation.

(2) The Commission rose as a gesture of respect.

(3) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the gesture.

**QUESTION RAISED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET IN CONNEXION WITH THE DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(4) The CHAIRMAN said that he had been asked by the Commission to refer to the Executive Board, through the General Committee, a question raised by the Advisory Committee about ways and means of reducing the burden on the Board. The General Committee had said that the Director-General had been asked to prepare a report on the matter, also that the question could more appropriately be referred to the new Board elected in accordance with the recently adopted amendments to Article V of the Constitution. The General Committee would take the necessary action to that end when the new Board was in being.

**ITEM 9.3 OF REVISED AGENDA LEGAL QUESTIONS** (document 8C/JUR/2: Second Report of the Legal Committee)

(5) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur of the Legal Committee) stated that, at its meeting of 19 November 1954, the Legal Committee had completed the drafting of amendments to Article V of the Constitution, and of the alterations in Rules 95, 95a and 98 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference which were necessary as a result of the new arrangements.
(6) The Committee had agreed that there was no contradiction or opposition between those Rules as amended and the Constitution or the Rules of Procedure, and had no comments to make from a substantive point of view.
(7) Regarding the wording, the Committee had merely collated the texts in the three languages, and had deleted the word "remodel" from paragraph C.13 of Article V.
(8) The Committee's Rapporteur then read out the texts in question in their new form.

(9) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), on behalf of his delegation, proposed the adoption of the Legal Committee's report.

(10) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) said that he did not consider the French word "portion" a particularly legal expression, and suggested replacing it by the word "durée".

(11) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) explained that the word had been used because it occurred in the

original text. He saw no objection to replacing it by "durée".

(12) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) disagreed with the wording of paragraph 4, Article V of the Constitution, as given by the Legal Committee in its report (document 8C/JUR/2). That passage mentioned only two possible occasions when a substitute might be required for a member of the Executive Board: the event of death or resignation.
(13) Such provisions generally took into account the possibility of physical or legal inability to serve, but the texts submitted by the Legal Committee made no mention of those eventualities.

(14) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) replied that that aspect of the question had not been overlooked by the Legal Committee.
(15) They had, however, come to the conclusion that they were not entitled to make substantive changes in the texts submitted to them, any more than it was for the Administrative Commission to propose amendments to the Constitution.
(16) Mr. Baugniet reminded the Commission that changes of the kind mentioned should take the form of a proposal to amend the statutes of the Organization, submitted with due notice.

(17) Mr. CARRERA MOLINA (Guatemala) agreed with the Argentine delegate.

(18) Mr. BUSTAMANTE (El Salvador), also signified his agreement.

(19) The CHAIRMAN said that, having considered the matter most carefully, he would have to rule that the change desired by the delegate of Argentina would be a change of substance requiring three months' prior notice and could not, therefore, be discussed at that session of the Conference. However, under Rule 106 of the Rules of Procedure, the Commission could always decide, by a two-thirds majority, that the proposal was one of form and not of substance.

(20) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the point was to some extent covered by Rule III, paragraph 11 (1) of the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board.

(21) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) did not believe that the question was cleared up by the statement of the United States delegate. The United States delegate had quoted a clause which applied to temporary admittance to meetings, but not to a member unable to attend the Executive Board.
(22) In the view of the Argentine delegation, that change in the Constitution was one of form and not of substance and could therefore be considered forthwith.

(23) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought that the wording of Article V, paragraph 3, which had been left unchanged, could be differently interpreted.
(24) He suggested that when its legal standing had been completely changed, the Executive Board with all its members newly elected could be considered a completely new body, having no link with the old one; and he asked whether, in that event, it would not be more logical to conclude that the bar on re-election only applied to consecutive terms of office after reorganization. Or he asked, should the view prevail that the old and the new Boards were in fact linked, merely in respect of paragraph 3? In that case, the members of the new Board could be considered re-eligible, by virtue of the fact that a member who had served on the old Board had done so in a personal capacity. In any case, it was desirable that the Commission should adopt an exact definition on the basis of a report by the Legal Committee.

(25) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) thought that the purpose of paragraph 3 was to avoid a member's serving on the Board too long.
(26) It would therefore seem that neither the new method of nominating candidates nor the forthcoming general election should affect that interpretation.

(27) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) wanted the question submitted to the Legal Committee in order that the Commission might receive its report, if possible before the Board held its elections and, in any case, not later than the close of the present session of the Conference.

(28) The amendments to Article V of the Constitution, as given in document 8C/JUR/2, were then approved as a whole by 45 votes to 6.

(29) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) was surprised that a vote should have been taken on the whole of the amendments to Article V of the Constitution, before delegations had been given a further opportunity to express their views on such an important question.
(30) He recalled that the Belgian, French and Yugoslav delegations had already voiced their grave apprehensions at the increasingly political colour of the Organization.
(31) If members of the Executive Board were to be forced to choose between their responsibilities to their government and their responsibilities to Unesco, the result would be to confront them with a tragic conflict of loyalties.
(32) Mr. Merminod also pointed out that, with regard to the amendments to Article V of the Constitution, both sides, i.e., those who had voted in favour and those who had voted against, had acted in accordance with instructions from their governments. Did not that prove conclusively that the change was ill-advised?

(33) In accordance with the proposal by Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), seconded by Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina), the amendments to the Rules of Procedure for election of members of the Executive Board (document 8C/JUR/2, page 2) were then adopted.

**ITEM 9.4.4 OF THE REVISED AGENDA: CONTRIBUTIONS: SCALE, CURRENCY AND COLLECTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER STATES.** (documents 8C/ADM/31 and 8C/ADM/32) (continued)

(34) The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the last meeting, a Japanese amendment to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on page 5 of document 8C/ADM/31 had been put to the vote, and that the result had been a tie. Under Rule 90 of the Rules of Procedure, there would have to be an immediate vote on the Japanese amendment and, unless there was a majority in favour, it would be considered rejected.

(35) Mr. JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia), seconded by Mr. VILLALON CALDAMES (Chile), proposed that discussion of the Japanese amendment be reopened.

(36) The Colombian motion was put to the vote and rejected by 42 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

(37) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) regretted that the words "without prejudice to any decision that may be taken by the ninth session of the General Conference" had been omitted in the report by the Conference Journal and that Saturday morning's minutes had not yet been distributed.

(38) A vote by roll-call was held on the Japanese amendment to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on the scale of contributions with the following results:

Voted against: Australia, Burma (Union of), Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Libya, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi-Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom.

Voted for: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Dominican Republic, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Italy, Japan, Korea, Laos, Liberia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Philippines, Spain, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstentions: Costa Rica, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Mexico, El Salvador, Switzerland, Uruguay, Viet-Nam.

Absent: Afghanistan, Austria, Cuba, Ecuador, Honduras, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela.

(39) The Japanese amendment was thus rejected by 24 votes to 22, with 7 abstentions.

(40) Mr. PETROVIC (Yugoslavia) explained that his delegation had voted for the amendment for purely technical reasons: to facilitate the work of the Conference by making the budget simpler.

(41) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already expressed its views on the resolution as a whole. If paragraph 2 were put to the vote separately, he would vote against.

(42) Paragraph 2 was put to the vote and adopted by 48 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

(43) The draft resolution in document 8C/ADM/31, as a whole, was put to the vote and adopted by 47 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

(44) The Commission returned to the Report by the Committee on Contributions - Methods of financing the budget (document 8C/ADM/32).

(45) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the United Kingdom delegation had made a proposal that the budget for 1955-56 should be financed in accordance with the Financial Regulations. An amendment had been moved by the delegation of Guatemala, as follows: "The delegation of Guatemala moves that the sums derived from miscellaneous sources (budget surplus of former years, miscellaneous revenue, and the contributions of new members for 1953-54, in accordance with the recommendations made by the special committee of the Executive Board and the views expressed by delegations in the Budget Commission) should be used to finance the extraordinary projects proposed at this session in relation to technical aid in basic education and in the provision of reading material for people learning to read."

(46) Mr. CARRERA MOLINA (Guatemala), referring to the draft recommendation which had just been read out, pointed out that the proposed measure was an extraordinary one. He added that several countries had put forward specific recommendations dealing with technical aid, and that they should not be underestimated. His country took a great interest in technical aid and in the fundamental education programme.

(47) The CHAIRMAN said, that, after much reflection, he had come to the conclusion that the proposal by Guatemala could not be considered an amendment to the United Kingdom proposal, in the sense given to the word "amendment" in Rule 86, paragraph 4, of the Rules of Procedure, and would have to be considered as a new proposal. The United Kingdom proposal would therefore have to be put to the vote first. If it were decided to abide strictly by the Financial Regulations, the motion by Guatemala would lapse, and the United Kingdom proposal would be adopted. If it were decided otherwise, then the United Kingdom proposal would be rejected, and the way would be open for the delegate of Guatemala to submit his proposal.

(48) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) wondered why a decision taken by the Commission on Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure should affect the provisions of the Financial Regulations. Could the two motions not be discussed together as they stood? If not, the Guatemalan delegation should be given time to draft a text which would meet all requirements.

(49) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) wished to know the order of priority of the two motions.

(50) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Rules of

Procedure which he had to observe only concerned the order in which voting should take place. The rule dealing with amendments to proposed amendments did not apply in the present instance, as the Guatemalan motion was not of that kind.

(51) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that it was not for the Commission to decide for what purposes funds should be used. In so far as it made definite proposals for the use of funds, the proposal by Guatemala was out of order.
(52) The United Kingdom was proposing that, in accordance with the Financial Regulations (see document 8C/ADM/32, page 1), two sources of income, namely, miscellaneous revenue for 1955-56 and contributions assessed on Member States for 1953-54, should be used to finance the budget. The proposal by Guatemala, if she understood it right, was to the effect that three sources of income (the budget surplus of former years, miscellaneous revenue, and the contributions of new members for 1953-54) should be used. Thus there was a sense in which the proposal by Guatemala could be considered an amendment to the United Kingdom proposal.

(53) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom was proposing that the three sources of income mentioned by the previous speaker should be used as laid down in the Financial Regulations. The Commission might be reluctant to decide that all those three sources of income should be so used, therefore he would be prepared to frame his proposal in a form which would make it possible to suggest amendments without rejecting the proposal outright, i.e. he would propose that the budget be financed in accordance with the Financial Regulations, paragraphs 4.3, 4.4, and 5.2.
(54) Since the delegate of Guatemala was proposing that funds should be used for purposes none of which were in accordance with the Financial Regulations, the proposal by Guatemala could only be considered as a direct negation of the United Kingdom motion.

(55) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) said that the proposal by Guatemala entailed the ear-marking of funds for certain specific purposes. It was difficult for the Commission to discuss the proposal without also discussing the financing of the whole programme.

(56) The CHAIRMAN agreed that the Commission was not called upon to decide how money should be spent. That was for the Programme and Budget Commission. He would therefore suggest that the delegate of Guatemala should amend his proposal in such a way as to make no reference to how money should be spent. Otherwise it would be out of order.

(57) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) announced that his delegation intended to move that from then on no decision taken by the General Conference would be valid if it were opposed to the Financial Regulations and that, in order to modify or suspend them, the approval of at least two-thirds of its members would be required.

(58) The reason for his proposal was that, in his opinion, the Financial Regulations had been repeatedly violated at recent meetings.

(59) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) thought that it would be better for the Commission to vote on a straightforward issue - whether the budget should be financed in accordance with the Financial Regulations or not. The proposal by Guatemala was, he felt, a direct negation of his own.

(60) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) thought that, as it stood, the Guatemalan proposal raised too many technical difficulties.
(61) It was impossible not to follow the Financial Regulations with regard to "miscellaneous revenue" and "budget surpluses from former years".
(62) On the other hand, an exception could be made in the case of the contributions of new members, provided that the use to which such sums were put were of value to them, e.g. to finance the publications of Unesco in their respective languages.
(63) Any surplus could be used by the Director-General, without touching the 1955-56 budget, for other expenditure in connexion with fundamental education.

(64) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) would, in principle, support the proposal by Guatemala and considered that a valuable purpose would be served if the Director-General were allowed to establish a special reserve fund for extraordinary projects, such as the question of making Unesco publications available to the newer countries, or in connexion with basic human rights, such as the right to a basic education. The Conference might decide what those extraordinary projects should be, or it might delegate special powers to the Director-General and Executive Board.

(65) Mr. LOISEAU (Haiti) recalled that, at a recent meeting of the Commission, the Guatemalan delegate had proposed that such funds should be added to the technical aid budget, whereas the United States delegate had suggested using them to repay the debt owed to the French Government.
(66) Mr. Loiseau thought that that one source - the contributions of new members - might be used for both purposes, in equal proportions, and that it was for the Administrative Commission to decide.

(67) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece), thought that, on the contrary, to do so would be to encroach on the preserve of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
(68) He asked the Chairman to state, in the case in question, what it was in order for the Administrative Commission to discuss.

(69) Mr. CARRERA MOLINA (Guatemala) agreed that the discussion of the special purposes for which funds should be used was a matter for the Programme and Budget Commission, and he therefore suggested a short recess during which he could amend his proposal accordingly.

(70) The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the

Committee on Contributions wanted the Commission to give a ruling on the question of the rights of States in arrears with their payments, but it was not quite ready to do so.

(71) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wanted the Commission to decide forthwith on the voting rights of Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

(72) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that consideration of the voting rights of China appeared on the agenda of the meeting and should therefore be considered at once.

(73) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) proposed that the voting rights of all four countries should be dealt with.

(74) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) proposed that the voting rights of China should be considered there and then, and those of the other three countries at the afternoon meeting.

(75) Finally, a motion by Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) for immediate adjournment and continuation of the discussion on voting rights at the afternoon meeting was put to the vote.

(76) The motion was adopted by 33 votes to 10, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

# TWELFTH MEETING

*22 November 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**VOTING RIGHTS OF CHINA**

(1) Opening the meeting, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Commission had two items to consider: (1) the voting rights of China, and (2) the report of the Committee on Contributions on the voting rights of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The Chairman of the Committee on Contributions had expressed the view that it would be unwise for the Commission to discuss the second point until members had the written report before them. The item would accordingly be deferred until the report was available.

(2) Miss POLICARPIO (Philippines) pointed out that the arrears in the payment of China's contribution were due to circumstances beyond that country's control, and the fact that it had made a token payment of $14,000 was proof of a sincere desire on China's part to co-operate in the execution of Unesco's programme. She therefore moved the following resolution:

"The Administrative Commission recommends to the General Conference that it decide to permit China to vote during the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco in accordance with paragraph 8 (c) of Article IV of the Constitution."

(3) The motion was seconded by Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan).

(4) Mr. HU CHING-YU (China) observed that while, under paragraph 8 (b) of Article IV of the Constitution, China was undoubtedly debarred from voting at the eighth session of the General Conference, the Conference could have recourse to the remedy provided in paragraph 8 (c) of the same Article. It was on the strength of that provision that China had been permitted to vote at the sixth and seventh sessions of the General Conference. Unfortunately China's financial situation had not improved since 1952, and the Chinese delegation again requested the Administrative Commission to recommend to the General Conference that it permit China to vote during the eighth session, on the grounds that failure to pay was due to circumstances beyond that country's control.

(5) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that it had been stated several times by several delegations that no representatives with authority to vote for China were present at the Conference. A decision in the sense advocated by the delegation of the Philippines would therefore be incorrect and would not further the cause of better understanding and real co-operation between States for the fulfilment of the high principles proclaimed in Unesco's Constitution. On those grounds the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would vote against the motion of the delegation of the Philippines.

(6) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) recalled that the motion to reduce China's contribution temporarily during 1955-56 had been defeated that morning by a very narrow margin of 24 votes to 22; that vote showed that a large proportion of the Conference felt that China should

be given every opportunity to participate actively in Unesco's programme. To enable China to do so, however, the Conference must decide either to reduce that country's contribution temporarily or to make full use of the clause in paragraph 8 (c) of Article IV of the Constitution. Mr. Kotschnig very much hoped that an overwhelming majority would show itself in favour of the second solution. The United States delegation accordingly seconded the motion of the delegation of the Philippines.

(7) The motion of the delegation of the Philippines was adopted by 28 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions.

(8) The CHAIRMAN stated that the report of the Contributions Committee on the voting rights of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary would be included in the agenda for the following morning.

The meeting rose at 3.30 p.m.

# THIRTEENTH MEETING

*23 November 1954 at 10.15 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONTRIBUTIONS SCALE, CURRENCY AND COLLECTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER STATES** (documents 8C/ADM/30 Add.1 and 8C/ADM/32) (continued)

(1) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions), introducing the addendum, said that his Committee had been called upon to decide how the arrears of three countries (Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia), which had withdrawn from Unesco and had recently declared their readiness to co-operate once more with it, could best be paid.
(2) In the initial stages of its deliberations, the Committee had been faced with letters from those three countries claiming more or less full cancellation of their arrears. The Committee had declined to accept that, but all concerned had been prepared for further negotiation. The resolutions now before the Commission represented the fruit of ten days' arduous deliberation.
(3) Although negotiations necessarily had to cover a wide field, the Committee had not been empowered to decide that the three countries should be granted the right to vote. Thence the onus of advising the General Conference to adopt the last paragraph of each resolution (on that point) lay on the Administrative Commission itself.
(4) It had been agreed in the Committee that the three countries should pay by instalments over varying periods.
(5) The three countries had claimed that they had not been members of Unesco during 1953. That was a legal point which the Committee had not felt competent to decide. Accordingly, in the case of two of those countries, it had merely considered the question of contributions due for the years before 1953, so that the resolutions relative to Poland and Czechoslovakia covered the period up to 1952 inclusive. Hungary, however, had expressed willingness to pay arrears incurred up to and including 1953.
(6) All three countries had wished to be allowed to make their payments in their national currencies (see I (ii) in each resolution).
(7) An important point was that in I (iii) of the resolutions, the Director-General was asked to report on the implementation thereof.

(8) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) expressed his appreciation of the work done by the Committee and, seconded by Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), moved adoption of the resolution relative to Czechoslovakia, including the last paragraph, recommending that Czechoslovakia should enjoy full voting rights at the eighth session of the General Conference.

(9) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested that it would be wise to amend the first line of i (iii) in each resolution to read: "instructs the Director-General to report to each ordinary session of the General Conference ...".

(10) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) and Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accepted the amendment.

(11) In reply to an enquiry by Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), Mr. VANECEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the Government of Czechoslovakia had authorized his delegation to accept the settlement.

(12) Mr. SZABO (Hungary) stated that, in the course of the discussions on the subject, his delegation had expressed its willingness to pay its arrears as assessed.

(13) Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) said that his Government found the resolution relative to Poland acceptable. His intention was to announce that fact in the Plenary Conference and to write to the President of the Conference to that effect.

(14) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) paid a warm tribute to the Committee on Contributions. He fully shared the general desire to regularize the position of the three countries. But the results of the Committee's negotiations had been less satisfactory than he had hoped.
(15) The period allowed for payment of the arrears was excessive - twice as long, in fact, as the period over which the debts had been incurred.
(16) In addition, too high a proportion of the arrears was to be paid in national currencies. Either much of the currencies so acquired by Unesco would prove to be unusable, or Unesco, in order to use the money, would be obliged to engage in programmes deviating from those proposed by the Director-General.
(17) The International Labour Organization (an organization with long experience in such matters), when faced with a similar problem in connexion with one of the three countries in question, had rejected the solution proposed.
(18) There were, however, certain redeeming features about the proposed settlement, especially the provision that the Director-General should report to each session of the General Conference on the progress made and on the extent to which he had been able to use the national currencies in question.
(19) For those reasons the United States delegation, not wishing to obstruct a settlement, but at the same time not being able to give its whole-hearted approval, would abstain in any vote on the draft resolutions.

(20) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) was gratified at the agreement reached between the Contributions Committee and the Hungarian, Polish and Czechoslovak delegations.
(21) He reminded the Commission that Unesco had from the very beginning shown a special interest in those three countries, and had set up a Committee for Cultural Reconstruction, of which he had been chairman.
(22) He was glad that purely practical considerations had yielded to others of a loftier character and thus opened the way for genuine collaboration.
(23) He was convinced that the small material drawbacks that might result were negligible by comparison with the great advantage of a friendly settlement accepted by both sides.

(24) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) agreed with the Brazilian delegate's statement, and likewise expressed his pleasure at the settlement of that delicate question.
(25) The Japanese delegate then asked to have two points explained to him:

(1) Did not the Financial Regulations provide that arrears paid by a Member State should be distributed among the other Member States?
(26) If such arrears were to be incorporated in the 1955-56 budget, should not a resolution be passed to that effect?
(27) (2) Was he correct in thinking that, according to the three resolutions, the three Member States regained their rights because their arrears were no longer regarded as due under the terms of Article IV of the Constitution, paragraph 8b, and not because it was recognized that "failure to pay" was "due to conditions beyond the control" of the Member States in question, under the terms of paragraph 8c of the same Article.

(28) Replying to the first question raised by the Japanese delegate, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) did not think that a resolution could alter the application of payments made by Member States.
(29) With regard to the second question, Mr. Saba explained that, once Member States had been given time to pay, they could no longer be required to settle their debts instantly.
(30) Therefore, in assessing arrears, so as to determine whether or not a Member State had the right to vote, the only amounts which counted were those which were immediately payable. In the present instance, paragraph 8 b was the operative clause.
(31) Paragraph 8c applied only when the delay in payment could be attributed to exceptional circumstances over which the Member State in question had no control.

(32) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) said that he was satisfied with the latter explanation, and then put his first question in another form: would the contributions of the three Member States (60% in national currency and 40% in foreign currencies stipulated by the General Conference) be incorporated in the 1955-56 budget or not?

(33) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that the amounts paid in by the States concerned in settlement of their arrears would become budget surpluses for the years in which those arrears were incurred. Thus the oldest debt, incurred by Poland, dated from 1947; the amounts paid in by that country would constitute a budget surplus for 1947 and would be available for distribution to Member States at the ninth session. Payments made for 1955-56 would of course be used to finance the budget for those years, like any other contribution.
(34) The national currencies acquired would be used, as far as possible, for the normal expenditure provided for in the budget for 1955-56. Otherwise an attempt would be made to exchange it for other currencies, so that the equivalent would be available for distribution to Member States in the normal way.

(35) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) said that, in all Specialized Agencies where members were in arrears, his Government had taken the line that such members should be penalized by loss of the vote. But in the cases under consideration, there were certain special features.
(36) He wished to pay tribute to the Committee on Contributions, and also to the delegations of the three countries. The resolutions proposed went a long way towards a satisfactory solution of the problem. At the same time, it would be most dangerous for Unesco if a precedent were to be created. Therefore, although recognizing that a genuine effort had been made to seek a settlement, his delegation would abstain from voting on the resolutions.

(37) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) pointed out that no account had been taken of the disadvantages resulting for certain Member States who had paid their contributions regularly from the beginning.
(38) He had listened with interest to the statements of the Brazilian delegate, but could not refrain from mentioning that Greece had suffered catastrophes of which everyone was aware and which would give it grounds for requesting a similar arrangement.
(39) The Greek delegation would accordingly abstain from voting, reserving its position until conversations had taken place on the subject between his Government and Unesco.

(40) Mr. CABOUAT (France) considered that the negotiations with Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia had satisfactorily resolved the difficult problem of arrears.
(41) The French delegation was particularly anxious that the use of national currencies in the course of future financial years should on no account play a decisive rôle in the preparation of future programmes.
(42) Subject to close observance of that principle, the French delegation would vote for the resolutions in question.

(43) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) asked Mr. Harper-Smith to explain the statement that the contributions to be paid by the States in question were to be assessed in accordance with the Financial Regulations, unless otherwise decided by the General Conference.
(44) Mr. Villalon also asked for an explanation of document 8C/ADM/32, which had not yet been adopted and in which the methods of financing the budget were laid down.

(45) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that, under the arrangements made in the resolutions the first payment of arrears would be made in 1955, and the second in 1956. The amounts so received would be reported to the ninth session as surpluses. It would be for that Conference to decide whether they were to be distributed in accordance with the Financial Regulations. In any case, these payments of arrears could not be used for the 1955-56 budget.

(46) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) paid a tribute to the Committee on Contributions for the solution it had found to a prickly problem. He welcomed the spirit shown by those speakers who, while unable fully to approve the resolutions, would nevertheless abstain rather than vote against them. It was much better for an organization such as Unesco to settle the problem once and for all.
(47) At the same time, the case of the three countries which were returning to the fold was a very special one, and he was emphatically of the opinion that it must not be allowed to create a precedent.

(48) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) was happy to note that there had been so little opposition to the resolutions, which he felt safeguarded the important principle that Unesco should suffer no loss in collecting arrears.

(49) Since the three countries concerned had already shown such readiness to co-operate, perhaps they could together review the methods whereby they would make their payments, with the best interests of the Organization in view.
(50) He entirely agreed with the delegate of Egypt that the solution found must not constitute a precedent.

(51) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested that the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 2 "Whilst it was understood that every effort ..." should be amended to read: "Whilst it was understood that every effort . . . should not be a determining factor either in implementing the current programme or in formulating future programmes of the Organization."

(52) The Indian motion for adoption of the resolution relative to Czechoslovakia was thereupon put to the vote and adopted by 35 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions.

(53) Dr. MUDALIAR (India), seconded by Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), then moved adoption of the resolutions relative to Hungary and Poland.

(54) The resolution relative to Hungary was adopted by 34 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions.

(55) The resolution relative to Poland was adopted by 34 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions.

(56) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) called for a vote on the introductory part of the report and for a vote on the report as a whole.

(57) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) requested that before a vote was taken on the first part of the report, the text of the last sub-paragraph but one should be altered to cover the Director-General's observation on the use of national currencies both for the current programme and for future programmes.

(58) Mr. KELLY (Australia) suggested that some addition be made to the introduction to cover the point made by the delegates of Egypt and India, i.e., that the arrangement made should in no sense constitute a precedent.

(59) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) proposed that the words "Neither should such an arrangement constitute a precedent" should be added to the last paragraph but one (page 2) of the introduction.

(60) This proposal was adopted.

(61) It was unanimously agreed to recommend the General Conference to adopt the introduction to the report, with the amendments proposed by the Director-General and Mr. Huzayin.

(62) Document 8C/ADM/30 Add.1, as a whole, was then put to the vote and adopted by 40 votes to 0, with 10 abstentions.

(63) The CHAIRMAN said he had been delighted to note the tributes paid to the Committee on Contributions

and to its Chairman. In addition, the countries concerned had displayed a most praiseworthy readiness to co-operate. He was convinced that the Committee, under the splendid leadership of Mr. Sternberger, had made a real contribution to international understanding.

(64) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) spoke with some diffidence as a newcomer to the General Conference. The Committee had merely done its duty. He was deeply grateful for the tributes paid to the Committee and to himself.

(65) The Committee then passed on to consideration of document 8C/ADM/32: Report by the Committee on Contributions - methods of financing the budget.

(66) The CHAIRMAN said that, when the discussion of the above document had been discontinued, the Commission had been confronted with a United Kingdom motion to the effect that the 1955-56 budget should be financed in accordance with three specific provisions of the Financial Regulations.
(67) The delegation of Guatemala had submitted an amendment to that proposal; he had been obliged to rule that the motion by Guatemala constituted a separate proposal.
(68) The delegate of Guatemala had now so altered his proposal that it could be considered an amendment to the United Kingdom proposal. He also understood that the Japanese delegation had suggested an amendment which had been accepted by Guatemala and embodied in its own amendment.

(69) Mr. CARRERA MOLINA (Guatemala) announced that for two reasons his delegation had decided to withdraw the proposal it had submitted the day before: firstly, in order to facilitate discussion on many of the subjects still before the Commission, and secondly because it had accepted suggestions made by certain delegations which had originally supported the proposal, but had afterwards asked for its withdrawal.
(70) It had nevertheless joined the Mexican delegation in submitting a new draft resolution, proposing that contributions assessed on new Member States should not be incorporated in the present budget.

(71) The CHAIRMAN had understood that the delegation of Guatemala was changing the wording of its resolution to adopt that suggested by Japan. But the proposal just read out differed from the Japanese proposal.

(72) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) said that he was not opposed to the substance of the resolution submitted jointly by the Guatemalan and Mexican delegations; with regard to the wording, however, he wished to point out that his own amendment seemed clearer.

(73) The CHAIRMAN felt convinced that the only way for the Commission to avoid an inextricable muddle was to adjourn forthwith, leaving a small working party, made up of the countries concerned, to clarify their differences, in order to present a proposal or proposals at the afternoon meeting. He would suggest that the following countries be represented on the working party: Egypt, United Kingdom, United States of America, Guatemala, Brazil, Mexico and Japan.

(74) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that his country would like to be represented too.

(75) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) asked the Chairman to explain the difference between the two methods of financing the budget. One was according to the Financial Regulations; the other was by special financial measures. He would like the point made clear.

(76) The CHAIRMAN believed that nothing would be gained by a discussion in the Commission until the points at issue had been clarified. A certain group of delegations wanted provision to be made for certain funds to be used in 1955-56, if it were found that they could be used, and wanted the funds not so used to be carried forward to 1957-58. But there were grave procedural difficulties, into which he would not go further at that stage.

(77) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought it would be useful if the Rapporteur of the Committee on Contributions could take part in the work of the party suggested.

(78) It was agreed to adjourn until the afternoon, and that a small working party (Egypt, United Kingdom, United States of America, Guatemala, Brazil, Mexico, Japan, and the Rapporteur of the Committee on Contributions) should meet forthwith.

(79) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to comment on statements made by him in the draft programme and budget documents. Recommendations had been made therein to the effect that, as an exception to the Financial Regulations, certain income now accruing should be used for the 1957-58 budget. The idea he had had in mind was that if, in 1954, all the money available were used, with an assessment level that would not cause Member States to pay more in 1955-56 than in 1953-54 (except, of course, in the case of new Member States), the funds available would be more than sufficient for the budget proposals he had submitted. He had proposed that, because a special situation would obtain at the 1956 Conference, the assessment level of Member States should not be lowered (except for such slight adjustments as might be made in accordance with the United Nations scale of contributions, and with the possible exception of the United States of America) and that money should not be returned to Member States. Whatever the assessment level in 1955-56, the level would have to be raised in 1957-58 to maintain the same spending level, unless part of the funds now accruing were carried forward to 1957-58.
(80) The expenditure decided on at the eighth session (use of Russian; decision to hold the ninth session in New Delhi) had modified the situation to some extent.
(81) His statements must not be allowed to influence the judgment of the Commission in deciding on the United Kingdom proposal to abide by the Financial Regulations. The interests of Unesco were taken care of by the proposals before the Commission, and it was for the Commission to decide.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

# FOURTEENTH MEETING

*23 November 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONTRIBUTIONS: SCALE, CURRENCY AND COLLECTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER STATES** (documents 8C/ADM/32 and Addenda 1 and 2) (continued)

(1) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) read out, at the Chairman's request, the United Kingdom proposal (8C/ADM/32 Add. 1) and the amendment proposed by the delegations of Brazil, Egypt, France and Japan (8C/ADM/32 Add. 2).

(2) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) explained that the amendment proposed by his delegation introduced no new principle; he understood that it was in line with a practice already adopted on different occasions by the General Conference, and he would be glad if the Secretariat would give him some details concerning those precedents.

(3) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that a decision to use the surplus for financing projects in the period 1955-56 would be in accordance with decisions taken at the sixth and seventh sessions of the General Conference; but it had never before been agreed to withhold surpluses pending a decision on their use by a later Conference.
(4) He replied in the affirmative to a further question from the Brazilian delegate whether there was a precedent for applying surpluses to a future Unesco budget instead of returning them to Member States.

(5) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) referred to a statement by the Director-General at the previous meeting that his reasons for formulating the proposals for applying the surplus were no longer valid. The only point of dispute between the two proposals before the Commission was the use of the sum of $603,600 and, as there was no longer any need for it to be held over until the 1957-58 period, he saw no reason why it should not be set against future expenses in accordance with normal business procedure.

(6) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) confirmed that the only point of controversy between the original proposal and the amendment was whether or not the $603,600 should be returned to Member States. The Director-General's object in proposing that the contributions from new Member States should be carried forward was to avoid undue fluctuations in the level of contributions.

(7) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that, while he believed that, in principle, the Financial Regulations should be adhered to and in normal circumstances he would have supported the United Kingdom delegate's proposal, the exceptional circumstances of the current year justified a departure from customary practice. It was essential to see the financial position as a whole. There were three points to be considered: miscellaneous income, contributions from new members, and the return of the 1947-51 surplus to Member States.
(8) The assessment level for 1955-56 showed a reduction for nearly every country, and, even at the maximum possible level proposed, the total contribution of any Member State would not exceed the amount paid in 1953-54, which worked out at one-half of a cent per head of the population. He could not understand why delegates of high calibre should spend so much time discussing details of the budget while there was so much other work to be done. He believed it would be contrary to the ideals of Unesco to reduce contributions because of an entirely fortuitous circumstance. Many speakers, in plenary and other meetings, had deplored the restriction of activities in important fields, and any additional funds available should be used for implementing Unesco's programme. A fund on the lines of that created by the United Nations for the furtherance of educational projects would be favoured by many countries - even those which had difficulty in meeting their contributions - because they would benefit by an expansion of activities.
(9) He therefore supported the amendment, expressing the hope that the Conference would agree to base 1955-56 contributions on the normal level, and apply the additional funds, amounting to over $2,100,000, to expanding Unesco's activities, possibly to include financing the new headquarters building. Those who believed in Unesco's ideals and the impact of its work on the world as a whole would surely recognize the error of remitting such funds to member governments.

(10) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) said that, if the surplus were distributed among members, even the largest contributors would receive a comparatively insignificant amount. If, however, the sum were kept intact, it could be used effectively in the 1955-56 programme, for which the budget provision was manifestly inadequate. He proposed that it should be placed in a reserve fund, to be used for cultural activities, the headquarters building or any other purpose which the General Conference might decide.

(11) Following a point of order raised by the United Kingdom delegate, the delegate of Brazil formally proposed the amendment in document 8C/ADM/32 Add. 2.

(12) Mr. C.W. CARTER (Canada) supported the United Kingdom delegate's proposal for five reasons: 1. The action proposed was in the best interests of Unesco as an organization and of its programme; 2. The members of the Commission were for the time being a part of Unesco and would be judged by the way in which they conducted Unesco's affairs; 3. The Commission had the double responsibility of enhancing Unesco's prestige throughout the world and inspiring faith and confidence in the Organization; 4. The Canadian delegation was convinced that it would be in the best interests of Unesco to adhere strictly to the rules and regulations laid down in respect of the budget; 5. The strongest argument in favour of the proposal was the confusion at the past three meetings caused by the potential departure from sound practice.
(13) The Financial Regulations had been established expressly to avoid such confusion, and to ignore them would lead Unesco to a similar situation. If the Regulations did not meet the circumstances, they could be revised.

(14) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller), in reply to a question from the delegate of Byelorussia, said that the surplus would be returned to the Member States who had contributed in the years during which it arose; members who had joined Unesco subsequently, or who were in arrears, would be excluded.

(15) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) wished, as one of the sponsors of the amendment, to reply to the points raised by the Canadian delegate.
(16) Point 1. Since Unesco was about to start on a transitional period of activity leading to a new orientation of its programme, it would be in the interests of the Organization to set aside a sum for use after the ninth session of the General Conference.
(17) Point 2. The best way to further Unesco's aims was to provide more funds for the programme.
(18) Point 3. Unesco's prestige was more likely to be enhanced by programmes which were certain to be implemented. Return of the surpluses to Member States would imply theoretical rather than practical support for Unesco's work. As to how the funds were to be used, they could be applied to fundamental education, production of reading primers, or financing the headquarters building; but the final decision should be left to the General Conference at its ninth session.
(19) Point 4. The Financial Regulations were not part of Unesco's Constitution and were therefore not binding.
(20) Finally, with as many as seventy-two Member States, confusion was unavoidable, but out of confusion clarity emerged. The amendment proposed by four Member States was not only a commendable effort to dispel the confusion but was also an offer of a compromise which he hoped the United Kingdom delegate would reciprocate.

(21) Like the delegate of India, he hoped that financial considerations would not obscure Unesco's mission to humanity.

(22) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought there was a mistake in the table given on page 5 of document 8C/ADM/32. Under the heading, "Total Appropriation", the following details were given:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Deduct: | Miscellaneous Revenue | $389,614 |
| | Budget Surpluses available for distribution | $603,600. |

Since the latter figure was identical with the budgetary surplus referred to in the draft amendment under discussion, that would appear to be a mistake either of wording or in the figures.
(23) Mr. Baugniet stated, however, that his delegation supported the draft amendment under consideration. It could not have agreed to any measure dealing with larger amounts, but thought it wise to reserve the sum in question, $603,600, for the financial year 1957-58.

(24) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said he could not give an immediate reply to Mr. Baugniet's question but, since the Belgian delegate approved the draft amendment before them, he would provide him with the required information when the meeting was over.

(25) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) had hesitated to enter the discussion because he represented a country whose contribution was small. In his view, while the larger contributors were within their rights in wishing to receive back surpluses, such action was contrary to the interests of Unesco. He therefore supported the proposed amendment, which would give the ninth session of the General Conference an opportunity to apply the surplus to the budget of the Organization, and allow time for consideration of the best ways in which it might be used.

(26) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) supported the amendment, which was in keeping with the spirit of Unesco. The sum in question could be used to further the Organization's aims. In industry and commerce, the new financial year began with the transfer of the balance from the old. To give that sum back to Member States would not be the best way of sharing the benefits. It would be far better that Unesco should announce one day that through its efforts the number of illiterates had decreased or the death rate throughout the world had been reduced. That was what the peoples expected of the Organization.

(27) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) agreed that the amendment had greatly simplified the Commission's work. Nevertheless, many of the arguments, and in particular those of the delegates of India and Egypt, were more appropriate to the Programme and Budget Commission, which had to approve the programme, than to the Administrative Commission, which had to approve a commensurate budget. If delegates wished to support specific projects, the correct procedure was to submit them as draft resolutions and support them in the Programme Commission.

(28) Speaking or behalf of the four delegations whose draft amendment was before the meeting, Mr. CABOUAT (France) stated that they were fully aware of the need to observe the rules of orthodox finance in all but exceptional circumstances. At that time, Unesco had a surplus of over $2,000,000. Was it wise to use up the whole amount at once, when heavy expenses would probably have to be met within the following two years? The amendment before the meeting offered a sensible solution and would keep the contributions payable by Member States as stable as possible.
(29) In two years' time the sum of $603,600 that it was suggested should be set aside, would enable a considerable number of activities to be successfully accomplished. Moreover, the sacrifice involved for Member States would be insignificant, since, if the surplus were distributed, each State would receive only a very small sum. On the other hand, it would be a satisfactory solution for those delegates who were anxious not to allow the total amount of contributions to undergo too many fluctuations.

(30) A vote was taken on the draft amendment contained in document 8C/ADM/32, Add. 2, which was adopted by 31 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

(31) The United Kingdom proposal (document 8C/ADM/32 Add. 1), thus amended, was then unanimously adopted.

**ITEM 9.2 OF REVISED AGENDA : CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PARTS I, III AND IV OF THE BUDGET, AND REPORT TO THE PROGRAMME COMMISSION (document 8C/BUD/1) (continued)**

**PART I – GENERAL POLICY**

**CHAPTER 2 – EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(32) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the change in the composition of the Executive Board required formal approval of the increase in membership from 20 to 22, involving an additional budgetary provision of $12,000 for the period 1955-56; and a decision on whether Unesco should continue to pay both travel and per diem.

(33) A formal proposal was made by the delegate of Japan and seconded by the delegate of the Philippines that the Commission approve the addition of $12,000 to Chapter 2, Part I of the budget.

(34) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) was willing to support the proposal if the Executive Board would endeavour to cut down both the length and the number of sessions. If that were done, the additional $12,000 might not ultimately be needed.

(35) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought that the Executive Board should try to cut down the number as well as the length of its sessions, and he proposed that the Commission assent to the opinion given on that point by the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (document 8C/BUD/1 (page 4)).

(36) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) asked whether the following wording would meet the wishes of the Belgian delegate: "that every effort be made by the Executive Board in co-operation with the Director-General to reduce as far as possible the number and length of sessions of the Executive Board."

(37) The delegate of Belgium signified his acceptance.

(38) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) reminded the Commission that Article V, B.8 of the Constitution, which had been in force up to that time, stipulated that "the Executive Board shall meet in regular session at least twice a year". Since Conference sessions were to be held biennially, it would perhaps be useful to arrange for five sessions of the Executive Board during each two-year period. Mr. Photiades thought that solution might satisfy the delegate of the United States of America.

(39) The CHAIRMAN said that the two sessions each year for the Executive Board were laid down in Article V, B.8 of the Constitution, amendments to which would require six months' notice.

(40) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) considered that the provisions regarding the number of sessions of the Board could be included in the Board's Rules of Procedure.

(41) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought there was no need to oblige the Executive Board to hold a minimum of five sessions in every two-year period, since the Board might well decide that the twice yearly sessions provided for under the Constitution were sufficient.

(42) Mr. LAUGIER (representing the Executive Board) recalled that up to that time the agenda of the Executive Board apart from one or two exceptions, had included only questions arising from provisions of the Constitution or from resolutions of the General Conference. The only noteworthy departure from that rule had been the preparation of the report on the remodelling of the future programme of the Organization.
(43) Furthermore the Executive Board had already asked the Bureau of Legal Affairs to enquire into the possibility of reducing its agenda, from which it had transpired that the only way to shorten the Executive Board agenda was to release the Board from some of its responsibilities. Mr Laugier did not think that was what the Commission had in mind, and therefore thought that all that could be done was to invite the Board to make its sessions as short as possible.

(44) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) concurred wholeheartedly in the views of the Executive Board representative.

(45) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed that it would be unwise to attempt to exceed the provisions of the Constitution, but favoured a

strong appeal for reducing sessions. The numbers envisaged - three in 1955 and five in 1956 - were excessive and the Executive Board might well follow the example of the Economic and Social Council in cutting down its agenda.

(46) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Executive Board had itself expressed the hope that the Conference would endeavour to lighten the burden which it placed on the Board, and he had asked whether the Board could help him to study the matter over the coming two years, with a view to submitting proposals to the next session of the Conference for amending the Regulations in that respect. A formal resolution from the Conference would be necessary, and the Administrative Commission would be the appropriate body to move it.

(47) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) suggested an addition to the proposal: "In this connexion the Conference requests the Executive Board, in co-operation with the Director-General, to study ways and means designed to achieve this end and to submit recommendations to the ninth session of the General Conference."

(48) This again was accepted by the delegate of Belgium.

(49) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) said that it would be putting the cart before the horse to cut down the number and length of the Executive Board sessions before reducing its burden of responsibility. However, the proposal of the United States delegation should satisfy the whole Commission, so long as it was understood that the possibility of curtailing the work of the Executive Board would be examined before attempting to reduce the number and the length of its sessions.

(50) The CHAIRMAN read the proposal of the delegate of Belgium, as amended by the delegate of the United States of America.

(51) The proposal was adopted.

(52) The CHAIRMAN then recalled the proposal of the Japanese delegate that the Director-General be authorized to include an additional amount of $12,000 in Chapter 2 of the budget to meet the cost of the two new members of the Executive Board. He asked whether the following wording would be satisfactory:

"That the Director-General be instructed to make provision in the budget for paying the expenses of the additional members."

(53) Mr. PETROVIC (Yugoslavia) considered that the travel expenses of members of the Executive Board should be defrayed by the Organization, whereas their per diem expenses should be defrayed by the governments they represented.

(54) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) recalled that the matter in question had already been thrashed out at the sixth meeting of the Commission, and he had imagined it was already settled. He then read the record of his statement, as given in the minutes of the meeting, adding that at the same meeting Mr. Rao had given details of the procedure in use at the United Nations, ILO and FAO.

(55) Mr. Haguiwara further thought that, if the Commission wanted to economize, the new Executive Board could review its Rules of Procedure and might, for example, abolish payment of per diem to deputies, or whenever the Board's sessions coincided with those of the General Conference. He doubted, however, if it were good policy to abolish the payment of travel and living expenses, since that might tempt governments not to send their appointed representative but to replace him by a deputy residing where the Board was meeting.

(56) In those circumstances, Mr. Haguiwara maintained his proposal to increase the Executive Board budget by $12,000. If that proposal were rejected, he thought the Board should be left free to work out its own solution, since it was preferable that the General Conference should not intervene too often in the internal affairs of the Board.

(57) Replying to the delegate of Japan, the CHAIRMAN quoted the summary records, which, in conformity with his own recollection, showed that a decision still had to be taken on Chapter 2. He asked whether the delegate of Japan would agree to the following form for his proposal:

"That the Organization continue to pay full travel and per diem expenses for members of the Executive Board and that the Director-General be authorized to add $12,000 to the budget item for 1955-56 to meet the cost of the two extra members."

(58) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) said that, while the Conference could vote a credit, the Executive Board, under its Rules of Procedure, apportioned the credit. He therefore wished to see the sum of $12,000 added to the amount provided under Part I, Chapter 2, paragraph 21, of the budget: "Travel of members of the Board." If his proposal were rejected, he hoped that the Board would either change its Rules of Procedure or find other ways of meeting the cost of the two additional members.

(59) The CHAIRMAN accordingly presented the original proposal of the delegate of Japan.

(60) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) was glad the Yugoslav delegate agreed that travel expenses for members of the Board should be defrayed by Unesco. As for the per diem expenses, though it was true that the sum involved was never a very large one, Mr. Carneiro thought it was best not to depart from the principle that expenses incurred by a national civil servant on a tour of duty with an international organization such as the Executive Board of Unesco, which was called upon to carry out certain tasks prescribed by the General Conference, were the responsibility of the Organization.

(61) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) disagreed with the delegate of Yugoslavia. The amendment would affect the attendance of some members of the

Executive Board who belonged to smaller countries. The suggested procedure would make them dependent upon their respective governments to an undesirable extent. As the United Kingdom delegate had pointed out, members of the Board would continue to exercise the powers delegated to them by the General Conference, and in its name, and therefore the Organization should pay for all the expenses consequent upon their attendance at meetings.

(62) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) agreed with the delegate of Japan. He fully concurred in the remarks of the delegate of Ecuador to the effect that members of the Board, in accordance with Article V.12 of the Constitution, continued to act "on behalf of the Conference" and that the Organization was therefore bound to defray expenses incurred through attending meetings of the Board. Approval of the Yugoslav amendment would mean doing an injustice to the smaller countries. The speaker was also opposed to the United States proposal. The Executive Board should be allowed complete freedom in deciding the number and duration of its sessions.

(63) The CHAIRMAN said that the number of sessions had been agreed; the only problem now under discussion was the method of finance.

(64) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) was strongly opposed to the Japanese delegate's proposal, which was superfluous: if the Board applied itself seriously to the recommendation to limit its sessions, the $12,000 necessary to meet the additional cost could easily be found.
(65) He had reconsidered the proposal of the Yugoslav delegate and was willing to support it. The Executive Board would now have a double responsibility - to Unesco and to the privileged governments - and it was only fair that the expenses should be shared. If the Organization assumed the cost of travel, there would be no discrimination, since governments would be contributing equal amounts for per diem. The resultant savings, which amounted to approximately $35,000, were far from insignificant and could be applied with great effect to programme activities.

(66) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) said that the implications of the Yugoslav proposal were more important than they had seemed at first sight, and time was needed to consider its administrative repercussions for both the Organization and member governments. He therefore supported the proposal of the Japanese delegate, with the provision that the Executive Board should be asked to report to the next General Conference on methods of meeting the travel and per diem of members of the Executive Board. That would permit of more careful discussion than was possible at present.

(67) The delegate of Japan accepted the addition to his proposal and the CHAIRMAN read out the final wording:

"That the Director-General be authorized to add $12,000 under Chapter 2 of the budget to meet the cost of the two additional members of the Executive Board and that the Executive Board be asked to report to the next General Conference on proposals for meeting the travel expenses and per diem of Executive Board members."

(68) Mr. BRICHET (France) considered that the amendment of the Yugoslav delegate carried the decisions of the Conference regarding the membership and character of the Executive Board to their logical conclusion. It would, however, be a disservice to Member States with limited resources to ask them to defray the expenses of their representatives on the Executive Board.
(69) Mr. Brichet pointed out that, at the United Nations, five members of each delegation received their expenses out of the Organization's budget; that step had been taken so as to ensure that even the smallest countries should be fittingly represented. It might be desirable to apply a similar rule to the members of the Executive Board of Unesco. Mr. Brichet accordingly asked that per diem expenses for members of the Board should be defrayed by Unesco.

(70) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) stated that he had accepted the reservation of the United Kingdom because he felt sure that the Executive Board would work out a plan for effecting economies. It must, however, be given time to carry out the necessary enquiries: a decision taken by the Commission in undue haste was unlikely to be a sound one.
(71) Mr. Haguiwara reminded the Commission that he had sat on the Executive Board for two years while officially employed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of his own country, which had funds for covering travel expenses. Had he been a university professor, the university authorities would no doubt have been hard put to it to find the necessary credits.
(72) Mr. Haguiwara thought that two years should be quite adequate for studying changes in the present procedure, and that the Board should be asked to report on the matter to the Conference at its ninth session.

(73) Mr. PETROVIC (Yugoslavia) considered that all countries had an interest in sending a representative to the Board and would readily agree to defray the cost involved. The stipulation that travel expenses should be paid by Unesco removed a possible source of inequality and it seemed only fair that other expenses should be borne by the governments concerned.

(74) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that there appeared to be a contradiction between the resolution already adopted, which called for economies on the part of the Executive Board, and the proposal under discussion, which authorized additional expenditure.

(75) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the first resolution called for resolutions to be submitted to the ninth session of the General Conference, and it could not be taken for granted that they would be adopted. There was therefore no direct contradiction.

(76) The Chairman asked for a vote on the following amendment to the Japanese delegate's proposal, submitted by the delegate of Yugoslavia:

"That the Administrative Commission recommends that the Organization pay for the travel expenses of members of the Executive Board from and to their home countries by the direct route to the seat of the Executive Board sessions and that Member States pay the per diem and subsistence allowances, and the Commission requests the Executive Board to amend its Regulations accordingly."

(77) The amendment was rejected by 36 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

(78) The proposal of the delegate of Japan: "That the Director-General be authorized to add $12,000 under Chapter 2 of the budget to meet the cost of the additional members of the Executive Board and that the Executive Board be requested to make proposals to the ninth session of the General Conference on the question of travel and per diem expenses of its members" was adopted by 32 votes to 8 with 5 abstentions.

**ITEM 9.8.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: ADOPTION OF SPANISH AS A WORKING LANGUAGE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD** (document 8C/ADM/7)

(79) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) opened the debate on document 8C/ADM/7, proposing the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board. It was a language spoken by 20 countries and by 200 million people, the discovery of America had been announced in that language; some of the most important works of the world had been written in it. The draft resolution asked that one more step should be taken towards declaring Spanish a working language of Unesco. It could not be objected that expenditure would thereby be increased, since the cost was insignificant. In fact, the use of Spanish as a working language of the Board would mean the publication of fewer documents in French and English with a consequent reduction in costs. Unesco was a universal organization, and should accept as a working instrument of its Executive Board a language so widely spoken as Spanish. Moreover, the Director-General had announced that funds were available to meet expenses arising out of the adoption of the proposal.

(80) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) seconded the proposal because of the intrinsic virtues of the Spanish language, its contribution to the human heritage and its value in linking the old world with the new. His delegation and those of other Arab-speaking countries had always favoured the use of Spanish as a working language. Its adoption for the Conference had proved of great benefit to Unesco's work and the additional funds required for its use at the Executive Board were small.

(81) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) seconded the draft resolution submitted by the delegate of Ecuador. He thanked the Egyptian delegate for his remarks. Spanish was the language in which Cervantes, St. John of the Cross, Ruben Dario, Caro, Cuervo, Bello and Sarmiento, among others, had written. There had been speakers from the United Kingdom, Yugoslavia and Greece, who had spoken in Spanish at that very Conference. The fact that sessions of the General Conference had been held in Mexico and in Uruguay, and that the Organization had Centres in Havana, Montevideo and Patzcuaro, confirmed the importance of that language. It was necessary to consider not so much the number of people who spoke it as the number of countries whose native language it was. More than a quarter of the Member States of Unesco spoke Spanish, and a very large number of groups of officials and National Commissions found it necessary in handling the documents of the Organization. There were four Spanish-speaking members on the Executive Board, and that number would probably be increased in the future. The Board itself had allowed its members to speak in Spanish even though, up to that date, speeches had not been interpreted in that language. Moreover, as the delegate of Ecuador had pointed out, if Spanish were declared a working language of the Executive Board, there would be fewer documents published in French and English, which would reduce the general cost of the Documents and Publications Service.

(82) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) agreed with the delegates of Ecuador and Spain. The International Labour Office and the Food and Agriculture Organization had already adopted Spanish as a working language. He proposed that the draft resolution be adopted unanimously.

(83) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) warmly approved the proposal of the delegate of Ecuador. He thought it the natural and inevitable consequence of the decision already taken to adopt Spanish as a working language of the General Conference. He also pointed out that the step would not only prove useful for the delegations of Spanish-speaking countries but also for those using a sister language.

(84) Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay) supported the proposal of the delegate of Ecuador. The Executive Board had been using Spanish unofficially in its discussions for some time, but the moment had come to extend the use of Spanish in Unesco officially.

(85) Mr. RIANO JAUMA (Cuba) declared that the unanimous adoption of the proposal would be an act of justice towards all the States of Latin America, which were members of Unesco and co-operated actively in its work.

(86) Mr. BRICHET (France) recognized that the adoption of the proposal would entail considerable expenditure, but, considering the noble history of the Spanish tongue and the place it held in Latin America, the French delegation gave its sympathetic approval to the proposal of the delegate of Ecuador.

(87) The proposal was warmly supported by the delegates of Israel, USSR and Czechoslovakia.

(88) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) fully agreed with the

proposal of the delegate of Ecuador, which had been recommended by the Executive Board. Since, however, the question of the working languages of the Board depended on the Rules of Procedure of that body, he thought it better to leave the final decision to the Executive Board itself.

(89) Mr. Haguiwara accordingly proposed that the Commission word its recommendation as follows: "The General Conference recommends that the Executive Board take the necessary steps to adopt Spanish as a working language of the Board." Since the Board had already expressed its approval, it would certainly accept such a recommendation.

(90) Mr. LAUGIER (Executive Board) reminded the meeting that the Board had unanimously adopted a recommendation in favour of Spanish as a working language. The Commission could therefore confine itself to approval of the Board's recommendation and invite it to take the necessary steps to carry it into effect.

(91) Mr. ENVERGA (Philippines) supported the proposal of the delegate of Ecuador and said he would vote in favour. He hoped the delegates would give a unanimous vote.

(92) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) strongly supported the proposal and hoped that it would be unanimously adopted by the Conference.

(93) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) regretted that, for administrative and financial reasons, his delegation could not support the proposal. Their attitude was not in any way a reflection on the language or the people of Spain, for both of which the United Kingdom had the highest regard.

(94) Mr. ATTAGARA (Thailand) also supported the proposal and pointed out that nearly one-third of the countries represented were Spanish speaking.

(95) Mr. DURAN MASIS (Costa Rica) fully concurred in all that had been said by the delegates in favour of the draft resolution moved by Ecuador. The Executive Board was about to have more Spanish-speaking members. The proposal was a step towards placing the Spanish language on the same footing in Unesco with French and English. Spanish-speaking delegates had to lose a great deal of time reading the large number of documents sent to them in French or English.

(96) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) expressed his deep regret at the attitude of the United Kingdom delegate. The amount involved was very small compared with expenditure on certain items which were of less importance.

(97) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) was unable to accept the amendment submitted by the Japanese delegate to the draft resolution of Ecuador. Further, the Executive Board had recommended that the resolution be approved. He expressed his gratitude to all delegates who had declared themselves in favour of the use of Spanish as a working language of the Board. They had conferred an honour on all Spanish-speaking people, but he thought their decision also did credit to themselves.

(98) The Ecuadorean proposal (document 8C/ADM/7) was approved by 42 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

(99) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) said that he had voted in favour because he was in complete agreement with the substance of the proposal concerned. He would, however, have preferred some other wording since he thought it best to avoid too frequent interventions by the Conference in the internal affairs of the Board.

**ITEM 9.8.2 OF REVISED AGENDA : ADOPTION OF RUSSIAN AS A WORKING LANGUAGE OF UNESCO** (document 8C/BUD/1 Add.)

(100) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the use of Russian as a working language of the Conference and the Executive Board was highly important to the Soviet and other Russian-speaking delegations. The cost involved was very small compared with the total contributions paid by those countries. He agreed with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, who, in presenting his report to the Commission, had referred to the need for economy in the translation of official documents in Russian and he pointed out that the Soviet delegation was not raising the question of the use of Russian outside the General Conference and the Executive Board.

(101) In stressing that the introduction of Russian as a working language would enable the Russian-speaking delegations to participate effectively in the meetings of Unesco, Mr. Soldatov said that he would like to see Unesco follow the practice of the United Nations, in all of whose constituent bodies Russian was an official and a working language, speeches and documents alike being translated into and from the language. While recognizing that such comprehensive action was not, at the present juncture, practicable in Unesco, he hoped that it might be possible to translate at least the basic official documents into Russian.

(102) He regretted the decision of the Advisory Committee and hoped that the Commission would be able to adopt a favourable decision, since on it would depend the fruitful co-operation of the Russian-speaking countries.

(103) He formally proposed the following resolution:

"The General Conference resolves that the Russian language shall be a working language of the General Conference and of the Executive Board of Unesco".

(104) Mr. STEPANEK (Czechoslovakia), supporting the proposal of the Soviet delegate, stressed the importance of the Russian language not only to the USSR but to all Slav countries in Eastern and Central Europe.

(105) Mr. KAVALEVSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) warmly approved the proposal of the Soviet Union delegate. He pointed out that Russian was currently used by many of the peoples of the world, and he emphasized the importance of

Russian literature. By adopting his proposal Unesco would assuredly enhance its prestige, facilitate the work of Russian-speaking delegates, and promote the interests of the Organization.

(106) Mr. DUDNIK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation wanted to see the Executive Board working as efficiently as possible. Viewed in that light, the question of working languages was of considerable importance. The Ukrainian delegation had supported the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board, and considered it unfair not to include Russian among the Board's working languages. It accordingly gave its full support to the proposal of the delegation of the USSR.

(107) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) supported the proposal of the delegate of the USSR. Russian was the language in which Pushkin, Tolstoi, Gorki, Mitchurin and Chernishewski had written. It would be to Unesco's advantage to adopt the language spoken by 200 million human beings. In addition, it was employed in the conduct of diplomatic, cultural and scientific affairs by a great many people, and to use it would add to Unesco's prestige.

(108) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) wished to avoid repeating the very telling arguments already put forward in favour of the adoption of Russian as a working language. He merely wanted to add that the Polish delegation, whose mother tongue belonged to the Slav group of languages, whole-heartedly supported the proposal of the USSR delegate.

(109) Mr. CHEN YUAN (China) strongly opposed the resolution. The United Nations have five official languages and, if their precedent were followed, Unesco would have seven, since Arabic and Hindustani would have to be included. For reasons of time and economy it was not possible to adopt that practice.

(110) He had supported the adoption of Spanish as a working language, because there were twenty Spanish-speaking Member States. If another language were to be adopted, however, it should certainly be Arabic in preference to Russian, since there were more Arabic-speaking members. He saw no justification for the expense of adopting Russian as a working language for the Conference, and there was no case at all for the Executive Board, since it had no Soviet member.

(111) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) moved that the resolution be dealt with in two parts. With regard to the Executive Board, his delegation considered that action would be premature, bearing in mind that the Russian-speaking countries had only recently joined Unesco, whereas the Spanish-speaking countries had been members for eight years before their language was adopted.

(112) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) supported the proposal of the United States delegate to deal with the resolution in two parts, but opposed the adoption of Russian as a working language of the Executive Board, bearing in mind that there were many other languages whose claims for adoption would be equally justifiable on the reasons given. His opposition should not, however, be taken as reflecting on the merits of Russian as a language.

(113) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) approved the suggestion to deal with the USSR proposal in two parts. He was ready to agree to the inclusion of Russian among the working languages of the General Conference. Since the USSR had decided to join Unesco, there was every reason to believe that it had assumed the obligations embodied in the Constitution, including that of allowing Unesco publications to be distributed freely throughout the USSR. It was, therefore, in the hope of enabling Unesco publications to be distributed among Russian-speaking peoples, that he supported that part of the Russian proposal.

(114) On the other hand, he wished, for the time being at least, to make certain reservations regarding the use of Russian by the Executive Board. It was not yet known how the Executive Board would be composed. Mr. Carneiro hoped that the USSR would be represented on it, but he also hoped that the USSR delegate would be able to use one of the present working languages of the Board, as did those of his colleagues whose mother tongue was not among the present working languages, or, if that were not possible, that he would have recourse to an interpreter.

(115) Mr. BRICHET (France) called for the application of Rule 85 of the Rules of Procedure.

(116) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the importance of Russian as a working language had been adequately stated before the Executive Board and the General Conference. He only wished to repeat that the financial and practical objections were not valid. He referred to his comparison of the cost to the Organization with the amount of the contributions of the Russian-speaking Member States. He regretted that the Spanish-speaking countries had had to wait so long for the adoption of their language but considered that it was irrelevant to the adoption of Russian. If the problem were viewed in relation to Unesco's work, irrelevant and political considerations would be eliminated; it was a matter on which each delegate must vote according to his conscience.

(117) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the first half of the proposal, namely the adoption of Russian as a working language of the General Conference.

(118) The proposal was adopted by 34 votes to nil with 6 abstentions.

(119) The remainder of the proposal, that Russian be adopted as a working language of the Executive Board, was rejected by 22 votes to 5 with 14 abstentions.

(120) The proposal, as amended, was adopted, it being understood that the Director-General would be authorized to make the necessary budget changes.

(121) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that certain regulations would require amendment, and it was agreed that the Legal Committee should deal with that aspect of the matter.

ITEM 9.2 OF REVISED AGENDA (continued)

(122) The Commission resumed its consideration of document 8C/BUD/1.

PART III – GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

CHAPTER 3 – BUREAU OF PERSONNEL AND MANAGEMENT

(123) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) moved that the paragraph contained in document 8C/BUD/1, page 23, be adopted as the Commission's recommendation.

(124) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of Israel, supported by the delegates of France and Belgium, and adopted.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

# FIFTEENTH MEETING

*25 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)
*later:* Mr. AVIDA (Israel)

REQUEST FROM THE DELEGATION OF ISRAEL FOR THE WRITING OFF OF THE SUM OF $5,714.30 BEING A LOSS INCURRED BY THE ISRAELI NATIONAL COMMISSION ACTING AS A DISTRIBUTION AGENCY FOR UNESCO COUPONS (document 8C/ADM/20 Add.1)

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the delegate of Israel to introduce his Government's request for writing off the loss incurred in the distribution of Unesco coupons.

(2) Mr. AVIDA (Israel) said that there was not much to be added to the information contained in the document before the Commission. He recalled that during the discussion of the similar request submitted by Iran the delegation of the United States of America had asked for an assurance that such cases would not recur. It had been stated that the Director-General had taken the necessary steps in that connexion and therefore he, the representative of Israel, requested the Commission to adopt the draft resolution contained in the last part of his Government's request.

(3) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) said that, when the request of Iran had been discussed, the Commission had decided that it should not constitute a precedent, and that individual cases should be judged on their merits. In the case of the Iranian request there had been time to study the available evidence. For the Israeli request there was both insufficient time and not enough available data to give the matter the necessary consideration from the point of view of Unesco, and he therefore proposed that the request should not be discussed.

(4) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) did not share the views of the Egyptian delegate, although he agreed that the previous decision in favour of the Iranian Government did not constitute a precedent to be invoked in every case. The members of the Commission were, however, aware of the facts behind the Israeli delegation's request; they were similar to those adduced by the Iranian delegation. Those facts, which had been confirmed by the Director-General, justified the Israeli Government's request, with the difference that the lapse of time was shorter than in the case of Iran. The loss had occurred because payment was made only 10 days after the change in the rate of exchange. The sum involved was not likely to disturb the balance of Unesco's budget, and its payment to the Israeli Government would satisfy the demands of justice.

(5) The Israeli delegate's proposal was adopted by 37 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

REQUEST FROM THE NATIONAL COMMISSION OF THE FEDERAL PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA FOR THE WRITING OFF OF THE SUM OF $1,666.67, BEING A LOSS INCURRED BY THE COMMISSION ACTING AS A DISTRIBUTING AGENCY FOR UNESCO COUPONS (document 8C/ADM/29 Add.2)

(6) Mr. PETROVIC (Yugoslavia) requested the Commission to approve a resolution, similar to that just adopted at the request of the Israeli delegation, in favour of the National Commission of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. The sum to be written off was the equivalent of $1,666.67.

(7) In reply to a question from the delegate of the

Union of South Africa, Mr. Petrovic said that,according to the Secretariat's comments on the requests presented by the Governments of Yugoslavia and Israel concerning losses incurred in the sale of Unesco coupons (document 8C/ADM/29 Add.3),the last instalment of the Yugoslav payments was made in August 1952, but in fact it went back to January 1952. As the United Nations account in Belgrade had been utilized, there had been some lapse of time before Unesco was informed.

(8) The Yugoslav proposal was put to the vote without further discussion and adopted by 37 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

(9) Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Chairman, then vacated the Chair, which was then taken by Mr. AVIDA (Israel), Vice-Chairman of the Administrative Commission.

**ITEM 9.6 OF REVISED AGENDA: RESOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANS CONCERNING UNESCO (document 8C/ADM/19)**

(10) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that document 8C/ADM/19 ("Resolutions and recommendations of interest to Unesco, adopted by organs of the United Nations") was purely informative and was intended to supplement the Report of the Director-General (documents 8C/3 and 8C/3 Add.), which had already been discussed by the General Conference in plenary meeting.
(11) The document showed that co-operation between Unesco and the various organs of the United Nations was becoming increasingly close and fruitful.
(12) Mr. Maheu wished to make two special observations.
(13) Part I of the document related to Unesco's Annual Report to the United Nations, which was examined each year by the Economic and Social Council. The Council had discussed the Report at its session in July 1954 and, for the first time, had unanimously approved it.
(14) The second observation concerned Part II of the document: Unesco's relations with the Trusteeship Council. Although strictly technical in character, the Organization's co-operation appeared to be highly appreciated by the Trusteeship Council.

(15) As the Commission was not required to take any decision on document 8C/ADM/19, it took note of it and proceeded to the next item on its agenda.

**ITEMS 9.6.2 AND 9.6.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: QUADRENNIAL REVIEW BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF SUBVENTIONS (1950-1953) (document 8C/ADM/20) AND QUADRENNIAL REVIEW OF THE DIRECTIVES CONCERNING RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (document 8C/ADM/21)**

(16) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) pointed out that the document submitted to the Commission came from the Executive Board. The General Conference had instructed the Board to examine the employment of subventions granted to non-governmental organizations. The report covered the activities of those organizations during the past four years, which had been reviewed at the Board's thirty-eighth session.
(17) Mr. Veronese summarized the four conclusions and the six recommendations set out in Section I of the document. In particular, he drew the Commission's attention to the following facts:

(1) The co-operation of the non-governmental organizations with Unesco, and the subventions granted to them by the Organization had yielded results which the Secretariat could not have achieved alone.

(2) The percentage of the budget granted to non-governmental organizations as a whole tended to remain stable, but it was impossible to stabilize the proportion allotted to each field of work.

(3) Unesco was naturally particularly interested in the non-governmental organizations set up under its auspices; they enabled the Organization to save considerable sums of money.

(4) There were financial difficulties in the way of extending the geographical scope of organizations; moreover, certain highly specialized scientific organizations had great difficulty in finding national or even regional specialists in all countries.
(18) Mr. Veronese drew the Commission's attention to the recommendations of the Executive Board, in particular to the last two:

(v) The information contained in document 38 EX/7 should be used as a basis for the preparation of an appropriate publication designed to impart to the general public a fuller knowledge of the work accomplished in the field of international co-operation with the help of Unesco's subventions.

(vi) In preparing the next quadrennial review of the employment of subventions, it would be desirable to consider making use of the evaluation techniques used in the social sciences.

(19) Mr. RAADI (Iran) expressed his approval of the document in general and of the Executive Board's conclusions in particular. He drew the Commission's attention to the need for extending the geographical scope of non-governmental organizations to cover the whole world. He believed that the organizations made Unesco's work easier, and that, being non-governmental, they helped to give a proper balance to Unesco, which itself was a purely intergovernmental organization.
(20) Most of the non-governmental organizations were found in highly developed countries. The delegation of Iran recognized that to be unavoidable for the time being, but hoped that the state of affairs would not persist; the subventions granted by Unesco to non-governmental organizations should be proportionate to their endeavours to form national leaders. The Iranian delegate added that additional efforts should be made to ensure a larger attendance by delegates from distant countries at conferences held under the auspices of non-governmental organizations.

(21) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) assured the Iranian delegate that the problem of geographical representation in the organizations was a major concern of the Secretariat, whose efforts had already produced appreciable results.
(22) He explained that there were 49 non-governmental organizations in receipt of subventions from Unesco. Twenty-seven of them were represented in

more than 20 countries and some of them in over 40 countries. That was particularly remarkable since 21 non-governmental organizations established under Unesco's auspices were founded very recently.

(23) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) was in agreement with the views expressed by the Assistant Director-General and by the representative of Iran. He was prepared to support the recommendations contained in the Executive Board's review.
(24) It was a fact that a large number of scientific organizations were centred in Europe and held their conferences in European countries. That was possibly unavoidable, but it made it very difficult for certain distant and less highly developed countries to send representatives to those conferences, and to benefit from them fully. He therefore supported the suggestion that some proportion of the subventions granted to those organizations should be made available to small countries to cover the cost of participating in their work.

(25) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) recalled that his delegation had always been in favour of a concentration of efforts and a stabilization of the Organization's programme. He agreed that much valuable work could be achieved by the granting of subventions to non-governmental organizations. Strict control should, however, be exercised over the granting of the subventions and in that connexion the activities of the organizations in question should be subjected to the most thorough scrutiny to ensure that they were being carried out in a sufficiently important field and that they were of value to Unesco. The international organizations should be given financial assistance, but he was opposed to Unesco taking upon itself the greater part of the burden of supporting them.

(26) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) expressed his satisfaction with the report presented by the Executive Board. He thought the co-operation established between Unesco and the non-governmental organizations was of the very greatest importance and hoped that the organizations would be called upon to assist in planning some of Unesco's programme projects, as well as in carrying them out. He urged that the problem should be studied anew with a view to drawing up Unesco's future programmes.

(27) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that his delegation was much interested in the question of subventions for non-governmental organizations. Such organizations, in order to receive subventions from Unesco, should, however, be international in membership and in their activities. He approved the principle of broader geographical representation advocated by the Executive Board. If it was true, for historical and other reasons, that most of those organizations were in one continent, they should nevertheless, when convening conferences, attempt to meet in other parts of the world as well. That would give their activities greater publicity and would contribute to the broadening of their membership. He suggested for example that the International Association of Universities should embody national unions of universities and not merely individual universities.
(28) Although Unesco was responsible for the setting up of a number of the international organizations in question, it was nevertheless imperative that the latter acquire financial stability and learn to stand alone as soon as possible. He did not object to the granting of contracts, but thought it wrong to encourage absolute reliance on subventions from Unesco.
(29) Finally, some non-governmental organizations had their head offices at Unesco headquarters in Paris. In certain cases that arrangement had proved inconvenient; there was also a danger that it might have an adverse effect on the work of the Organization as a whole, and more particularly the Secretariat. He believed that it should be made clear to the organizations in question that Unesco would not be able to give them indefinite shelter. Their moving to other premises might require financial aid from Unesco, but action in that respect would have to be taken by the Executive Board and the Director-General.
(30) He paid a tribute to the work done by the Executive Board in connexion with the review before the Commission. His delegation fully supported the principles on which the Executive Board proposed to pursue its work.

(31) Mr. BENCHENEB (France) agreed with the Executive Board's recommendations but pointed out that most of Unesco's activities received insufficient publicity, and that, in particular, the assistance Unesco furnished to non-governmental organizations was passed over unmentioned. He asked what sort of publication was contemplated by the Executive Board in recommendation (v); if it was to be a pamphlet, he thought that it would not be the most useful type of publication. He considered that Unesco's activities needed constant publicity in the press, on the air and in films. In particular he felt that Unesco's efforts in that direction, unlike those of other international organizations, which received constant publicity, were reasonably effective only during sessions of the General Conference, which occurred only every two years.
(32) Referring to the Indian delegate's remarks, Mr. Bencheneb thought it out of the question that Unesco should grant aid to non-governmental organizations on a purely temporary basis; that would, in his opinion, be limiting Unesco's operations in an arbitrary fashion. He recalled that certain non-governmental organizations, older than Unesco, had served it as models when it was established.
(33) The French delegate urged that, on the contrary, Unesco's assistance should be permanent. It was true that the increase in non-governmental organizations might entail financial dangers, but they could be avoided by grouping the organizations into international associations.

(34) At the CHAIRMAN's request, Mr. BENCHENEB (France) explained that he was not submitting a formal proposal for the time being, but would like his observations to be included in the minutes of the meeting.

(36) In reply to a question by the representative of the Executive Board, Mr. Bencheneb also intimated that he was not referring to the wording of recommendation (v) but, more generally, to the interpretation of the term "publication".

(36) Mr. KELLY (Australia) thought that, in the case of nearly all the organizations reviewed, the Executive Board had been insufficiently critical. That could probably be explained by lack of time. On the face of it, reports on organizations failed to reveal in a number of cases that they were truly international in scope and in intention.
(37) With regard to the lack of international character, a number of organizations had clearly done nothing to establish contacts outside Europe. It was necessary to define the term "international organization" and to devise new criteria for the guidance of the Executive Board.
(38) In the case of the organizations set up by Unesco, and which could be considered as its children, some had been stillborn, some existed only on paper, while others submitted no reports on their activities for long periods at a stretch.
(39) In view of those considerations he proposed that the Commission, instead of pursuing the discussion, adopt the following resolution:

"That the recommendations before the Commission in document 8C/ADM/20 (including especially the reports on the subsidized organizations) and document 8C/ADM/21 be referred to a working party of nine members for a report to this Commission, the working party to consist of the representatives of India, Egypt, United Kingdom, Argentina, Colombia, Canada, France, Denmark and the Philippines".

(40) If, as he understood, the representative of France was unable to take part in the working party, he would propose the representative of Italy as an alternate.

(41) Mr. PAGE (Canada) supported the proposal to refer the matter for further study. It would be necessary to find out in greater detail about the achievements of the various organizations. Some had done good work, while others had shown few concrete results.
(42) There was a danger in merely listing organizations by countries since in some countries some were possibly not represented by more than one member. If such were the case, it was clear that no subvention could be granted.
(43) A further point was that many of the organizations did nothing to give publicity to the work and aims of Unesco.
(44) In conclusion, he said that it was possible to scan the whole field of human activity and find gaps where no international organization existed, but there was no need for such an organization in any given area, then surely there was no need to create one.

(45) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) recommended that the Commission examine the document as a whole without, for the time being, either formulating directives for the Secretariat regarding future subventions or examining each subvention separately.
(46) As the representative of the Executive Board, he had nothing to say with regard to the Australian delegate's proposal that a working party be set up to study the question of subventions, but he believed that the Commission should make a comprehensive study of all the documents on subventions before taking a decision on the proposed working party.

(47) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) seconded the Australian delegate's proposal.

(48) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) considered that it would be premature and rash to adopt the Australian delegate's proposal and set up a working party of the Administrative Commission at that stage of the discussions, for it would not know how to organize its work. It was also doubtful whether it could secure better results in a few hours or a few days than had been achieved by the Executive Board. The working party could scarcely do more than discuss the few documents submitted to the Commission, whereas the Executive Board had had much fuller and more comprehensive information at its disposal.
(49) If a working party were in due course set up, the question of the accommodation of certain non-governmental organizations at Unesco headquarters could be submitted to it. The same decision could not be taken on each of those organizations; for some of them constantly needed to refer to information assembled by the Secretariat, which, in turn, could use their documentation daily.
(50) As the French delegate had declined to serve on the proposed working party, his place would be taken by the Italian delegate.

(51) The Australian delegate's proposal was rejected by 18 votes to 9, with 13 abstentions.

(52) The general discussion therefore continued.

(53) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation was most interested in improving as far as possible, the relations between Unesco and the non-governmental organizations. The contributions of the latter to Unesco's work could be most valuable, but unless the relationship between them were sound, and unless the greatest care were taken in choosing the organizations to be subsidized, Unesco would be running a serious risk of squandering its funds. He supported the views expressed by the representatives of South Africa, Australia and Canada that the organizations subsidized should be alive and viable. Their normal overhead expenses, including such items as travelling and publicity, should be covered by their own resources.
(54) His delegation agreed that funds should be made available to bring eminent representatives of small but distant countries to conferences, but they should not go to cover the administrative expenses of the organizations in question, particularly the travelling expenses of administrative staff.
(55) Under the existing directives for the granting of subventions, the recipient organization had to provide a substantial proportion of the funds needed before obtaining a subvention. In that connexion, the review of the Executive Board provided no information, and he feared that a detailed analysis of the facts would show that some nine-tenths of the funds of the organizations were provided by Unesco. If that were the case, it was highly regrettable, since subventions should only be granted until such time as the organizations were able to provide their own resources.
(56) He did not know which non-governmental organizations had their head offices in the Unesco headquarters building in Paris and thought that some

measure of decentralization could be agreed upon. If their head offices were moved, Unesco should not carry the major burden of their administrative costs. Unesco subventions should be devoted exclusively to constructive activities.

(57) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) first emphasized the importance of the document submitted by the Executive Board. He thought that Mr. Veronese had made it clear that the Board had given much attention to the question. It was obvious that the Board and the Secretariat considered the problem of geographical representation in non-governmental organizations to be extremely important.
(58) Another no less serious problem arose - the control of the funds granted to non-governmental organizations. The Greek delegate urged that the Assistant Director-General should see that the reports submitted by the organizations were carefully checked by the Secretariat. The auditors also should supervise the use of the funds with the greatest vigilance.
(59) The delegate of Greece thought that a new, concise report on non-governmental organizations - and, in particular, on some of them - should be drawn up by the Executive Board. It was essential for the Board to sift them thoroughly, and for that purpose adequate information was required.
(60) The Greek delegate asked that his comments be included in the minutes.

(61) Mr. MARDONES RESTAT (Chile) wished to comment on the recommendations set forth in the Executive Board document, 8C/ADM/20. He was in agreement with the first. With regard to the second, he felt that the word "harmoniously" was too vague. He would prefer it to be stated that "greater support would be given to cultural activities", and asked for the inclusion of a statement to that effect.
(62) He was not in favour of the stabilization of subventions, as he considered such a course would be a mistake. There were organizations receiving subventions of more than $40,000 while others had no more than $1,000. Stabilization would perpetuate the existing allotments although it might be better to change them as time passed. With regard to the third recommendation, he urged that some criterion should be established for classifying non-governmental organizations by categories. Such a criterion should be applied, for example, to library organizations. In connexion with the fourth recommendation, he stressed the desirability of maintaining contact with the different regions. It was not enough for a non-governmental organization to be in touch with the Unesco Secretariat; it would be most useful for the members of non-governmental organizations to establish contacts with the National Commissions in their own countries. In that way, it would be easier to see whether the activities of the member or members in question, and of their organization, were really useful. He agreed with the French delegate's contention that subventions should not, as a rule, be temporary or partial. No limit should be placed on subventions so long as considerations of efficiency, or other circumstances, required them. At the request of the Chairman, the delegate of Chile said that he would present a document containing his suggestions to the Secretariat.

(63) Mrs. PATRONETTO VALIER (Italy) remarked that the Executive Board's report brought out the differences between the various non-governmental organizations. Their diversity was explained by the fact that some of them were purely scientific, while others, such as youth organizations, represented an important section of public opinion.
(64) The delegate of Italy was in agreement with the Executive Board's recommendations about the proposed publication. In her view, the document could be cast in such a form as to provide the critical study requested by certain members of the Commission. The publication might then act as a stimulus to non-governmental organizations as a whole.
(65) The delegate of Italy drew attention to certain anomalies in the Executive Board's report. A careful reading of the document showed that certain organizations had received the same subvention twice, that others had been active during 1951 and 1952, but had largely discontinued their work during later years, while, lastly, there were organizations which made entirely false claims that they had representatives in certain countries. The delegate considered that anomalies of that kind were sure to come to light if the Commission decided to set up a working party on the subject.

(66) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) was under the impression that a number of those taking part in the discussion did not appear to know a great deal about the non-governmental organizations and he thought that some of the charges made against the system as a whole were not justified.
(67) The non-governmental organizations were of the greatest importance to Unesco and vice versa. He personally had had a great deal of experience of their work and, without the assistance given them by Unesco, a great number would never have existed, particularly in the new world.
(68) Unesco was using the non-governmental organizations to an ever greater extent for implementing its projects. They provided valuable knowledge which would otherwise only be available to the Organization at much higher cost.
(69) With regard to the geographical expansion of their spheres of activity, it had frequently been difficult to find in other parts of the world corresponding institutions with which contact could be established. A fair degree of success had been achieved in the countries of Latin America, but in Canada, for example, progress had been much slower.
(70) He thought that those organizations which were doing valuable co-ordinating work should be allowed to retain their premises at Unesco headquarters; otherwise the work which Unesco would be compelled to do itself would be practically doubled. If on financial grounds such co-operation were prevented, considerable damage might result.
(71) He agreed that publicity as a whole was inadequate, and thought that the publication of a yearly handbook on the work of the non-governmental organizations would do much to obtain co-operation from abroad.

(72) Mr. FERNANDEZ MORENO (Argentina) remarked that some of the previous speakers had started by praising the work of the Executive Board, and had gone on to make criticisms and reservations. Perhaps, after hearing what had been said later, somebody would like

to correct that impression. He agreed with the statements of the delegates of India, Australia and the United States of America. In fact, 25 of the non-governmental organizations set up at Unesco's instigation had their headquarters in Paris, 9 in the United Kingdom, 3 in America, 1 in Switzerland, 1 in Belgium and 1 in the Netherlands. It would be better if headquarters were set up in different parts of the world. He endorsed the remarks of the delegate of Chile and asked, further, that a working party be set up.

(73) Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay) was particularly in sympathy with the views of the delegates of the United States of America and Greece. He made a distinction between non-governmental organizations set up by Unesco, such as the Theatre Institute, and those which had applied to it for aid. Unesco had some responsibility for the existence and successful work of the former. A distinction should be drawn between different types of expenditure, between travel and administration costs, on the one hand, and expenditure on publications and fellowships, on the other. Account should also be taken of the non-governmental organizations which contributed their own funds.

(74) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) wished to propose a draft amendment. With the Chairman's consent, he suggested that a working party be set up to study and report on non-governmental organizations, their practical usefulness, and whether or not they should continue to receive subventions.

(75) The delegate of Peru seconded the proposal.

(76) Mr. RIANO JAUMA (Cuba) asked that a study be made of the importance and usefulness of international non-governmental organizations, and of the extent to which the co-operation they furnished offset the subventions they received. He supported the delegate of Chile's views and seconded the draft resolution proposed by the delegation of Mexico. He agreed with the opinions expressed by the delegates of the United States of America and Greece.

(77) Mr. MORAZE (France) referred to the remarks already made by Sir Charles Webster, who represented a country which was not in the habit of taking justification for expenditure lightly. If the work done by the non-governmental organizations were put in the hands of experts employed directly by Unesco, the cost would be enormous. He therefore concluded that the non-governmental organizations, 25 of which had their headquarters in Paris, enabled Unesco to make considerable savings.
(78) Mr. Morazé would be the first to recommend an equitable geographical distribution of non-governmental organizations if world-wide travel became simple and well organized.
(79) He drew the Commission's attention to the fact that certain scholars were not particularly anxious to take part in work organized by Unesco itself and preferred to co-operate with non-governmental organizations, established well before Unesco, which had chosen their headquarters quite freely, and without reference to fair geographical distribution.
(80) The delegate of France added that administrative expenses should not be confused with direct programme costs. In fact, the more administrative expenditure was cut, the more money would be available for action. It would also be inadvisable to compel organizations which had been in existence only a few months, to extend their geographical scope too soon. Similarly, it would be unwise of the Secretariat to encourage the formation of non-governmental organizations at a great distance from its own headquarters.
(81) The delegate of France agreed with the United Kingdom delegate's view that a resolution should not be lightly adopted without a proper appreciation of all its consequences or a thorough investigation of the machinery which it was desired to change. He would deplore any decision taken by the Commission which might be interpreted as showing lack of confidence in the Executive Board. The discussion should be based on the report presented by the Board.
(82) Mr. Morazé also suggested that, if the Committee wished a special study to be made of the geographical distribution of the headquarters of non-governmental organizations, it could be carried out by the working party.

(83) Mr. RIEGNER (Vice-Chairman of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations having consultative status with Unesco) thanked the Director-General and the Executive Board for their assessment of the work of the non-governmental organizations, and the Assistant Director-General for the explanations he had given the Commission; he assured the Commission that the non-governmental organizations would not fail to make a close study of the criticisms advanced during the debate. He warned the Commission against over-generalization, which he did not believe could have good results. For that reason, he was grateful to the delegations of the United Kingdom and France, which had defended the non-governmental organizations and explained the difficulties that they had to overcome. The organizations had no fear of financial supervision with regard to the subventions they received from Unesco, but, on the contrary, thought it desirable. They were doing useful work and were proud of the confidence shown in them by the General Conference of Unesco in giving them financial assistance; and were fully aware of the responsibility towards States which that confidence imposed upon them.
(84) In connexion with widening the geographical scope of non-governmental organizations, or the idea of making them world-wide, Mr. Riegner said that the organizations realized that they should one day cover the whole world. There were various reasons, chiefly financial, which prevented their doing so for the time being. He asked for increased assistance, which the organization could devote entirely to establishing themselves in the continents where they were not yet represented, or to bringing people from such regions to their international conferences, for they were in a real sense centres for work and propaganda in support of Unesco.
(85) Mr. Riegner said that the Director-General had called the representatives of non-governmental organizations together for consultation on Unesco's programme; at that consultation the organizations had made a number of observations. They had also noted with regret that the subventions and contracts coming under the Department of Education mounted to a lower

total than those under other Departments, such as the Department of Natural Sciences. Mr. Riegner added that it would be very useful to bring representatives of remote countries to conferences on education.

(86) In comparing the usefulness of contracts with that of subventions, the representatives of the non-governmental organizations had been anxious, above all, to avoid refusing any type of aid. Even the smallest subventions invariably produced good results as a whole.

(87) Finally, the speaker stressed the importance that the non-governmental organizations attributed to the Executive Board's recommendation (v). The Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations had been unable to take a formal decision on that proposal. But he wished to inform the Commission that, at previous conferences, many organizations had expressed a hope that the contribution of the non-governmental organizations to the work of the United Nations and Unesco would be better publicized. There was no doubt that the organizations would welcome an objective, critical study designed to evaluate their contribution.

(88) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that he had not yet spoken during the discussion because the document being examined was issued by the Executive Board. But he could no longer keep silent in a discussion which involved Unesco's general policy of promoting international co-operation by assistance to non-governmental organizations.

(89) Mr. Maheu wished to remind the Commission of certain basic facts. The Executive Board's review of the employment of subventions (document 8C/ADM/20) was a critical study dealing with the past, while the quadrennial review of the Directives concerning relations with non-governmental organizations (document 8C/ADM/21) dealt with the future; or, in other words, considered possible amendments to the Directives concerning the grant of subventions. Some of the criticisms made in the Commission were answered in the second document, and the Director-General considered that those replies were satisfactory.

(90) Mr. Maheu was surprised that certain members of the Commission had complained that the quadrennial report submitted by the Executive Board was not adequate; he observed that, of all the documents which the General Conference had to consider, the review came next in bulk after the proposed programme and budget and the Director-General's Report. Nevertheless, not all the material which the Executive Board had used in drawing it up was included in the document. The Board kept constant watch over the working of the non-governmental organizations, and its report was the result of the very close contacts always maintained, particularly in that field, between the Secretariat and the Executive Board.

(91) Replying to a question asked by the delegate of the Union of South Africa on the increased in subventions in the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56, Mr. Maheu explained that the increase, which amounted to $96,000, was exactly equivalent to the sums allocated to the Unesco Institutes in Germany. The appropriations would thenceforward appear as subventions, whereas previously they had been granted by way of contracts. There was, therefore, no question of increasing the budget, but simply of transferring funds from one category of expenditure to another.

(92) In reply to the comment made by the delegate of India in connexion with the International Association of Universities, which, in the delegate's view, should include not only universities, but also national unions of universities, Mr. Maheu said that each non-governmental organization was free to adopt its own statutes. That freedom was one of the privileges of the non-governmental organizations. The Secretariat no doubt had some moral influence over them and frequently gave them advice; but any pressure going beyond the limits of suggestion and persuasion would be directly contrary to the aims pursued by Unesco in co-operating with the organizations.

(93) With regard to the remarks made by the delegate of India, and endorsed by the delegate of the United States of America, concerning the fact that certain non-governmental organizations were housed in Unesco's headquarters in Paris, Mr. Maheu said that the number of organizations involved was very small (about 10), and, with one or two exceptions, they had made agreements with Unesco under specific resolutions of the General Conference.

(94) In reply to the delegate of Australia, Mr. Maheu said that the non-governmental organizations set up by Unesco, which might be called Unesco's "children", were not arbitrary creations of the Secretariat, but had been established in pursuance of explicit resolutions of the General Conference. Their working or their usefulness might be re-examined, but there could be no doubt of their origin. Some of them had been alleged to be "still-born"; the Assistant Director-General would like to know which. Some of the children were very young but undoubtedly sturdy. As far as the organizations said to exist only "on paper" were concerned, Mr. Maheu considered that the previous statements by the delegates of France and the United Kingdom, who had had wide personal experience of the work of the organizations, had adequately answered the allegations, which were, to say the least, somewhat rash. Mr. Maheu knew of no non-governmental organization which could be said not to have submitted a report and accounts to Unesco.

(95) Like the delegate of Greece, Mr. Maheu was in favour of a new study of non-governmental organizations if it were carried out on a selective basis. But, referring to what the delegate of the United Kingdom had said, he warned the Commission against hasty generalizations likely to upset the whole policy with regard to the organizations.

(96) In conclusion, he considered that the establishment of a working party would be necessary only if there were real uneasiness on the subject; but, frankly, he could see no objective justification for it. In any case, the working party on the decentralization of Unesco's activities could not be made responsible for carrying out that further task, because the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget was awaiting the working party's recommendations in order to draw up its report for the Programme and Budget Commission, which was already very much behind in its work.

(97) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board might be gratified that the discussion

on the documents concerning non-governmental organizations had been so wide. He endorsed the Assistant Director-General's suggestion that the survey of the past, set forth in document 8C/ADM/20, could not be divorced from the proposals for the future appearing in document 8C/ADM/21. In conclusion, he thought that all the work done would serve to provide general directions and more exact references for the future Executive Board of Unesco.

(98) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) would not object to the whole matter being referred to a working party for further consideration if that could help the Conference. The subject, however, was a most complicated one, and there was a tremendous need to study as much of the evidence as could be made available. It was not a good plan to take hurried decisions on such an important question and he therefore proposed that the salient points of the discussion be made known to the Executive Board, which might then devote further study to the matter with a view to producing in two years' time fresh conclusions on the basis of new evidence.

(99) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the discussion be pursued at the next meeting.

(100) It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

# SIXTEENTH MEETING

*25 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEMS 9.6.2 AND 9.6.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: QUADRENNIAL REVIEW BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF SUBVENTIONS (1950-1953) (document 8C/ADM/20) AND QUADRENNIAL REVIEW OF THE DIRECTIVES CONCERNING RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (document 8C/ADM/21) (continued)**

(1) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) said that, in view of the satisfactory explanations given by the representatives of the Director-General and the Executive Board, and as it was clear that there was no need to set up a special working party to consider documents 8C/ADM/20 and 8C/ADM/21, the delegation of his country withdrew the draft amendment it had proposed at the previous meeting.

(2) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) thanked the delegate of Mexico for having reconsidered his attitude. The discussion in the Commission had been of great interest and many points of view had emerged, but it was clear that if the problem were submitted to a working party it would not be possible for the Commission to submit a report to the present Conference. He therefore moved the following proposal:

"The General Conference, having considered the voluminous reports on international non-governmental organizations submitted in document 8C/ADM/20, approves the resolutions in document 8C/ADM/20 and refers back to the Executive Board the suggested changes in document 8C/ADM/21 to be reconsidered in the light of the discussions in the Administrative Commission, and where necessary with the assistance of special experts appointed by the Executive Board. The Executive Board should also refer the above documents, with the report of the discussions in the Administrative Commission, to the National Commissions and invite them to forward their comments to the Executive Board for its consideration. In the light of the above information and the comments of the National Commissions, the Executive Board will make a further report on the suggested changes in the directives to the ninth session of the General Conference".

(3) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of the Philippines and supported by the delegates of Belgium, Argentina, France and the United States of America.

(4) Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate went a long way towards meeting the views expressed at the previous meeting by the delegates of Australia, Canada, Mexico, India and Argentina. He supported the proposal and submitted the following criteria, to be borne in mind when granting subventions to international organizations and institutions:

1. Were the constitution and work of the organization truly international in character and scope?
2. Were the constitution and work of the organization in accordance with the aims, ideals and programme of Unesco?
3. Was Unesco the most appropriate body to provide assistance?
4. Did the organization require the proposed assistance for its continued and effective contribution to the aims of Unesco?

(5) The third and fourth points were especially important and he proposed that all four should be included in the Summary Record for the guidance of the Executive Board.

(6) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) asked whether adoption of the United Kingdom delegate's proposal would preclude furtner discussion of document 8C/ADM/21.

(7) The CHAIRMAN said that there could be no further discussion at the present juncture, since the Organization would continue to work under existing directives for the next two years. In reply to a further question from the South African delegate, the Secretariat would welcome recommendations for improving on the draft alterations in document 8C/ADM/21.

(8) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) supported the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate. With regard to the four criteria suggested by the Australian delegate, while Unesco had no intention of interfering in the affairs of non-governmental organizations, it had an obligation to see that certain fundamental principles were fostered by the organizations to which it proposed granting subventions. The Secretariat no doubt had means of conveying the views of the Conference to those organizations without impinging on their freedom. He hoped that the Executive Board's proposed alterations would not be entirely ignored during the coming two years, since he was not in favour of the existing directives remaining in force unchanged. The Executive Board must be given some latitude in that respect.

(9) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stressed the importance of the question raised by the delegate of India. The United Kingdom delegate's proposal, as it was worded, meant that the existing directives would remain in force until the ninth session of the Conference. According to that proposal, the Executive Board was to reconsider the question and engage in extensive consultations, which would lead to a new report, on which the ninth session of the Conference would have to take a decision. The Indian delegate's proposal would leave the Executive Board some latitude to make transitional arrangements in the light of the Commission's discussions and the results of its own consultations. If that proposal were accepted, the point would have to be made clear in the draft resolution, which, as it stood, asked only that a still fuller report should be submitted to the Conference at its ninth session.

(10) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) found himself, for the first time, in opposition to the delegate of India: the question was too important to admit of any lack of precision. The United Kingdom delegate's proposal provided specifically for the current regulations to remain in force for two more years and, if the Executive Board were to be given the latitude desired by the delegate of India, the Commission would have to undertake a detailed study of document 8C/ADM/21, since not all the proposed alterations were acceptable.

(11) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) had not intended to advocate too wide a latitude for the Executive Board. He nevertheless withdrew his suggestion in view of the objections of the delegate of the United States of America.

(12) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that he had been trying to point out that the United Kingdom delegate's proposal meant that the existing directives would continue to apply, since only the Conference could alter them.

(13) Referring to document 8C/ADM/21, Mr. Maheu drew attention to the proposed amendment to clause 2 of Section B (Beneficiaries) (page 11), the purpose of which was to cover more adequately the variety of bodies set up in implementation of resolutions of the General Conference - such as the Unesco Institutes in Germany. As the Programme and Budget Commission, at its meeting that morning, had approved the subventions to those three institutes, the amendment to the Directives was necessary to make that decision legal. He therefore asked the Commission, as an exception, to accept the following new provision for the period 1955-56: "subventions may be granted to non-governmental bodies set up in implementation of a resolution of the General Conference".

(14) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) supported the request of the Assistant Director-General, but suggested that it should be included in a separate resolution.

(15) The first proposal of the United Kingdom delegate was adopted by the Commission.

(16) The delegate of the United Kingdom then submitted a second proposal: "That the Administrative Commission approves the action with regard to the three institutes in Germany, the problem having already been fully considered by the Programme and Budget Commission".

(17) The proposal was duly seconded and adopted.

**ITEM 9.6.4 OF REVISED AGENDA : RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD REGARDING APPLICATIONS BY INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR ADMISSION TO CONSULTATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**
(Documents 8C/ADM/22 and Annexes 1 and 2; Addenda to document 8C/ADM/22 and to Annex 1 of that document)

(18) The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Executive Board to introduce the documents.

(19) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) explained that the Executive Board, at its thirty-ninth session, had considered applications for admission to consultative arrangements from 28 international non-governmental organizations, and the comments of Member States on those applications. The results were set forth in document 8C/ADM/22, Add.2. The Executive Board recommended the General Conference to admit 21 of those organizations to consultative arrangements. It had recommended refusal in only one case - that of the World Chess Federation - but recommended that the decision on six other organizations be postponed until the ninth session. The Board considered that it had insufficient information about the Académie Internationale de la Céramique, the International Humanist and Ethical Union and the Union Internationale pour la Liberté d'Enseignement to make a recommendation either for or against the

admission of those organizations, while, as the applications from the International Union of Students, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Student Movement for the United Nations had not arrived by the prescribed date, they could not be submitted for prior consideration by the Member States, and therefore had to be postponed.

(20) The CHAIRMAN invited discussion on the Appendices to document 8C/ADM/22, bearing in mind the Executive Board's recommendations in document 8C/ADM/22 Add.2.

Appendix 1: Conference of Internationally-Minded Schools

(21) Approved without comment.

Appendix 2: Co-ordinating Secretariat of National Unions of Students

(22) Approved without comment.

Appendix 3: International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom

(23) Approved without comment.

Appendix 4: International Association for Vocational Guidance

(24) Approved without comment.

Appendix 5: International Catholic Film Office

(25) Approved without comment.

Appendix 6: International Confederation of Professional and Intellectual Workers

(26) Approved without comment.

Appendix 7: International Council for Educational Films

(27) Approved without comment.

Appendix 8: International Federation of Catholic Youth

(28) Approved without comment.

Appendix 9: International Federation of Senior Police Officers

(29) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what relation that organization bore to Unesco.

(30) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) quoted the following extracts from the comments submitted by the Government of India in a letter to Unesco dated 1 July 1954 (document 8C/ADM/22, Annex II, page 2): "Some of the organizations appear to have been established recently and, unless we have an opportunity of observing their work for some time, it would be difficult to say whether the organizations should receive consultative status with Unesco". "In addition, these organizations should not confine their activities to particular religious or racial groups".
(31) He enquired to what extent and in what manner Unesco proposed to co-operate with the International Federation of Senior Police Officers.

(32) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Executive Committee of the International Federation of Senior Police Officers had repeatedly expressed its interest in Unesco's programme and its desire that the police should be used not only for the punishment, but also for the prevention of crime, especially among juveniles. The Committee considered that the police had an important part to play in society in that respect and that the International Federation of Senior Police Officers could help materially in solving the problem of juvenile delinquency - a tragic problem, which no one concerned with education could disregard. Mr. Maheu concluded that it would be advantageous to extend the collaboration that already existed between Unesco and that organization.

(33) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) said that the discussions in the Board had dealt with the same point. The Board's recommendation was based on two considerations: in the first place, the Federation was not an international police organization, but an international federation of senior police officers whose object was to supply its members with studies bearing on the social aspects of their difficult work; in the second place, if Unesco co-operated with the Federation, both parties would be able to benefit from the exchange of information.

(34) Mr. DE HOOG (Netherlands) had attended the congress held by the Federation at The Hague in 1951, and the leaders of the organization had shown the keenest interest in Unesco's activities. He had given a lecture lasting an hour, and the lively discussion that ensued had lasted still longer.

(35) Mr. BENCHENEB (France) pointed out that the senior police officers had a profound knowledge of society and of the means of diagnosing the causes of the evils afflicting it. They were, in their way, philosophers, who wished to give their colleagues in other States the benefit of their experience. Their fundamental aim was to make mankind better - and that was also Unesco's aim.

(36) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) said that his request for information had not been made in a spirit of levity. As to the activities of the Federation, the mental health of children was surely not the concern of police organizations but came within the domain of the World Health Organization, which was performing valuable work in that field.

(37) At the request of the delegate of the USSR, the proposal to admit the International Federation of Senior Police Officers to consultative status was put to the vote and adopted by 18 votes to 12 with 9 abstentions.

Appendix 10: International Federation of the Periodical Press

(38) Approved without comment.

Appendix 11: International House Association and Alliance Internationale des Anciens de la Cité Universitaire.

(39) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) was in favour of admitting those two associations, but considered that it would be more appropriate to admit them separately.

(40) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) explained that the Board had thought the proposed procedure would have the advantage of giving both associations consultative status, while facilitating their relations with Unesco. The Board had indeed recommended that the procedure be adopted generally.

(41) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) still thought that each of the associations, which was a distinct legal entity, should assume its own responsibilities towards Unesco, though they could, if they found it more convenient, make one person, representing them both, responsible for correspondence with Unesco.

(42) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the Economic and Social Council had for many years been endeavouring to foster liaison between comparable organizations and to grant group consultative status. Progress had been limited, but where successful, as with the International Touring Association and the International Touring Alliance, it had proved of great convenience from the administrative point of view, and valuable in bringing about closer co-operation between non-governmental organizations. Unesco, whose consultative relations were, to some extent, modelled on those of the Economic and Social Council, should therefore accept and not oppose such a request.
(43) He supported the application.

(44) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) saw no reason for admitting the International House Association and the Alliance Internationale des Anciens de la Cité Universitaire separately, since in paragraph 8 of Appendix 11 (document 8C/ADM/22, Annex I, page 23) it was clearly stated that the two organizations had concluded an agreement "by which members of one association are considered as members of the other". That meant that approval of one organization would adequately cover the other.

(45) The application was approved.

Appendix 12: International Labour Assistance

(46) Approved without comment.

Appendix 13: International League for the Rights of Man

(47) Mr. AFTALION (Argentina) maintained that the recognition and admission of organizations to consultative status always entailed some risk to Unesco's prestige. From that point of view, the Directives so far in force seemed to be somewhat inadequate; the Government of India had indeed stated, in an official document, that Unesco should lay down definite criteria on the question.
(48) In the particular case of the International League for the Rights of Man, the only material available for forming an opinion of its activities was that contained in paragraph 7 of Appendix 13 (document 8C/ADM/22, Annex I, page 26). But a close perusal of the second part of paragraph 7 immediately revealed that the protest meetings organized by the League, and referred to in the above-mentioned document, were not in keeping with the guiding principles of Unesco, although neither the League nor its affiliated bodies might take part in street demonstrations with political aims.
(49) For that reason, the delegation of Argentina felt obliged to oppose the recognition sought by the International League for the Rights of Man; and if his opposition was not considered to be sufficiently well founded, he requested that more information about the "main activities" of the League be collected, for the prestige of Unesco was at stake.

(50) Mr. BENCHENEB (France) reminded the Commission that the aim of the League for the Rights of Man was well known. The League was trying, by all means in its power, to give man a higher sense of his dignity. In many countries, it had had to fight to gain recognition of its point of view, and it had done so with great dignity. The French delegation was sorry to find that, though deeds of courage were rewarded on the battlefield, they were not rewarded in time of peace. The League for the Rights of Man had consultative status with the Economic and Social Council; it enjoyed a high reputation and did not seek to cause disturbances; its activities were exactly in line with those of Unesco; and the French delegation was strongly in favour of its admission.

(51) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that his Government had investigated the organization and whole-heartedly supported its application.

(52) The application was approved by 30 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions.

Appendix 14: International Social Science Council

(53) Approved without comment.

Appendix 15: International Union for Protecting Public Morality

(54) Approved without comment.

Appendix 16: Société européenne de Culture

(55) Approved without comment.

Appendix 17: Universal Esperanto Association

(56) Approved without comment.

Appendix 18: World Chess Federation

(57) Mr. STEPANEK (Czechoslovakia) asked what were the Executive Board's reasons for rejecting the application.

(58) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) said that the application from the World Chess Federation had given rise to lengthy discussions in the Board. Arguments

involving history and educational theory had been adduced, and two currents of opinion had emerged: one side regarded chess as a form of recreation, whereas the other considered that it could contribute to cultural and intellectual development. The former school of thought had prevailed, and the majority had decided against admitting the World Chess Federation.

(59) Mr. STEPANEK (Czechoslovakia) disagreed with the views of the Executive Board. Chess was an important intellectual activity and helped to develop and strengthen co-operation between nations. He moved that the application be accepted.

(60) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of Spain and supported by the delegates of the USSR, the United Kingdom and Nicaragua.

(61) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) supported the views of the Executive Board. After careful consideration, he could find no reasons for supporting the application or any ways in which the Federation could contribute to the aims and activities of Unesco. None of its activities - which he quoted - qualified it for consultative status with Unesco, and the argument that it provided mental training might equally well be applied to Latin or Bridge. It was essential to set a limit to the organizations which could be admitted to consultative status.

(62) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) associated himself with the opinions of the United States delegate. The privilege of consultative status should be granted sparingly and only to organizations which were well known and were believed capable of making a practical contribution to the work of Unesco. A limit must be set, to prevent Unesco from becoming an instrument for encouraging innumerable organizations with sectional interests.

(63) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) supported the application. Chess was a cultural exercise and as such was entitled to a place in the programme along with other forms of culture on the agenda. It was, moreover, a very special kind of exercise, with a long history of association with the cultures of many countries, and had played a great part in the intellectual deve'opment of mankind.

(64) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) asked on what criteria the applications of non-governmental organizations were accepted or refused. The Commission had just agreed to admit the International Federation of Senior Police Officers, whose aims he reread. Mr. Wiechecki could not see in what way the World Chess Federation, which organized international meetings for cultural purposes, was less suitable for admission than the International Federation of Senior Police Officers.

(65) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) opposed the application. The Indian Government felt that Unesco was not sufficiently discriminating in its admission of organizations to consultative status, and shared the opinion of the delegate of Argentina that some organizations only wished to use Unesco as a stepping stone to enhance their position within Member States. He asked how many organizations were already associated with Unesco and urged that before adding to the number a set of firm criteria for admission should be drawn up, studied by the Executive Board and submitted to the next General Conference.

(66) In reply to the Indian delegate's question, Mr. HERCIK (Secretariat) said that Unesco had consultative arrangements with 105 international non-governmental associations.
(67) In reply to the Polish delegate, he mentioned the four criteria for admission to consultative arrangements, which were contained in the Directives issued by the General Conference at its fifth session and were still in force (cf. document 8C/ADM/21, page 4).

(68) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the proposal to admit the World Chess Federation to consultative status with Unesco.

(69) The proposal was rejected by 20 votes to 17 with 7 abstentions.

Appendix 19: World Movement of Mothers

(70) Approved without comment.

Appendix 20: Académie internationale de la Céramique

(71) Mr. HELLER (Académie internationale de la Céramique) said that the organization which he represented was not only carrying out a programme entirely in keeping with resolutions 4.321 and 4.322 of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56, but was also, by its very structure, a small-scale model of Unesco, as its members were appointed by their respective governments.
(72) Up to 1 June 1954, the governments of 43 countries had given it their support, and it was clear, from the list of those countries (paragraph 5, Appendix 20, Annex I. Add. 1 to document 8C/ADM/22), that the Academy was neither a private nor a restricted organization, but represented thousands of teachers and workers in ceramics throughout the world.
(73) Therefore, in consideration of the aims and activities it pursued, the Academy requested that Unesco admit it to consultative arrangements.

(74) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) stated that the Board proposed to defer action on the application, on the grounds that the Académie internationale de la Céramique covered a rather narrow specialized field; the Board would more readily approve the admission of a broader organization of decorative artists, which could be established within the Association of Artists, founded with Unesco's help.

(75) Mr. PAGE (Canada) agreed with the views of the Executive Board. He asked in what way the Canadian Government had supported the Académie internationale de la Céramique.

(76) Mr. HELLER (Académie internationale de la Céramique) having replied that the Canadian Department of Education had appointed a representative to his organization, Mr. PAGE (Canada) denied that that was the case and deplored the many similar inaccuracies

which had come to light during the discussion of non-governmental organizations.

(77) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the organization under discussion had great potentialities which might justify its admission to consultative status at the proper time. It was clear, however, from the preceding remarks that its organizational situation was at present somewhat obscure. The Académie had been set up very recently, and delegates had not had time to ascertain its relations with their own countries. He therefore proposed that action be postponed until the next General Conference and hoped that by then there would be sufficient justification for whole-hearted support.

(78) The proposal of the United States delegate was adopted.

Appendix 21: International Federation of Children's Communities

(79) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) noted that Spain appeared in paragraph 5 of Appendix 21 (document 8C/ADM/22, Annex I. Add.), although his country's National Commission had not yet been able to discover who was its representative on the International Federation of Children's Communities. He therefore asked for the name of the said representative.

(80) Mr. HERCIK (Secretariat) stated that the International Federation of Children's Communities was represented in Madrid by a correspondent, Professor Bosch Marin. The Federation was composed partly of communities and partly of groups of communities.

(81) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) said that the information given confirmed what he had thought, as the person just named was not the Director of any institute of that kind in Spain. As, in addition, the Children's City (Ciudad de los Muchachos) in Madrid, which was the most important organization of its kind in Spain, was not represented in the Federation, he asked that a vote be taken on the item.

(82) On the proposal of the delegate of Spain, a vote was taken on the admission of the International Federation of Children's Communities.

(83) The application was approved by 16 votes to 5 with 16 abstentions.

Appendix 22: International Federation of Women Lawyers

(84) Miss POLICARPIO (Philippines) said that, although small in membership, the Federation's function was as important as that of other organizations whose applications had been accepted. It was essential to give women the opportunity to participate in the work of Unesco and she supported the application for admission.

(85) Mr. MARDONES RESTAT (Chile) felt that the general features of the professions for which university training was necessary did not justify an internal division into men and women; and that, contrary to the implications of the application of the International Federation of Women Lawyers (document 8C/ADM/22, Annex I. Add.), it would be more logical to have one organization for such professions, so as to avoid such difficulties.

(86) Miss POLICARPIO (Philippines) agreed with the delegate of Chile on the need for concentration in professions but pointed out that not every woman lawyer had the opportunity to practise, and many, like herself, were teachers.

(87) Mrs. HEFFELFINGER (United States of America) warmly supported the Federation, whose objects included the protection of children, the promotion of opportunities for women in industry, business and professions, and the securing of equal rights for women.

(88) The application was approved.

Appendix 23: International Humanist and Ethical Union

(89) It was decided to recommend that a decision be postponed until the ninth session of the General Conference.

Appendix 24: International Union for the Liberty of Education

(90) It was decided to recommend that a decision be postponed until the ninth session of the General Conference.

Appendix 25: World Union of Catholic Teachers

(91) Approved without comment.

Appendix 26: International Union of Students

(92) Replying to a question from the Czechoslovak delegate, who wished to know why a decision on the application of the International Union of Students had been deferred, Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) stated that, as he had already mentioned, the Board had recommended that action be postponed (as in the cases of the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Student Movement for the United Nations) on the ground that the organizations' applications had not been submitted by the date stipulated, in time for Member States to express their opinions.

(93) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) did not consider the Executive Board's recommendation was justified. He pointed out that the International Union of Students had submitted its application for membership to the Secretariat on 18 September 1954, at the same time circulating full details of its work to Member States. Document 8C/ADM/22, Annex I. Add. 2 had been distributed on 21 October 1954. It was now 25 November, and the Czechoslovak Government considered that there had been time enough for Members to form an opinion on the aims and activities of the Union, particularly as the application was not a new one, but a request for review of a decision taken by the General Conference at its seventh session. That decision had been based on arguments which, in the opinion of the

Czechoslovak Government, did not accurately reflect the facts; it had been alleged that the International Union of Students had taken too little interest in Unesco's aims and activities, while in fact, in that same year (1952), the Union had taken part in the deliberations of a working party organized in consultation with Unesco. He thought it no more than justice to right a decision taken on the basis of insufficient information, and said it was in the interests of Unesco itself that the Czechoslovak Government recommended that the Union, which had been established almost simultaneously with Unesco and the United Nations, and whose programme faithfully mirrored the fundamental ideas of those two organizations, be accorded consultative arrangements. The maintenance of the closest possible relations with United Nations bodies, and with Unesco in particular, was mentioned in the Union's constitution as being one of its permanent activities. The Czechoslovak delegate considered that, among the applications submitted at the current session of the Conference, the Union and the World Federation of Democratic Youth were the organizations most deserving of having consultative arrangements with Unesco. He pointed out that the membership of the International Union of Students was world-wide, and mentioned its various activities, including the organization of world festivals, which did much to spread and foster the ideas Unesco stood for; thanks were due to the Union for having made the ideal of international understanding between young people a reality. In conclusion, the Czechoslovak delegate felt that the Commission knew enough about the Union's activities and its past record of co-operation with Unesco to recommend that the Conference grant it consultative arrangements.

(94) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) maintained that the organization and activities of the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth (document 8C/ADM/22, Annex 1. Add. 2) were in entire conformity with the conditions which international non-governmental organizations were required to fulfil (document 8C/ADM/21). He recalled that when the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession had sought admission to consultative arrangements in 1952, the postponement then recommended by the Executive Board to the seventh session of the General Conference, which was similar to the postponement suggested in the cases under consideration, evoked an energetic protest from the delegate of the United States of America. He therefore proposed that the applications of the two organizations be approved.

(95) Mr. PAGE (Canada) moved that consideration be postponed until the next session of the General Conference, first because the Commission had already approved the application of a student organization - the Co-ordinating Secretariat of National Unions of Students; and secondly, because of the lack of adequate information to support the application at the present juncture.
(96) He recalled the discussions at the seventh session of the General Conference, when he had been Chairman of the working party set up to deal with the problem. Since that time he had acquired additional information on the International Union of Students, and he quoted figures which showed that, while on paper representation appeared to be adequate and well distributed geographically, many of the affiliates were in fact fragmentary organizations in no way representative of their respective countries or of university students.

(97) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) strongly supported the Canadian delegate's proposal, not only on technical grounds, but because of the character of the organization, which appeared to be more political than educational. He reminded the Commission that the Economic and Social Council had withdrawn its consultative rights.

(98) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the Commission that the papers submitted to it were dated 21 October; on the same date, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the Director-General had circulated them for information to the Member States, some of which had forwarded comments. Those comments had arrived after the final date, 10 November, too late for inclusion in the printed document. They had been received on 16 November, after the Conference had opened, and had been communicated verbally to the Executive Board, and duly noted. A number of Member States had supported the Union's application (Hungary, Czechoslovakia, USSR, Ukraine and Byelorussia), while two States had opposed it (United Kingdom and United States of America).

(99) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if it were granted consultative status, the International Union of Students could make an important contribution to Unesco's work for international understanding in education and culture.
(100) He supported the application, and regretted that the opposition expressed by certain delegates seemed to be based on political grounds rather than on the facts concerning the organization's activities.

(101) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) supported the Executive Board's recommendation to postpone until the next General Conference a decision on the International Union of Students, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Student Movement for the United Nations, the application in each case having been received too late to permit of the careful consideration which was necessary. The case quoted by the delegate of Hungary was an entirely different matter: the delay had been caused by an unfortunate oversight on the part of the Secretariat and it had been agreed not to penalize the organization in question.
(102) The delay on the part of the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth was especially serious, as it was not likely to encourage confidence in organizations which were applying for consultative rights previously withdrawn and, moreover, did not allow time for the acquisition of information which might lead to a reversal of opinion.

(103) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the last statement by the United States delegate showed that certain delegations regarded the question not in the

light of Unesco's interests, but of their own purely political likes and dislikes.
(104) He recalled that a Committee, elected by the Third Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations had, on 5 December 1952, noted with regret the proposal to withdraw consultative status from certain organizations which had shown a keen interest in Unesco's programme and had taken part in conferences which Unesco had convened. The Committee had hoped that the decision would be reconsidered by the appropriate organs of Unesco. One of the organizations so excluded had been the International Union of Students. The Czechoslovak delegate remarked that the arguments put forward by the delegate of the United States of America were at variance with his previous statements, already referred to by the Hungarian delegate; the United States Government seemed to have found time enough to give a negative reply on political grounds which were only too clear. Finally he reiterated his proposal to recommend that the International Union of Students be approved for consultative arrangements.

(105) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the amendment proposed by the delegate of Canada: "That consideration of the application of the International Union of Students be deferred until the ninth session of the General Conference".

(106) The amendment was adopted by 26 votes to 6 with 6 abstentions.

Appendix 27: World Federation of Democratic Youth

(107) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) proposed that the Commission recommend that the World Federation of Democratic Youth be approved for consultative arrangements; the arguments in favour of his proposal regarding the International Union of Students had even more force in the case of the World Federation of Democratic Youth.

(108) The motion was supported by the delegates of Poland and the USSR.

(109) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) informed the Commission of the comments received from Member States since the opening of the Conference. Those in favour of admitting the Federation were Hungary, Czechoslovakia, USSR, Ukraine and Byelorussia; those against its admission were the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

(110) Mr. BLOCH (World Federation of Democratic Youth) said that the Federation he represented, and the International Union of Students, were the two largest youth organizations in the world, and that their aims were essentially the same as those of Unesco, since both organizations were working for international understanding and were seeking to give thousands of young students in colonial, semi-colonial and underdeveloped countries opportunities for education and culture.
(111) Neither of them was, as had been alleged, a political organization. Their only loyalty was to the cause of international peace and co-operation. And those who today gave the name of democracy to what only recently they had called fascism, could certainly not level accusations against them.
(112) Up to the seventh session of the General Conference, both organizations had had consultative status. The Executive Board, by recommending that they should not be admitted until the ninth session of the General Conference, showed that it had not taken into account the recommendation made in 1952.
(113) The question of date under discussion was very important to the organizations, for if their admission were postponed for another two years, they would be prevented from co-operating more closely with Unesco. The World Federation of Democratic Youth therefore requested that account be taken of the fact that the organizations' applications were prompted by the contribution they could make to the work of Unesco, and also asked for it to be borne in mind that Unesco should not exercise discrimination.

(114) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) wished to make one point clear. The representative of the World Federation of Democratic Youth had just asserted that the Executive Board had taken no account of the discussions at previous sessions of the General Conference, in which it had been agreed that any association from which consultative status had been temporarily withdrawn was entitled to submit a fresh application. The Executive Board had never disputed that right, but it had felt that the way in which the Federation's request had been submitted made its recommendation impossible.

(115) Mr. PAGE (Canada) said that he had listened with great interest to the statement of the representative of the World Federation of Democratic Youth and agreed with him that the problem needed careful study. From his own experience of the organization, he did not believe that it was representative of more than ten per cent of the Member States listed in paragraph 5 of Appendix 27; he recalled that one of the criteria for admission to consultative status was that national representation should be truly national and not fragmentary. The Canadian delegation was not prepared to support the application at the present time.

(116) Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved that the recommendation of the Executive Board be adopted. The tardy submission of the application was evidence of inefficiency, and because of that inefficiency he had been unable to obtain precise instructions from his Government.

(117) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) said that his delegation warmly supported the application of the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth. He compared the attitude of the United States delegation on the question at the seventh session of the General Conference and at the current Conference, and asked why, if the space of two months had been sufficient in 1952, it was no longer so in 1954, in order to approve the admission of the two organizations in question.

(118) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal of the Australian delegate. He had followed the eloquent appeal of the representative of the World Federation of Democratic Youth with

careful attention to see if it provided any reasons which might justify him in departing from his Government's instructions. Unfortunately it had only confirmed those instructions. He opposed the application for the same reasons as he had opposed that of the International Union of Students - which, he reminded the Commission, had in 1950 expelled Yugoslavia as a traitor to the cause of peace and democracy.

(119) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) moved the closure of the debate, since all the members of the Commission were well aware of the arguments which could be adduced on either side.

(120) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) reiterated that the entire discussion had confirmed what he had said from the beginning of the consideration of the application of the International Union of Students; the proposal to postpone a decision on the applications of the two organizations was prompted by purely political considerations; and that, from Unesco's point of view, was a great pity. The Hungarian delegate had shown that certain delegations, and the Executive Board, applied the regulations concerning the time-limits for the receipt of applications differently for different organizations, and gave unfair treatment to those which had incurred certain governments' disfavour by reason of their work for peace, thereby seeking to disqualify youth organizations whose support would be invaluable in bringing knowledge of Unesco to the great bulk of the younger generation all over the world. Mr. Hayek urged the Commission to take time for thought before members allowed themselves to be inveigled into a course of action contrary to Unesco's principles. In conclusion, he moved that the Commission recommend the General Conference to approve the World Federation of Democratic Youth for admission to consultative arrangements.

(121) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), replying to a question which had been asked earlier in the discussion, said that he had already explained the facts relating to the case referred to by the delegate of Hungary. He requested that his explanation should be included in the Summary Records.

(122) Mr. VERONESE (Executive Board) deplored the suggestion made by the delegation of Czechoslovakia that the Executive Board had acted under pressure. That had never been the case.

(123) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the Australian delegate's proposal that the Commission should recommend postponement of the question until the ninth session of the General Conference, taken as an amendment to the proposal of the Czechoslovak delegate.

(124) The amendment was adopted by 28 votes to 6 with 3 abstentions.

Appendix 28: International Student Movement for the United Nations

(125) Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved the adoption of the Executive Board's recommendation.

(126) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of the Philippines and supported by the delegate of Turkey.

(127) The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of the World Federation of United Nations Associations had requested permission to address the Commission. He proposed to grant the request, under the provision in Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure that observers of international non-governmental organizations could make statements on matters within their respective competence.

(128) Mr. ARIAS-PEREZ (World Federation of United Nations Associations) said that approval of the recognition of the organization he represented would simply mean giving legal recognition to a situation which had already more than five years' sanction in practice.
(129) The organization was the only international movement among young people in universities throughout the world which was designed to support the principles of the San Francisco Charter. In that respect, its co-operation in the work of Unesco had been very considerable.
(130) If the organization were refused consultative status on grounds of strict legal considerations and without taking into account other more human considerations, the present enthusiasm of thousands of students would be damped.
(131) He therefore asked that the question should be thought over fairly and calmly before a decision was taken on the admission of the Movement to consultative arrangements with Unesco.

(132) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) asked exactly when the International Student Movement for the United Nations had applied for admission.

(133) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) had no objection to the organization, but thought that the same procedure should be applied to it as to other organizations in the same position, i.e. those whose applications had arrived too late to be examined by the Member States.

(134) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) agreed; he personally could express no opinion, as he had not had the time to consult the Belgian National Commission.

(135) A vote was taken on the proposal to defer the decision on the application of the International Student Movement for the United Nations, which was approved by 28 votes to 0, with 7 abstentions.

**ITEM 9.6.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: RENEWAL OF FORMAL AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED WITH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (8C/ADM/23 and Addenda)**

(136) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) then presented document 8C/ADM/23 and Addenda, dealing in particular with the renewal of the formal agreements concluded with 8 non-governmental organizations, which were due to expire on 31 December 1954. The General Conference was asked to prolong them until 31 December 1955, as the Executive Board was

competent to take the necessary action for 1956. The Member States consulted had raised no objections, except that the Australian Government had commented on the premises made available to the organizations. Mr. Maheu recalled that he had already stated at the previous meeting that, apart from two other organizations, those mentioned were the only ones housed in Unesco's headquarters. It had been decided that the whole question should be reconsidered by the Executive Board, since the Australian delegate had not insisted that it be discussed by the Commission.

(137) The Executive Board had also approved a draft formal agreement to be concluded with the International Social Science Council, which was accordingly submitted to the General Conference for ratification.

(138) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that, in accordance with Section A, paragraph 4 of document 8C/ADM/23, the eight formal agreements at present in force were submitted to the General Conference for review and renewal until 31 December 1955.

(139) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) moved that the Commission recommend the renewal of the agreements.

(140) The proposal was seconded by the United Kingdom delegate.

(141) Mr. MARDONES RESTAT (Chile) enquired whether the conclusion of the agreements meant that the non-governmental organizations in question would receive increased or altered subventions.

(142) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that it would not; the question had no bearing on that of subventions.

(143) The Commission passed to the discussion of the Draft Formal Agreement with the International Social Science Council (8C/ADM/23 Add. 1).

(144) The CHAIRMAN asked for comments on the ratification of the draft agreement.

(145) Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) moved that the Commission recommend the General Conference to ratify the Draft Formal Agreement with the International Social Science Council.

(146) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of the Union of South Africa, supported by the delegates of Haiti and Belgium and adopted.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

# SEVENTEENTH MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* **Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)**

**ITEM 9.5.6.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: MEDICAL BENEFITS SCHEME (document 8C/ADM/15)**

(1) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller), introducing the report of the Director-General on the Unesco Medical Benefits Fund, said that it had two main proposals. The first (paragraph 4) was in connexion with the contributions to be paid into the Medical Benefits Fund by the Organization and by the staff members. The second (paragraph 7) dealt with the methods whereby contributions were calculated.

(2) Until 1953, the contributions paid in by the Organization had been equal to those paid by the staff. It had then been found that income was not sufficient to meet needs, and the Director-General thought that the contributions by the staff should be increased, those by the Organization remaining the same.

(3) The Director-General was now proposing to revert to the old system, but with a new scale of contributions (paragraph 9). The new scale had five contributory levels instead of three (see Annex II) and took much more accurately into account the real number of dependents enrolled in the fund.

(4) As regarded the second proposal, the calculation of contributions, the practice had hitherto been for contributions paid by staff to be deducted from their basic salaries. But it was the practice in all Specialized Agencies to include certain specific allowances paid to staff in the General Services Category in the pensionable remuneration on the basis of which contributions were paid. Accordingly, the Director-General was asking for authorization to do the same thing.

(5) The rest of the report was a detailed account of the operation of the fund up to the end of 1953.

(6) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon, seconded by Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), moved adoption of the resolution in paragraph 9.

(7) Mr. KELLY (Australia), while in sympathy with the resolution, asked why allowances were included in the amount on which contributions were calculated only in the case of staff in the General Services Category.

(8) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that, for staff in the Professional categories, there were no pensionable allowances and therefore the calculation was made on basic salary.

(9) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that, when the matter was discussed in 1952, her delegation had expressed anxiety lest, with so high a level of benefits, the fund might run into difficulties. Those fears had been borne out, as shown by the document now before the Commission.
(10) The proposals made in the report would put the fund on a sound financial basis, but at greater cost both to the Organization and to individual members.
(11) It was important, she felt, that any scheme for medical benefits should not vary from agency to agency. No mention was made in the report of negotiations with other agencies with a view to evolving a common plan.
(12) In general, her delegation favoured the system in force within the United Nations, i.e., a scheme with a sliding scale for contributions by the Organization, so that the Organization would pay an amount varying in inverse proportion to the salary of the individual contributor.

(13) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions had discussed the question of providing coverage to bridge the gap between a short illness and permanent invalidity. In Unesco, there were such provisions in the Medical Benefits Scheme, members falling ill being put on half pay, after exhaustion of sick leave, for a period not exceeding eleven months in respect of the same illness. That amply fulfilled the spirit of the Pension Fund Regulations, which laid down that, to qualify for a disability pension, a member had to be ill for at least nine months.
(14) In the United Nations, and in FAO, the contribution by the Organization decreased as salaries grew higher, but elsewhere the two contributions were the same. Within the Consultative Committee, it had been agreed to compare notes on the experience acquired. In fact, FAO had recently expressed much interest in the Unesco scheme. So Unesco had in the past co-operated, and would continue to co-operate, with the other organizations.

(15) The resolution in paragraph 9 of document 8C/ADM/15 was unanimously adopted.

**ITEM 9.5.6.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: COMPENSATION FUND FOR SERVICE-INCURRED RISKS (document 8C/ADM/16)**

(16) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that a corrigendum would be issued affecting the French text of paragraph 4.
(17) At the seventh session of the General Conference, the Director-General had been authorized to operate a provisional common benefits plan and had been instructed to submit final proposals for approval at the eighth session.
(18) In 1953 and 1954, he himself had taken part in discussions, within the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions, on how such a plan should be financed. The actuary of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund had submitted a report showing that the cost of a common fund would far exceed the commercial premiums then being paid by the Specialized Agencies. In addition, the creation of such a fund would have encountered administrative difficulties. For that reason all representatives of the Specialized Agencies had agreed that their particular part of the scheme should operate independently. The independent Unesco scheme would continue to operate in 1955 and 1956, although continuous contact would be maintained with the other agencies.
(19) The proposal made in Annex I did not call on Member States for further contributions. The point was that the small annual budget appropriation requested to meet risks of that type would be totally inadequate in the event of a disaster.
(20) It was therefore proposed that a special Staff Compensation Fund should be set up, into which the unused portion of the $8,000 provided in 1953 should be paid, as also any amounts similarly left over in future years. Unused balances would thus be carried forward from year to year. Any compensation paid by third parties in the case of injury or death of a staff member would also be paid in.
(21) In document 8C/ADM/16 (Annex I) it was suggested that the fund might be built up until it amounted to some $15,000 - $20,000, and that then, for future years, the sum requested would be only such amount as had been actually spent in the immediately preceding two years. In fact, that figure would probably be too low.
(22) He would therefore submit the following resolution:

"The General Conference:

Resolves:

1. That a Staff Compensation Fund, for service-incurred death and disability, shall be established, into which shall be paid: (a) sums appropriated for this purpose in the budget; (b) the proceeds of any commercial insurance effected by the Director-General; (c) compensation payable by any third party (up to the maximum payable under the rules of the Compensation Plan).

2. This Fund shall be carried forward from one financial period to another up to a maximum of $50,000. Any balance above this sum at the end of a financial period shall be credited to the General Fund.

3. This Fund shall be used to pay for compensation awarded under the rules of the Staff Compensation Plan.

(23) In two years time more experience would have been gained, and a report could then be submitted at the ninth session".

(24) Mr. MENDIS (Ceylon), seconded by Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon), moved adoption of the resolution.

(25) Mr. KELLY (Australia) congratulated the Director-General on producing a report which was obviously the fruit of much careful study. But while not lacking in sympathy for the staff, he was not convinced of the advantages of the proposal made.
(26) What would be the effect of the creation of such a fund on the amounts annually paid to Lloyd's in the form of premiums?
(27) There would be no difficulty, he felt, in securing money from the General Conference to meet any emergency that might arise.

(28) At a time when the plans made by other agencies were under review, it might not be desirable to adopt any final scheme. While not anxious to press his point, he wondered whether the Director-General could not at least amend his motion to the effect that the matter be reviewed at the ninth session.

(29) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) emphasized that the proposal was in no way designed to secure large appropriations to cover risks insured against by the United Nations and by all the Specialized Agencies. It was merely intended to ensure that the money left over from a "good" year, such as 1953 (when nearly $8,000 were left unexpended) was used to create a fund which could cope with a sudden grave emergency. Otherwise the amounts left over in that way would revert to Member States in the form of surpluses.
(30) The proposal had been made precisely to avoid having to appeal to the General Conference in the way suggested by the delegation of Australia.
(31) That very year Unesco was faced with the problem of providing compensation for the accidental death of a staff member. To buy an annuity for his widow would be exceedingly expensive ($50,000), and to meet the cost a supplementary budget estimate would be required. With a fund amounting to some $20,000, another $30,000 could be paid in from the proceeds of commercial insurance with Lloyd's, and no doubt the airline company would be called upon to pay a substantial sum, with the result that an annuity could be easily purchased.
(32) The annual appropriation mentioned in the proposal was hardly more than a token figure. If another two years had to elapse before a final decision could be taken, quite different figures would have to be submitted.

(33) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) said that the aims of the proposal were laudable enough, but had the other Specialized Agencies been consulted? Was the Director-General satisfied that he had found the best way of financing such a fund?

(34) Referring to the remarks made by the Australian and South African delegates, Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) said he was not in favour of leaving to the General Conference the task of determining at each session the amount of appropriations that should be used for compensation. That would entail subordinating payment of indemnities - which should be regarded as obligations - to the decisions of the General Conference. If any accident occurred immediately after a session of the General Conference, the payment of compensation could be delayed for nearly two years.
(35) Mr. Ammoun would therefore be prepared to support the Director-General's proposal, which appeared to ensure i mediate and automatic payment of such compensation.

(36) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that joint studies had in fact been made by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, and it had been agreed that it would be best for each organization to work out for itself the most satisfactory way of financing its scheme. Other agencies had shown a keen interest in the Unesco idea of having a fund partly constituted by appropriations. Unesco would of course keep in touch with what was being done elsewhere.
(37) The proposal was not designed to do more than provide provisional machinery.

(38) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that the Comptroller had justified the proposal to have a large fund on the grounds that it would be expensive to buy annuities. But was that the best way of meeting such obligations as the Organization might have in the circumstances? In the regulations for the compensation plan there were definite rules governing the grant of annuities.

(39) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that in the particular case he had alluded to no decision had yet been taken. Every case had to be judged on its merits.

(40) It was agreed to add a final clause to the resolution to meet the point raised by the delegate of Australia:
"The Director-General is requested to present a report on the operation of the Fund for review at the ninth session".

(41) Thus amended, the resolution was unanimously adopted.

**ITEMS 9.5.7 AND 9.5.8 OF REVISED AGENDA: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PENSION BOARD TOGETHER WITH REVISED REGULATIONS AND RULES OF THE PENSION FUND AND ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION FUND (documents 8C/ADM/17 and 8C/ADM/17 Corr.1)**

(42) The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee was merely called upon to take note of the documents attached to document 8C/ADM/17 (Annual Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board), and of the amendments to the Regulations and Administrative Rules of the Pension Fund, which were attached to document 8C/ADM/27 (Unesco Staff Rules).

(43) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that document 8C/ADM/17 dealt with the appointment of representatives of Member States to the Unesco Staff Pension Committee. At the seventh session, the three members and the three alternates named in paragraph 2 had been appointed. Their term of office expired at the end of the eighth session. Incidentally, three of them had been obliged to resign in the course of 1953.
(44) The Director-General was suggesting that members be nominated from among the permanent delegations in Paris, and that they hold office until the end of the ninth session.
(45) The proposal had been made in order to facilitate attendance at meetings of the Pension Committee.
(46) Article XXXV of the regulations for the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund laid down that the Joint Staff Pension Board should submit an annual report on the operation of those regulations to the United Nations General Assembly and to the Member organizations. The Joint Staff Pension Board was also called upon to draw up the administrative rules

necessary for the carrying out of those regulations and to report thereon to the competent authority of each Member organization.
(47) That annual report, and the latest set of administrative rules, were accordingly annexed to document 8C/ADM/17. No action was required by the General Conference.
(48) Part III of document 8C/ADM/17 dealt with recognition by Unesco of the competence of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal in respect of pension matters - a question discussed separately in document 8C/ADM/18.

(49) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had always taken a warm interest in medical benefits, staff compensation, and the Unesco staff pension scheme. He would be interested to know what sort of benefits would accrue to individual members under the regulations for the Pension Fund.

(50) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) warmly commended the Director-General's proposals for appointment of members of the Pension Committee, and moved adoption thereof.

(51) Miss LAISE (United States of America) seconded the motion, but asked that, before a final election took place, an enquiry be made among delegations in order to ascertain who was likely to come forward as a candidate. Then a list of names should be distributed, and time should be allowed for the Conference to consider them at leisure. She attached great importance to having persons of first-class abilities to represent their governments on the Pension Committee.

(52) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) could accept an amendment to his motion on the lines suggested by the delegate of the United States of America.

(53) The CHAIRMAN suggested that delegations interested in submitting names should get into touch with him, and that final consideration of document 8C/ADM/17 should be deferred.

(54) It was so decided.

(55) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the Pension Fund Regulations provided for benefits on the withdrawal of a staff member before the age of sixty, on retirement at sixty, and in the case of permanent disability and death.
(56) The benefits were, roughly speaking, as follows: If a member withdrew before he had completed five years' service, he received his own contribution plus compound interest thereon at two and a half per cent.
(57) If he left after more than five years' service, he received the actuarial equivalent of the pension he would have received had he retired at 60.
(58) If he retired at 60, he received one-sixtieth of the final average remuneration over the past ten years for every year he had spent in Unesco. Thus, if he had spent ten years in the Organization, he would get one-sixth of the final average remuneration, if twenty years, one-third.
(59) On his death, his widow would as a rule be entitled to one-half the disability benefit he would have received (three-tenths of the salary at the time of death). She would thus get three-twentieths of that salary.

**ITEM 9.5.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT STANDARDS AND METHODS (document 8C/ADM/11)**

(60) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the General Conference had often expressed the wish that the geographical distribution of staff should be widened to the greatest possible extent consistent with the high standards of competence laid down in the Constitution.
(61) He himself considered that, if Unesco was to become really effective, a broader geographical distribution of staff was required than that so far attained. It was important that there should be, within the Secretariat, persons representing different cultures, equipped with a thorough knowledge of the problems peculiar to those parts of the world from which they came.
(62) It was always easy to give lip-service to the ideal of broad geographical distribution.
(63) He had felt under an obligation to suggest definite methods whereby that ideal, about which so much had been said in the past, might be attained. Hence the proposed new paragraph 4.6 on page 8.
(64) Under the existing system, staff members from the under-represented areas were continually being offered important posts in their home countries, so that staff had to be recruited more and more from the under-represented areas in order to prevent the situation from getting worse.
(65) The other important point he had to make was the following. According to paragraph 4.5.1 of the Staff Regulations, members of the staff were appointed either for an indeterminate period or in the light of programme requirements.
(66) How were the words "in the light of programme requirements" to be interpreted?
(67) He understood them to mean that he was obliged to award permanent contracts to persons in certain categories unless, in the light of programme requirements, he was justified in not so doing. In considering programme requirements, was he expected to bear in mind the current programme, or to take a longer view? The words "in the light of programme requirements" tied his hands, and he was strongly in favour of their deletion.
(68) As regarded permanent appointments, the best solution, he felt, was to aim at a target figure, as set forth in paragraph 19 of the document. The percentages he had suggested there, were, he considered, reasonable.

(69) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) said that the Board had often discussed the question of staff and contracts, and in July had adopted a resolution calling the attention of the Conference to the need for clear guidance as to indeterminate contracts and improvement of geographical distribution.
(70) It had also called on the Conference to recommend Member States to second national civil servants to Unesco for limited periods, and to safeguard the rights of such persons during their employment with Unesco.

(71) The CHAIRMAN said that the best course would be for the Commission to have a general discussion on the principles involved, before considering the Staff Regulations in detail.

(72) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) hoped that the Director-General would furnish some details concerning paragraph 4.5.1 of the Staff Regulations, which dealt with the renewal of contracts for fixed periods (document 8C/ADM/11, page 8).

(73) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, under the existing paragraph 4.5.1 of the Staff Regulations, he was under an obligation to renew a contract for an indeterminate period (provided the person satisfied all the requirements), unless he could invoke programme needs as a reason for not doing so.

(74) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) thanked the Director-General for his explanations. He considered, however, that the Director-General's interpretation of paragraph 4.5.1 was not the only possible one. In any case, he asked to be given information on the way in which particular problems arising from the renewal of contracts had been solved in the past and on previous decisions that might be taken as precedents.

(75) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it was not in the interests of Unesco that he should be faced with the alternative of either letting a staff member go when his contract expired or else giving that staff member a permanent contract. Something intermediate was required.
(76) Who could say what programme requirements would be thirty years thence?

(77) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) wondered whether the words "in the light of programme requirements" were in fact so difficult to interpret. If the words were transferred to the end of the sentence in paragraph 4.5.1, the position became clearer. The paragraph could then be taken to mean that the Director-General could either reappoint for an indeterminate period or for some fixed period, and that programme requirements would determine the exact period of re-engagement - one, two, three, four, or five years.

(78) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that that was not his interpretation.
(79) There were certain items, such as fundamental education, which had appeared in Unesco's programme for a long time, and a staff member engaged in that field should enjoy the maximum tenure. But tenure was not the only factor; there was the question of personal suitability too.
(80) His own view was that, except for a small number of highly specialized posts, the aim should be to build up a corps of people who could be used no matter what changes might be made in the programme. The aim should be to acquire the services of persons capable of a certain flexibility. That was why he preferred to set a percentage for the number of permanent contracts in the organization. It was better to proceed like that than to take each individual post and to estimate the likelihood of its occupier being required by Unesco thirty years thence.

(81) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) wondered who could be authorized to decide what were "programme requirements".

(82) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that, in the view of her delegation, there was a contradiction between the proposal made in paragraph 19 (fixing percentages to represent the proportion of permanent contracts) and the proposed new paragraph 4.6 of the Staff Regulations.
(83) She seriously questioned the desirability of both those proposals. Although she recognized that it was desirable to achieve stability, surely it was unwise to set definite target figures at a time when the question of remodelling the programme was under discussion and when there must be continued efforts to improve the quality and the geographical distribution of the staff.
(84) She doubted whether the proposed paragraph 4.6 should be included in the Staff Regulations. Her country was gravely under-represented in the staff of Unesco, so she could not be accused of special pleading in saying that the primary aim must be to secure the services of staff offering the highest standards of efficiency and integrity. Paragraph 4.3.1, she felt, was sufficient. Inclusion of the proposed 4.6 would lay undue stress on the importance of a broad geographical distribution. It was important not to sacrifice competent staff members merely because they did not come from under-represented areas.
(85) She understood that a suggestion had been made in the Executive Board for a solution of the problem of geographical distribution. If so, she would be glad to know what it was.

(86) Referring to page 7 of document 8C/ADM/11, Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was absolutely against eliminating paragraph 4.2.1, which excluded from the Organization persons compromised by their relations with Fascism, Nazism or militarist aggression. To eliminate that prohibition would be contrary to the letter of the Constitution, since it would enable persons guilty of barbarous acts or the destruction of valuable literary works and other cultural property to be admitted to the Secretariat. Mr. Soldatov also observed that the Executive Board, at its thirty-eighth session, had declared that it did not recommend eliminating the paragraph in question, and had embodied its views in the resolution reproduced in document 8C/ADM/14.
(87) Mr. Soldatov said he would reserve a number of observations he had to make on other suggested changes till later. However, he wished to emphasize at that stage that he did not think it desirable to extend the Director-General's existing powers with regard to the recruiting of staff.

(88) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board), referring to the statement made by the delegate of the United States of America, said that another scheme had indeed been put forward in the Executive Board, but various views had been expressed and no full agreement had been reached. The minutes of the meetings of the Board would provide fuller information.
(89) As regarded the point raised by the delegate of the Soviet Union, he could confirm that the Board had not recommended deletion of paragraph 4.2.1.

(90) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) disagreed with the delegation of the United States of America on the question of equitable geographical distribution of staff. The geographical criterion was a strictly fair one; existing methods led to a most irregular position, as was shown by figures: out of 385 staff members, a bare 20 belonged to the Latin American countries, which formed one-third of the Member States of the Organization. Yet there were countries who had 73 and 96 officials on the staff.
(91) Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and the Dominican Republic, which between them formed a highly cultured group, were not represented on the Secretariat by a single member.
(92) The delegate of Ecuador disagreed with the Soviet delegate and supported the Director-General's proposal for the suppression of the paragraph under discussion (4.2.1). It was dangerous to allow the Director-General a completely free hand in dismissing officials under political pretexts. The danger lay not in the admission of officials with certain political tendencies, but in the possibility that those officials might afterwards carry on a political activity from their post.

(93) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) agreed with the Lebanese delegate that, for a better interpretation of paragraph 4.5.1., it would be well to rely on the way in which the Appeals Board and the international administrative tribunals had in the past settled disputes arising from the renewal of contracts.
(94) Then, again, Mr. Juvigny wished to emphasize that, without opposing the principle of geographical distribution, as laid down in the United Nations Charter and the Unesco Constitution, the principle should not under any circumstances be applied as a hard-and-fast rule. The aim of that principle was to give men of all countries the same chances of entering the international public service and to ensure that the most diverse cultures were represented on the Secretariat. It was an ideal to be upheld, but, if it were put into practice too hastily, it might impair the Organization's efficiency. If the principle of geographical distribution were applied too strictly, the Organization would be obliged to part with people who had served it well in the past and also acquired useful experience, which newcomers would lack, at least for a time. It would also constitute a threat to many of the staff and adversely affect their work. It might even lead to the resignation of the ablest among them. Moreover, in practice it was hard to see what criteria could be used to ensure a really fair geographical distribution. Would the total contributions paid by the different Member States be taken into account?
(95) Any provision intended to enforce a rigid and impersonal application of the principle of geographical distribution might, in certain cases, facilitate arbitrary dismissals. Therefore the French delegation was against the proposed texts.

(96) Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay) considered that long-term contracts were essential to efficiency. Officials needed the guarantee of stability and a suitable pension at the conclusion of their working days. If officials were not afforded the protection of sufficiently long contracts, there was little chance of their renouncing national fields for international work. It was not enough to study their salaries; the system of long-term contracts renewable after 5 or 7 years should be made general. It should also be possible to transfer officials from one department to another, according to the requirements of the service. Otherwise, instead of an international civil service, the Organization would find itself staffed by a body of persons holding scholarships or travelling bursaries.
(97) The delegation of Uruguay would vote for the Italian draft resolution (document 8C/DR/74), with an amendment to the effect that the years spent in the Organization by a staff member should count for pension purposes.
(98) In its 1935 Pensions Law, the speaker added, his country had laid down that League of Nations employees should be placed on the same footing as national civil servants.

(99) Mr. HENQUET (representing the Staff Association) thanked the Chairman and the Commission for their generosity in allowing him to put the staff's point of view before them.
(100) He first reminded the Commission that the Staff Association's function was not only to represent the staff and protect their interests, but also, in certain cases, to give the Director-General its advice. Its advisory capacity, established in the Staff Regulations, had already been recognized by the General Conference and the Executive Board. Thus the Association had taken part in the appointment of staff representatives to the joint committees which the Director-General was required to consult whenever he proposed to make any important changes in the Staff Regulations. Yet those committees, he said, had not been consulted about the changes envisaged in document 8C/ADM/11. The changes affected the criteria for the renewal of fixed-term contracts. Sixty per cent of staff members belonging to the Professional category held such contracts. Accordingly, the provisions that might be made concerning the renewal of those contracts would apply to the great majority of the staff in that category. Again, there was no absolutely clear distinction between a permanent contract and a contract for a fixed period; the jurisprudence of the United Nations administrative tribunal, for instance, was based on the idea that any official who had performed his duties satisfactorily could reasonably expect to have his contract renewed unless the post were suppressed. The Unesco Appeals Board had recently confirmed the reasonable presumption of renewal of contracts for officials whose services had been satisfactory.
(101) Analysing the Director-General's proposals, Mr. Henquet said that the Staff Association fully subscribed to the considerations set forth in paragraph 18 of the document, dealing with the necessity of ensuring the stability of the Secretariat and security of employment for the staff. But it wished to make some observations concerning the new texts proposed for paragraphs 4.2, 4.5.1 and 4.6 of the Regulations.
(102) With regard to Number 4.2, Mr. Henquet drew the Commission's attention to the problems that might arise if the criterion of "integrity" were to be applied to staff that had been in the service of the Organization for a considerable time.
(103) With regard to paragraph 4.5.1, he said that the Staff Association was worried over the subjective

criteria of interpretation, proposed in paragraph 27 of the document, for judging aptitude for international civil service.

(104) In connexion with paragraph 4.6, Mr. Henquet stressed the dangers of including in the Staff Regulations a text strictly applying the principle of geographical distribution. The International Civil Service Advisory Board had recognized the necessity of a certain elasticity in the implementation of that principle, and neither the staff regulations of the United Nations nor those of the other Specialized Agencies contained any hard-and-fast rule in that matter. The Staff Association was very anxious for the administration not to invoke that principle when renewing contracts, but only when recruiting new staff.

(105) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, answering the question raised by the delegate of Lebanon, said that the only person who could decide what exactly programme requirements involved, as far as staff contracts were concerned, was the Director-General. It stood to reason that the Director-General would always keep programme requirements, in the general sense, in mind, but the phrase "in the light of programme requirements" was open to no wholly satisfactory interpretation, and he therefore recommended its deletion.

(106) The delegate of the United States of America had said that the proposal he had made in paragraph 19 ran counter to his proposal for a new paragraph 4.6. In that paragraph, he was proposing that contracts expiring on or before 31 December 1956 should not be renewed, in cases when their renewal would militate against improved geographical distribution of staff. The authority given him to take such action would expire at the end of 1956. Even if the proposed new paragraph 4.6 were adopted, he would still award many indeterminate contracts, so that in the next two years steady progress would be made towards the target figures set forth in paragraph 19.

(107) During the years 1955-56, but especially in 1956, he would recruit from the under-represented areas, and persons appointed early in 1956 would have two years of service before the General Conference met in 1958, by which time the percentage of permanent posts would have approached even more closely the figure proposed in paragraph 19.

(108) He had submitted his proposals because he believed that better geographical distribution was necessary for Unesco, and that such geographical distribution could not be achieved without changes in the Staff Regulations. There could be no decisive improvement in that respect with the number of vacancies now occurring. Some of those vacancies, in addition, were of so responsible and specialized a nature, that a few countries only were likely to be able to provide suitable candidates.

(109) As regarded his proposal to delete paragraph 4.2.1, the reasons were set forth in document 8C/ADM/14.

(110) He wished to make it clear that he desired to obtain the services of staff of the highest standards of competence and integrity, and also to improve geographical distribution. If the new paragraph 4.6 were adopted, it was his intention, after 1956, to lay less stress on geographical distribution when considering how posts should be filled. But adoption of that paragraph was essential if a proper balance was to be obtained at the outset.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# EIGHTEENTH MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.5.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT STANDARDS AND METHODS (document 8C/ADM/11) (continued)**

(1) The Commission renewed its examination of proposed amendments to Staff Regulations 4.2 to 4.6.

(2) Mr. ATTAGARA (Thailand) moved the adoption of the proposed amendment to Regulation 4.2.

(3) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) suggested that Regulation 4.2 be linked to Regulation 4.3.1 by adding the following words at the end of Regulation 4.2:

"Due regard shall be paid to recruiting staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible".

The amendment would thus bring Regulation 4.2 into line with the corresponding regulation of the United Nations.

(4) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that, in his delegation's opinion, the principle of geographical representation should override all others.

(5) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) agreed with the Soviet delegate that geographical distribution was an extremely important consideration, but the United Kingdom delegation felt that it should not take precedence over the aim of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. He

therefore proposed the addition of the following sentence at the end of Regulation 4.2: "and shall pay due regard to the desirability of achieving as wide a geographical distribution of staff as possible".
(6) The above amendment would presuppose the withdrawal of the existing Regulation 4.3.1 and the proposed new Regulation 4.6. The United Kingdom delegation considered that two years were too short a time in which to achieve a geographical redistribution of the Secretariat; to aim at that might lead to injustices; the delegation was therefore against tying the Director-General down, either in time or in the matter of percentage.

(7) Mr. SUNDARAM (India), drawing attention to the chart in Annex I to document 8C/ADM/11, which showed the distribution by nationality of members of the Secretariat, pointed out that vast underdeveloped areas of the world were under-represented on the Secretariat, while a number of small and advanced countries were over-represented. It was true that underdeveloped countries could not afford to release their key people for service in international organizations, but, even if less efficient people were recruited in the interests of geographical representation, with experience they would gradually attain the highest standards of efficiency and competence. In promotion and renewal of appointments, as well as in initial recruitment, geographical distribution should be the main consideration, provided that efficiency were not sacrificed. The Indian delegation therefore moved the addition of a sentence to Regulation 4.2, which would read roughly as follows: "In the matter of promotion and renewal of appointments, other qualifications being equal, geographical considerations should be kept very much in view".

(8) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) paid tribute to the Director-General and his staff for having tried to present a practical scheme to the Conference, with a view to redressing the bad balance of geographical distribution within the Secretariat. Geographical distribution was not a political, but a cultural issue; even cultures which did not seem as developed as others had something to contribute to Unesco. Further, at a time when Unesco was launching a programme of practical projects designed to meet the felt needs of Member States, it was important that the countries with the greatest needs should be represented on the Secretariat.
(9) With regard to the United Kingdom amendment, the Egyptian delegation felt that the wording needed strengthening and would prefer to substitute for "and shall pay due regard to the desirability of achieving..." the words: "and shall also aim at achieving...". Although he agreed that the amendment made Regulation 4.3.1 unnecessary, he thought that Regulation 4.6, which related to a temporary measure, should be kept.

(10) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) agreed to withdraw his proposal to delete Regulation 4.6.

(11) The CHAIRMAN, seconded by Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon), proposed that the Commission adjourn for a few minutes to enable the delegations of Pakistan, the United Kingdom, India and Egypt to reach agreement on a joint amendment to Regulation 4.2.

(12) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) thought it might help the discussion if the original text of the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations were carefully examined. The various sections of that text were perfectly interrelated, and they all dealt with the problems then under discussion. The principle of geographical distribution was taken into account in Regulations 4.3.1 and 4.6 (in the latter, in respect of the renewal of contracts). Those two regulations were complementary to the general stipulations contained in Regulation 4.2, with regard to the other criteria for the appointment, transfer or promotion of staff.
(13) A study of that text might simplify the discussion and prevent the submission of somewhat improvised amendments, aimed at settling points already dealt with in the text itself.

(14) Mr. KELLY (Australia) was not convinced that the recruitment of staff "on as wide a geographical basis as possible" would achieve the desired result, unless it were made clear that the connexion between a national and his country should not merely be a legal one. A Frenchman, for example, might be born in France, but live all his life in Patagonia. The Director-General should also ensure that staff recruited were truly representative of their countries. If a new formula could be substituted for "geographical basis", the Australian delegation would be satisfied.

(15) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL did not think that the Secretariat was competent to decide whether or not an individual was representative of his country, but he pointed out that, before any candidate was appointed, his government was asked to comment on him. The Director-General assumed that no government would recommend a candidate who had spent most of his life in another country.

(16) Mr. TREJOS DITTEL (Costa Rica) supported the proposals made by the United Kingdom and Egyptian delegates. He said that the Secretariat had made considerable efforts to apply the principle of fair geographical representation, but there was still room for improvement. Central America had never been represented on the Secretariat and, although it consisted of small countries, that geographical zone possessed people who were sufficiently qualified to work as officials of Unesco.
(17) A Unesco official was a publicity agent for the Organization in his own country. That was a good reason why geographical distribution should be improved along general lines that would render it more effective.

(18) Mr. RIAÑO JAUMA (Cuba) agreed that the Director-General should be empowered to secure a fair geographical distribution, in regard both to the recruitment of staff and to the renewal of contracts.
(19) He pointed out that in the statistics published in document 8C/ADM/11, Cuba was shown, in 1952, with a representative on the Secretariat, who had later disappeared without any reason being given. The nationality of officials on the Secretariat should be

defined more clearly, in order that they should not appear as the nationals of a country to which they were attributed but to which they did not actually belong.

(20) Mr. RAADI (Iran) reminded the Commission that the discussion bore on a text submitted by the Director-General, to which several amendments had been proposed. The authors of those amendments were about to try to work out a joint text, and it would therefore be useful to know whether the spirit of the amendments was in keeping with the Director-General's wishes, or nearly so. If those amendments were approved by the Commission, would the Director-General be able to carry out his wishes?

(21) Although the United Kingdom - Egyptian amendment did not quite correspond to what he had in mind, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL would be prepared to agree to it, if it were acceptable to the majority of members of the Commission.

(22) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile), on a point of order, thought it would be useful to adjourn the meeting in order to allow the authors of the amendments to come to an agreement over the wording of their text.

(23) The point of order involved a question of procedure, namely, that, whatever the text agreed upon, it should not include anything on the geographical distribution of the staff until Staff Regulations 4.3.1 and 4.6 had been dealt with.

(24) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Regulation 4.6 was not yet at issue, as the delegate of the United Kingdom, at the request of the delegate of Egypt, had withdrawn his proposal to delete it. The only Regulations at issue, therefore, were 4.2 and 4.3.1 and the motion to combine the substance of 4.3.1 and 4.2 was perfectly in order.

(25) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) took the view that the Chilean delegate was invoking Article 85 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference; in other words, that he had called for a separate vote on the terms of the draft resolution under discussion. The Spanish delegate joined the delegate of Chile in making that request.

(26) The CHAIRMAN remarked that the point of order raised by the delegate of Spain was not the same as that of the delegate of Chile. He would therefore first take account of the latter.

(27) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said that his wishes were similar to those of the Chilean delegate. He hoped it might be possible to vote on the proposed amendment in separate parts. If the text submitted by the Director-General, to which several amendments had been proposed, were accepted, there would have to be a provision covering the acquired rights of staff members whose contracts were due to be renewed.

(28) The CHAIRMAN asked members of the Commission to take the point raised by the delegate of Belgium into consideration, since it seemed likely that they would be asked to vote on the two parts separately.

(29) The meeting adjourned for ten minutes to enable the delegations of Pakistan, the United Kingdom, India and Egypt to prepare a joint amendment.

(30) The meeting having reassembled, the following joint amendment to Regulation 4.2 was submitted for consideration:

"In appointing, transferring or promoting staff members, and in renewing appointments, the Director-General shall aim at securing as wide a geographical distribution as possible and the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity".

(31) Mr. von GRAEVENITZ (German Federal Republic) considered that, in matters of staff recruitment, Unesco must establish a balance between two criteria: that of the highest standard of efficiency, which could be best assured by continuity of service, and that of a fair geographical distribution of posts between the Member States. Clearly, continuity could only come into play when the programme was concentrated round a small number of long-term projects. In the view of the German delegation, those two criteria were of equal importance; neither should be regarded as prevailing over the other. The speaker noted with regret that the resolutions of the seventh session of the Conference had accorded priority to the first of those criteria - that of continuity - by placing too great an emphasis on indeterminate appointments; the second requirement had accordingly been only partially met. However, no blame attached to the Director-General in that connexion; he had, on the contrary, done all he could in the circumstances. Paragraph 23 of 8C/ADM/11 ran: "The present geographical distribution of the Secretariat is not satisfactory and special action by the General Conference is necessary if the Director-General is to be able to improve it quickly and satisfactorily". Assuming that there were general agreement on that statement, it was necessary to redress the errors which had brought about such a situation, but it was not by reversing the relationship between the two criteria - i.e. by giving priority to geographical distribution - that the situation could be put right or the necessary compromise achieved. The mistake had been to lay too much stress on the idea of continuity at a time when the programme had reflected a certain discontinuity. Now that Unesco was assuming greater long-term obligations, it would be inadvisable to allow too much fluctuation in the staff. That reason carried all the more weight since Unesco was faced with an additional task - for which the Conference had repeatedly pressed - that of evaluating certain of the programme projects undertaken by Unesco in the light of critical and detailed observations. The sooner past errors could be rectified on the basis of such an evaluation, the better it would be for Unesco's reputation.

(32) In conclusion, the speaker said that the foregoing ideas were reflected in the proposed amendment, which accordingly had his approval.

(33) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) agreed with the delegate of the German Federal Republic, but would like

an explanation on one point. Was the expression "geographical distribution" to be interpreted in terms of territories and frontiers or - as it should be - in terms of joint efforts in the realm of science, education and culture, on the basis of which the Director-General should make his choice?

(34) Mr. GOMEZ ROBLEDO (Mexico) asked whether, if the amendment were approved, Regulations 4.3 and 4.6 would still stand. He agreed with the United Kingdom proposal, because he understood it to imply the deletion of Regulation 4.6, but it now appeared from the discussion that that Regulation would be maintained. The powers of the Director-General were thereby considerably increased, and the not altogether fair criterion of geographical distribution was introduced as an important factor in the recruitment of Unesco officials. The amendment would be logical if Regulation 4.6 were deleted. If that Regulation were maintained, there was no point in the amendment.

(35) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that, even if the amendment to Regulation 4.2 were passed, it would still be essential to maintain Regulation 4.3 (selection without distinction of race, sex or religion) which was not covered by 4.2. He had understood that Regulation 4.6 was to be discussed separately.

(36) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) sympathized with any misgivings which the Director-General might have at the idea of operating under the joint amendment proposed to 4.2. In interpreting the amendment, there would certainly be many pressures as to whether geographical distribution or the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity should have priority. To make the Director-General's task easier, therefore, he proposed the deletion of the word "and" and the substitution of the words: "without sacrifice to". The sentence would thus read: "... as wide a geographical distribution as possible, without sacrifice to the highest standards...".

(37) At the DIRECTOR-GENERAL's suggestion, Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) agreed to accept the more usual form of wording: "without prejudice to".

(38) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) thought that both considerations should be given equal weight and would therefore prefer the word "and" to be maintained.

(39) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 4 of Article VI of the Constitution, where it was laid down that the highest standards of integrity, efficiency and technical competence should be given paramount consideration.

(40) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) much regretted that the suggestions of the United States delegate had not been accepted, subject to drafting changes, at least in the French version. The text of the amendment submitted jointly by a number of delegates read: "In appointing, transferring or promoting staff members..... the Director-General shall aim at securing as wide a geographical distribution as possible and the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity". (41) He pointed out that, whereas in the text of the Staff Regulations of the United Nations, as in the text proposed by the Director-General, emphasis was laid in the first place on professional qualifications, efficiency and integrity - the need for recruitment on a wide geographical basis being stipulated in the second place only - the new text reversed this order, and required the Director-General, in recruiting the staff of the Organization, to give first thought to geographical distribution in the light of high policy considerations based on quantitative values, assigning a secondary place to competence and integrity. The speaker thought that the text had perhaps gone beyond the intentions of its authors. Whilst agreeing with the principle, he therefore recommended, with a view to dispelling that unfortunate impression, that a form of words similar to that proposed by the United States delegate should be used.

(42) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said that, after listening carefully to the remarks made by the United States and French delegates, he was of the opinion that to adopt the joint amendment would be to violate one of the fundamental provisions of the Constitution. Paragraph 4 of Article VI, the terms of which he recalled, would have to be modified by the Conference before that amendment could be accepted. All that the Commission could do was to propose the insertion in the Staff Regulations of a sentence which would be a mere repetition of what was stipulated in the Constitution.

(43) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he personally would interpret the joint amendment to mean that the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity should take precedence over geographical distribution, but, if the Commission wished to make the position clearer for some other Director-General, it should adopt the amendment proposed by the United States delegate. He drew attention to the fact that, in Regulation 4.2, the appointment of staff was more important than transfers or promotions.

(44) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) regretted to say that, when he had consulted with the delegations of Pakistan, India and Egypt, he had not been aware of Article VI, paragraph 4 of the Constitution. In order not to be inconsistent with that provision, he felt obliged to ask his colleagues if they would accept the United States amendment.

(45) Mr. SUNDARAM (India) thought that acceptance of the United States amendment would be equivalent to reverting to the status quo, whereas, in his delegation's view, slightly more importance should thenceforth be attached to geographical distribution than to the other considerations.

(46) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) thought that the joint amendment was complementary, but not contradictory, to the Constitution.

(47) Mr. RAADI (Iran) thought that the discussion might have taken an uneasy turn because there was a tendency to contrast the notion of efficiency with that of geographical representation. But the two notions

should not in fact be set against one another. If an official was to work competently and effectively, he must have a clear idea of the conditions obtaining in different parts of the world and understand the factors that enabled Unesco to have a real influence in the world; in the minds of the authors of the Constitution, competence and geographical distribution had been parallel ideas.

(48) With regard to Article VI, paragraph 4. of the Constitution to the effect that "subject to" a combination of the highest standards of integrity, efficiency and competence, staff should be recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible, that sentence could also be taken to mean that the widest possible geographical basis was at once an essential and desirable condition, subject to, etc. The speaker thought that those were purely legal considerations which could be left out of account; in his view, the proposed compromise amendment might provide a basis for immediate agreement, and to depart from it was to run the risk of reopening the question of the priority of the aforesaid two notions, which would lead to interminable discussions.

(49) At the proposal of Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) it was agreed that the Commission should again adjourn for a few minutes to enable the sponsors of the draft amendment either to reamend it or to withdraw it in favour of the Director-General's original proposal.

(50) The meeting having reassembled, Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) announced that he and his colleagues had decided to withdraw their amendment.

(51) The CHAIRMAN observed that the Commission should therefore vote on the original motion of the delegate of Thailand to adopt the amendment to Regulation 4.2 proposed by the Director-General.

(52) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said he would abstain from voting on Regulation 4.2 since, unless a reservation on the acquired rights of staff were included, it was unacceptable to him.

(53) The amendment to Regulation 4.2 proposed by the Director-General in document 8C/ADM/11 was put to the vote and adopted by 26 votes to 0, with 14 abstentions.

(54) The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to section 15 on page 7 of document 8C/ADM/14 (Regulation 4.2.1).

(55) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had already had an opportunity to state its point of view, namely, that Regulation 4.2.1 should be maintained. He therefore moved acceptance of the Executive Board's opinion that the regulation should not be deleted.

(56) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) reminded the Commission that the Executive Board's opinions on Regulation 4.2.1 were set out in 8C/ADM/14, referred to in the document at present under discussion (8C/ADM/11); apart from the delegations of the USSR and Ecuador, no delegation had given its views on that matter, and Mr. Juvigny preferred to reserve comment on Regulation 4.2.1 until 8C/ADM/14, which contained the justifications, was discussed.

(57) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Commission wished to consider Regulation 4.2.1 forthwith, or at a later stage in connexion with document 8C/ADM/14.

(58) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation attached a great deal of importance to Regulation 4.2.1 and that its retention or deletion would determine the Soviet delegation's attitude towards a series of other questions. He did not think that it would be correct procedure to jump from one document to another, and therefore proposed that the Commission decide at once whether or not to delete Regulation 4.2.1, examining the question in document 8C/ADM/14 at a later stage.

(59) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) regretted he could not share that view. As regarded the order of discussion, texts should be examined according to the documents prepared by the Director-General. Regulation 4.2.1 should be considered when document 8C/ADM/14 came before the Commission.

(60) The Soviet motion to discuss Regulation 4.2.1 forthwith was put to the vote and rejected by 22 votes to 6, with 19 abstentions.

(61) It was thus agreed to discuss Regulation 4.2.1 at a later stage in connexion with document 8C/ADM/14.

(62) The Commission agreed to maintain Regulation 4.3 and passed on to Regulation 4.3.1.

(63) In order to meet the intention of the major portion of the original United Kingdom amendment, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed the following wording:

"Without prejudice to the terms of Regulation 4.2, the Director-General shall strive to secure a staff distributed on as wide a geographical basis as possible".

(64) Such an amendment would make Regulation 4.6 unnecessary.

(65) The Director-General's proposal was seconded by several delegations.

(66) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) failed to see how that draft amendment, as he understood it, differed from the text proposed; he would be glad to know where the distinction lay.

(67) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the difference was that Regulation 4.3.1 limited the question to recruitment, whereas his amendment also covered transfers, promotion and renewal of appointments.

(68) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) said that the wording now proposed: "The Director-General shall strive to recruit his staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible", enabled the Director-General to express his views on the substance of the problem.

(69) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the correct wording was: "Le Directeur général s'efforcera d'obtenir un personnel....".

(70) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) acknowledged that it was difficult to evolve a sound French text at the meeting itself. He suggested the following: "Le Directeur général s'efforcera d'assurer que le personnel représente une distribution géographique aussi large que possible", but that would need polishing.

(71) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) replied that the substance of his remarks would not be affected by the difficulty of finding a suitable way of expressing a notion that was quite clear. The wording "shall strive to secure" in effect expressed a wish, whereas the present text was an imperative which would be weakened by the change proposed. He only pressed that point because he thought that the heart of the matter had not yet been touched.

(72) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed to strengthen his amendment by altering it to read: "shall ensure a staff distributed on as wide a geographical basis as possible".

(73) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) agreed that that text was clearer, but thought that it brought the debate back to its starting-point and still left the substance of the problem untouched, since all the difference lay in the form used. Mr. Ammoun was aware of the Director-General's difficulties, who, in order to take into account the two aspects of the problem (indeterminate contracts and equitable geographical representation), had to reconcile two often contradictory conditions. The whole point was that he must be empowered not to renew indeterminate appointments. The staff representative had referred to tribunal decisions based on jurisprudence, and he would like to have details of that; had there been any legal decisions on that particular point, the non-renewal of contracts? The point should be studied very closely. Perusal of the General Conference resolutions showed that the Conference had never recommended that a text be modified, but only that methods be changed, for the better implementation of principles already incorporated in the Constitution and the Staff Regulations. After hours of discussion a text had emerged which stated: "The Director-General shall strive". Mr. Ammoun urged that a serious study of that question be placed before the Commission. In conclusion, he assured the Director-General that he fully sympathized with him in his perfectly justifiable attempts to redress a situation which left him with his hands tied.

(74) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) asked if the Director-General would accept the substitution of "constituted" for "distributed" on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

(75) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it a great improvement.

(76) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) agreed, in general, with the Lebanese delegate. Regulation 4.6, as originally drafted in the proposal, was more expressive than the amendment which purported to strengthen it. The phrase: "in order to achieve more equitable geographical distribution within the Secretariat" should be maintained. The aim was to rectify a lack of equity. Paragraph 4 of Article VI of the Constitution was clear, but there had been a discrepancy between constitutional principle and actual practice. That was no new state of affairs but one which had recurred since the foundation of Unesco.

(77) If the amendment were accepted, the above-quoted phrase of Regulation 4.6 in the proposed amendments to Staff Regulations should be maintained.

(78) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, who said that he had merely been trying to help the Commission to reach agreement, would not insist on his amendment.

(79) In reply to a question from Mr. KELLY (Australia) concerning the interpretation of the word "selection", the DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he would interpret it to mean recruitment only in Regulation 4.3.1. In 4.3.2, it might mean recruitment only. In 4.3, he would take it to apply also to transfers, promotions, renewal of appointments, and all other personnel matters.

(80) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) seconded the remarks of the Lebanese delegate, which he himself had touched on in two of his own statements. He hoped the Secretariat would take them into account and study the points raised by the Lebanese delegate from a legal point of view.

(81) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that to his knowledge there was no legal provision for the case of non-renewal of contract for the purpose of assuring better geographical distribution, although the Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations and the Unesco Appeals Board had had to give decisions in cases of non-renewal of contracts. Those authorities had decided that staff members were entitled to a reasonable expectation of renewal and they had held themselves to be competent to pronounce upon the reasons for which a contract had not been renewed. The Legal Adviser personally considered that the right not to renew contracts on expiration was strictly a prerogative of the Director-General, who had full discretion in the matter; but in view of the precedents established by the appeals authorities in that connexion, and of the fact that those precedents might be applied to non-renewal in the interests of better geographical distribution, the Director-General had wished for a clear and precise decision on the matter.

(82) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) saw no obstacle in the way of adopting Regulation 4.3.1, which was merely the logical sequel to Regulation 4.2 as it had been amended on the proposal of the Director-General. Regulation 4.3.1, which had been rather vague in its original form, had become more precise as a result of the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom delegate and the Director-General. He accordingly supported those amendments.

(83) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) wondered if the amendment proposed by the Director-General would give him the same powers as under Regulation 4.6. If Regulation 4.3.1 were approved, he would later propose an amendment to Regulation 4.6.

(84) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) presumed that what the delegate of Pakistan wished to know was whether the amendment to Regulation 4.3.1 proposed by the Director-General would give the latter the same rights as those deriving from the proposed amendment to Regulation 4.6. He explained that, since the idea of selection was to be replaced by a more general wording, to the effect that "The Director-General shall secure as wide a geographical distribution as possible", it was perfectly clear that that covered appointments proper, as well as renewal or non-renewal of contracts. However, there was a difference of degree in the force of the two articles, Regulation 4.6 as proposed being by far the more categorical; also, non-renewal was explicitly mentioned in Regulation 4.6 but was only implicit in Regulation 4.3.1.

(85) In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) said that he had received an answer to his question from the Legal Adviser. There was a difference in degree, but the Director-General did have the same power under both Regulations to ensure geographical distribution when it came to renewing appointments. If necessary, he would later move an amendment to Regulation 4.6.

(86) On a point of order, Miss LAISE (United States of America) drew attention to the fact that Unesco's own Staff Rules and Regulations clearly specified that there was no presumption of the renewal of a contract when it expired, and that the United Nations Regulations and jurisprudence were not relevant.

(87) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) asked whether the Director-General thought the proposed wording would suffice to eliminate any difficulty of interpretation in cases of non-renewal of contracts, and whether he thought it would cover the case of all Unesco staff members. If so, the speaker was prepared to vote for the proposed text without further discussion.

(88) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL believed that, as the machinery for appeal existed, the text proposed would provide the maximum protection both for Unesco and for its staff members.

(89) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) observed that, if he understood aright the Legal Adviser's explanation, the proposed text would leave the Administrative Tribunals with practically no control, since the equitable geographical distribution clause would in fact give the Director-General arbitrary powers - a situation which seemed to him somewhat difficult to accept. Account must be taken of the legal decisions taken by Administrative Tribunals, from which common principles had emerged. The proposed wording, by giving the Director-General full power, might cover a number of other reasons (the officials conduct, etc.) and, in extreme cases, the geographical reason might well be used to conceal others.

(90) The speaker gave a second reason, of a practical nature. Supposing that there were, in one department of the Secretariat, four or five officials with the same grade and the same nationality, the Director-General would be obliged to choose which of them should be sacrificed in the interests of better geographical distribution - and that choice ought not to be purely arbitrary. It would therefore be necessary to adopt objective criteria, such as the standard of service rendered by those officials; the Appeals Board, and later the Administrative Tribunal, would thus be enabled to apply a material test (comparison of reports on the officials in question). Mr. Juvigny thought such jurisdictional controls would still be necessary, even if the proposed new text were adopted, as they were an essential safeguard for staff members.

(91) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL understood as well as any member of the Commission that the gift of power placed a heavy responsibility on a Director-General and inescapably provided the possibility of the abuse of power. That was why he had told the General Conference in a plenary meeting that he would always be ready to give a reason when he refused to renew a contract, although he was not obliged to give such reason. That gave the tribunal an opportunity to evaluate his reason and provided staff members with maximum protection against the exercise of arbitrary power. He had, for example, given a reason for his recent refusal to renew four contracts.

(92) The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the amendment to Regulation 4.3.1, as proposed by the Director-General:

"Without prejudice to the terms of Regulation 4.2, the Director-General shall ensure a staff constituted on as wide a geographical basis as possible".

(93) The amendment was adopted by 42 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions.

(94) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) asked for an explanation regarding Regulation 4.3.2. He wished to know whether the statement that staff should be selected "on a competitive basis" meant that the selection was to be made by a comparison of their merits or by examination. The situation would vary according to the method used.

(95) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that either method could be employed, the main point being to ensure that the best person secured the position.

(96) It was agreed to maintain Regulation 4.3.2 and the Commission passed to Regulation 4.4.

(97) It was agreed to maintain Regulation 4.4 and the Commission passed to Regulation 4.5.

(98) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, since the document had been prepared, he had asked the Conference for permission to suppress the post of Deputy Director-General and to appoint two Assistant Directors-General. If the Conference agreed to his proposal, the text of Regulation 4.5 would have to be amended accordingly.

(99) Subject to the Director-General's reservation, the proposed new text of Regulation 4.5 was approved.

(100) The adoption of the proposed amendment to Regulation 4.5.1 was moved and seconded by several delegations.

(101) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) pointed out that the present wording of Regulation 4.5.1 as given in document 8C/ADM/11 was not in accordance with the French text adopted by the General Conference and given on page 122 of the Resolutions (French) of the 1952 session of the Conference, which provided for the renewal of certain contracts "pour des périodes déterminées d'un an au moins et de cinq ans au plus"; the text given in document 8C/ADM/11 read "not less than one year up to a maximum period of service of five years". There was an appreciable difference between the two, as the text adopted by the Conference in 1952 allowed of several five-year contracts in succession, whereas the text submitted to the Commission might be interpreted as meaning that all higher officials would have to go after five years' service if they had not been granted indeterminate contracts.

(102) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the original text, adopted by the Conference in 1952, had been written in English; the error was merely one of French translation. He was certain that the text in document 8C/ADM/11 was correct and reflected the intention of the Conference at its 1952 session.

(103) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) asked that note should be taken of the abstention of the French delegation; he asked whether the text meant that the Director-General could not renew a contract that implied the retention of an official in his post for more than five years.

(104) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, taking 1 January 1952 as a starting-point, a person in continuous service could not serve the Organization beyond 1 January 1957 without having an indeterminate contract; on all successive dates after 1 January 1952 the same principle would apply.

(105) The amendment to Regulation 4.5.1 proposed by the Director-General was adopted by 43 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

# NINETEENTH MEETING

*30 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.5.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT STANDARDS AND METHODS (document 8C/ADM/11) (continued)**

(1) The Commission turned to the examination of paragraphs 19 and 24.

(2) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it was highly desirable for the General Conference to give him definite guidance as regarded the proportion of fixed-term and indeterminate appointments within Unesco.
(3) The principles set forth in paragraph 19 had been endorsed two years before by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.
(4) Some time would necessarily elapse before the percentages indicated in that paragraph were achieved. That was why he had proposed that the date by which those figures should be attained should be 1958. He would, of course, report on progress made to the ninth session.
(5) All he was doing in that paragraph was to ask the Conference to set target percentages and a target date by which they should be attained, leaving him free to decide, with the best interests of the Organization in mind, how to set about attaining them.
(6) The adoption of the principle set forth in paragraph 24 would considerably strengthen his hand in dealing with applications for employment.

(7) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) sympathized with the Director-General. In any organization it was difficult to decide what the proportion of fixed-term and indeterminate appointments should be. But he was not sure that the Commission would be assisting the Director-General by adopting a resolution on the lines suggested. To lay down fixed percentages for such posts might not be in the best interests of Unesco.
(8) Accordingly he would propose the following motion:

"The Commission recommends that the General Conference authorize the Director-General to continue his efforts to build up a permanent cadre of Unesco officials in the interests of continuity and stability, and request him to report to the next session on the progress made".

(9) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, answering a question by Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt), said that about 40% of staff in the Professional categories were at that moment in possession of permanent contracts.

(10) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) had been reassured by the wording of paragraph 19, in which it was stated that the Director-General's aim would be to achieve the figures in question. In such matters it was always dangerous to be too explicit in setting target figures. He supported the United States motion.

(11) The United States motion was put to the vote and adopted by 32 votes to 0, with 8 abstentions.

(12) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain), seconded by Mr. Huzayin (Egypt) and Mr. de Los Santos (Philippines), moved that the Commission recommend the General Conference to instruct the Director-General in accordance with paragraph 24.

(13) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) said that, during the discussions of the day before, the point had been made that the Director-General had, under the Staff Regulations, full power to renew or not to renew a contract with an eye to obtaining the highest possible standards of efficiency and integrity, coupled with an equitable geographical distribution of posts. That had also been the view of the Legal Adviser.
(14) In view of the new paragraph 4.3.1, did the Director-General feel that there was a need for any more specific authorization, such as would be given under paragraph 4.6?

(15) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that in paragraph 24 he was not asking for further powers. All he was requesting was that the Conference should give him instructions which he could invoke when dealing with applicants from over-represented countries.
(16) Admittedly it was difficult to define what an "over-represented" country was. Generally speaking, he did not absolutely require the instructions asked for, although they would be of assistance to him.

(17) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) was inclined to trust the Director-General in implementing the Staff Regulations. He was deeply suspicious of hard-and-fast instructions and definite percentages, and thence considered paragraph 24 superfluous.

(18) Mr. SUNDARAM (India) said that the day before, the Director-General had expressed his willingness to give his reasons for not renewing a contract.
(19) If the Director-General terminated, or refused to renew, a contract, and gave as one of his reasons that the individual concerned came from an over-represented country, would any appeal against that decision be sustained by the Appeals Board?

(20) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that in some cases he might indeed give that as one of his reasons, but, unless the principle of paragraph 24 were adopted, he would not give as his reason that any particular Member State was over-represented. He felt that the Appeals Board could hardly fail to uphold his decision if that decision were honestly arrived at and were in accordance with the facts.

(21) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) reminded the Commission that he had already informed them the previous day of the French delegation's attitude towards the principle of geographical distribution. He would therefore merely express his reactions to the actual terms of paragraph 24.
(22) First of all, he called the Commission's attention to the unsuitable use of the word "represented" in the part of the sentence which read "of nationals from Member States which are over-represented in the Secretariat". He pointed out that the idea of "representation" was a very precise one, and to consider the Secretariat officials as "representative" of Member States was contrary to the fundamental principle of international organizations.
(23) The French delegation was equally unable to accept the words "unless he judges that to do so is essential to the efficient administration of the Organization". It felt very strongly that the efficient administration of the Organization should always, and in all circumstances, be one of the major aims of the Director-General.

(24) The CHAIRMAN observed that the Director-General would not insist on his proposal.

(25) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) said all would agree that the primary consideration was to obtain staff of the highest possible efficiency and integrity. The point of the Director-General's proposal in paragraph 24 was as follows: if there were two candidates for a particular post, one of them from an over-represented, the other from an under-represented, country, then, all else being equal, the latter candidate would be chosen. That was surely very reasonable.

(26) The Commission decided, by 20 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions, to recommend the General Conference to instruct the Director-General in accordance with paragraph 24 and passed on to paragraph 4.5.2.

(27) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that there were occasions when he wished to prolong an appointment beyond the normal term without making a temporary appointment, pending the recruitment of a successor.
(28) For example, the contract of the Director of the Mass Communication Department expired on 31 December. He (the Director-General) might wish to ask the official in question to stay on until a successor was found. The alternative was to abolish the post and to create a temporary appointment for a fixed period. The change requested was a matter of convenience for the Secretariat.

(29) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain), seconded by Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa), moved adoption of paragraph 4.5.2 as proposed by the Director-General.

(30) The Spanish motion was put to the vote and unanimously adopted.

(31) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL then withdrew his proposal in connexion with paragraph 4.6.

(32) Mr. ERIKSSON (Rapporteur) said that, in paragraph A.1, document 8C/ADM/11 quoted a resolution by the seventh session, calling on the

Director-General to aim at a better geographical distribution of staff and at added efficiency. Had the Director-General anything to say on the action taken to achieve added efficiency?

(33) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that at the seventh session he had been Chairman of the Administrative Commission, which had framed the resolution. The feeling there had been that equitable geographical distribution automatically entailed increased efficiency as far as Unesco was concerned. That was his view, and hence there was no separate report on the steps taken to attain added efficiency.

(34) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) pointed out that the Lebanese delegation, while not opposed to the modifications which had just been approved, doubted if in fact they altered the present situation to any great extent. However, it felt quite sure that it would be to the advantage of all to give effect to the idea set out in paragraph 28 (a) in the following terms:

"The Director-General believes that it will be in the long-term interests of the Organization to recruit for junior professional posts young persons with good academic qualifications with a view to giving them within the Secretariat the training in languages and in civil service methods which they lack. He believes that this should be done within the framework of the approved programme and not by the creation of special training posts".

(35) Mr. Ammoun suggested that the method proposed might even be extended to include the General Service categories.

(36) He also protested strongly against certain unjustified statements, such as that which appeared in the first sentence of paragraph 28 (a): "It is difficult to find candidates from Member States which are not English- or French-speaking who combine professional qualifications with a good knowledge of one of these languages, which is clearly necessary for efficient service to the Organization". It seemed to him that the representatives of English- or French-speaking Member States should be the first to contest that statement, which showed that it was not realized how widely spread those two languages were. For his part he would be glad if the Rapporteur would kindly mention that in his report.

(37) The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission had now finished its consideration of document 8C/ADM/11.

**ITEM 9.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: LEGAL QUESTIONS (document 8C/JUR/3) (continued)**

(38) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur of the Legal Committee) presented document 8C/JUR/3, which set forth the recommendations of the Legal Committee on the various questions referred to it by the Administrative Commission. He wished, first, to draw the Commission's attention to the changes recommended by the Committee in respect of Articles V, 9 and VI, 3 of the Constitution (page 1).

(39) The proposed new wording of Article V, paragraph 9, was approved unanimously.

(40) The proposed new wording of Article VI, paragraph 3, was approved unanimously.

(41) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) next submitted the draft resolution given in paragraph 4 (c) (pages 1 and 2).

(42) Replying to a question from the delegate of the Union of South Africa, he explained that the point of the words "if necessary" in paragraph (2) of the draft resolution was to avoid tying the Director-General down, even if the General Conference met in the early months of the year, to preparing a report which could only cover a very short period and would in all probability be of little interest.

(43) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) thought too much was being asked of the Director-General's discretion. The Commission should give some indication of how often a report was required.

(44) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that his intention was to take the advice of the Executive Board. He was prepared to accept an amendment whereby the words "if necessary" would read: "if considered necessary by the Executive Board".

(45) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) expressed willingness to approve the draft resolution in question with whatever drafting change might be made to meet the wishes of the South African delegate.

(46) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) said that distant countries often received, almost simultaneously, reports for two consecutive periods. One report only, for the whole period, should be distributed to Member States. Perhaps the Director-General might report to the Executive Board every six months.

(47) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that to report every six months would lay a great burden on the Secretariat. He realized that sometimes reports for consecutive periods were received at almost the same time, but would try to arrange things so that Member States would receive a report for any year within the first three months of the following one.

(48) In view of the foregoing discussion, Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) proposed rewording paragraph 2 of the draft resolution as follows:

"..... in those years during which the General Conference shall meet in ordinary session, and if the Executive Board deems it necessary, an interim report covering the activities of the Organization from the end of the preceding year".

(49) This amendment was adopted.

(50) The draft resolution thus amended was approved.

(51) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) went on to inform the Commission of the Legal Committee's proposals on item 9.3.3 (Draft amendment to the Constitution, and other provisions relating to the withdrawal of Member States) (paragraphs 5 and 6, page 2).

(52) Proposed by Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) and seconded by Mr. AFTALION (Argentina),

the text recommended by the Committee as paragraph 6 of Article II of the Constitution was unanimously approved.

(53) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) then proceeded to the Legal Committee's recommendations in respect of item 9.3.4 (Proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference). Some of those amendments were solely designed to bring the Rules into line with the new situation which had arisen as a result of the admission of "Associate Members" to the Organization.

(54) Mr. DE HOOG (Netherlands) drew attention to Rule 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, pointing out that the English text should be corrected to read "or Associate Member" instead of "and Associate Member".

(55) Subject to that correction, the amendments proposed by the Legal Committee in respect of Rules 6 to 24 of the Rules of Procedure (document 8C/JUR/3, pages 3 and 4) were approved.

(56) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) then presented Rules 25, 26 and 28, which referred to the organization of the Conference.

(57) Speaking in connexion with the proposed rewording of Rule 25, paragraph 2, and apart from the general reservation of approval by the General Conference in plenary session, Mr. POMPEI (Italy) wished to make a special reservation concerning the inclusion of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget in the list of Committees of the General Conference. He thought that the work of the present session had not yet gone far enough to warrant an attempt to determine whether or not that Committee should be retained at future sessions.

(58) The CHAIRMAN said that a decision taken by the Commission at that stage would not bind the Conference, if the Conference saw fit to make any changes later.
(59) The Chairman proposed that Rule 25 should read "The Commissions or subsidiary bodies", instead of "The Commissions and subsidiary bodies".

(60) Subject to that alteration, the new wording of Rules 25 and 26 was approved.

(61) The proposed change in Rule 28 was also approved.

(62) Referring to Rule 30, Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) said the Legal Committee had decided that the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Chile for the amendment of Rule 30, paragraph 1 (document 8C/DR/65) was not within the Committee's jurisdiction and should first be studied by the Administrative Commission. The only proposals the Legal Committee wished to make in respect of Rule 30 were those given on page 4 of document 8C/JUR/3.

(63) Mr. VILLALON GALDAMES (Chile) said that his delegation was withdrawing the preamble it had included in its draft amendment to paragraph 1 of Rule 30 (document 8C/DR/65), but wished to maintain the proposed modification in substance: it accordingly suggested that the phrase "On information received from the Executive Board" be deleted, since, although that expression was quite clear in theory, it had in practice given rise to false interpretation and difficult situations.

(64) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) was gratified to observe that the delegate of Chile was in agreement with the United Kingdom delegation in holding that Rule 30, paragraph 1, with its existing wording, did not commit the Nominations Committee to accepting only the list submitted by the Executive Board
(65) The delegate of Chile had apparently not been satisfied that all delegations would accept that interpretation.
(66) His own impression of what had gone on in the Nominations Committee was that nobody had in fact maintained that the Committee had no option but to accept the list submitted by the Board. Certainly his delegation, for one, had said that not to accept the Board's list might make the task of the Committee more complicated, since the way would be thrown open for the submission of many different lists. His delegation had pointed out that the Executive Board was under an obligation to give most careful thought beforehand to the proper distribution of Conference offices, and that, though it might be unwise, it would certainly not be wrong, to depart from the Board's recommendations.
(67) He assumed that the Chilean amendment to paragraph 1 tended to eliminate the part played by the Executive Board. Thence he was not sure he could agree that the deletion of the first words of the paragraph was a drafting amendment only. A serious issue was being raised.

(68) Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay) proposed the compromise wording "Without obligation to follow the report, if any, of the Executive Board....", which was agreed to by the delegation of Chile.

(69) There followed some discussion on the Chilean proposal between the delegates of Argentina, Chile, the United Kingdom, Uruguay and the Union of South Africa, and after a short interval the CHAIRMAN submitted the following text (agreed upon by the delegations concerned) for approval by the Commission:

"The Nominations Committee, after receiving the report from the Executive Board, and without any obligation to accept its recommendations, shall determine and submit to the General Conference the list of nominations for the posts of President and of the ten Vice-Presidents of the General Conference".

(70) This resolution was put to the vote and adopted by 33 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

(71) The recommendation by the Legal Committee for the insertion of another sentence at the end of paragraph 1 (Rule 30) was adopted unanimously.

(72) The recommendation by the Legal Committee for a new paragraph 4 to be added to Rule 30 was adopted unanimously.

(73) The CHAIRMAN then submitted the proposed new wording of Rule 40 (Acting President) (document 8C/JUR/3, page 5).

(74) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation saw no need to change the existing wording of Rule 40, and would therefore vote against the proposed alteration.

(75) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) said that the proposal was based on experience acquired at past sessions and he supported it. Paragraph 1 of Rule 40 provided for short absences, but there should be some system to cope with the event of accident or illness.

(76) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no reason why the President needed in his absence to be replaced by one and the same Vice-President for the whole time. He would have thought that the various Vice-Presidents could take turns to serve as Acting President.

(77) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) said that no provision had been made for the case of the President of the General Conference being away for more than one meeting, but less than two days.

(78) The CHAIRMAN thought that in that case the provisions of paragraph 1 would apply. In other words, the President would be replaced by the Vice-Presidents in turn.

(79) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) concurred.

(80) The Legal Committee's proposals in respect of Rule 40 were put to the vote and carried by 20 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

(81) The proposed amendments to Rules 47, 59, 63, 69, 73, 74, 75 and 76 were then approved one after the other.

(82) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) then proceeded to Rule 92, which set out the Legal Committee's recommendation that a clause be inserted to deal with Associate Members.

(83) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) thought that the expression "the Member State or other authority having responsibility" in the revised text of Rule 92 should be made clearer so as to cover the case of States not Members of Unesco applying for membership on behalf of territories or groups of territories for which they were responsible.

(84) In reply to the Spanish delegate, Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) said that the proposed wording took all such possibilities into account. For his own part he saw no objection to substituting the single word "State", for the words "Member State" in paragraph 2.

(85) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) said that what he wanted to know was whether a State which was not a Member of Unesco could apply for membership on behalf of a territory or a group of territories under its jurisdiction.

(86) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the revised text merely repeated the words used in Article II of the Constitution. It was for the Commission to decide whether it now wished to discuss how that Article should be interpreted.

(87) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) explained that he did not wish to present a formal motion, but only to raise the point for the time when the Legal Committee should be ready to examine it.

(88) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) pointed out that the words "or other authority having responsibility for their international relations" could be applied to non-Member States just as well as to Member States.

(89) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) said that the formula used had a definite meaning in other international organizations. It was designed to provide for cases in which the United Nations might accept responsibility for a trust territory.

(90) The Legal Committee's recommendation on Rule 92 was adopted unanimously.

Rules 103, 104 and 105

(91) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in Rules 103, 104 and 105 the words "Associate Members" had to be added.

(92) The amendment to Rules 103, 104 and 105 was adopted unanimously.

(93) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) then submitted the proposed amendment to Rule 106.

(94) Adopted.

(95) Paragraph 8 of document 8C/JUR/3 was likewise approved.

(96) Document 8C/JUR/3 was then adopted as a whole subject to the amendments previously agreed upon.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

# TWENTIETH MEETING

*30 November 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zeland)

**ITEM 9.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: LEGAL QUESTIONS**
(continued)

(1) Opening the meeting, the CHAIRMAN said that he had omitted that morning to thank the Chairman, Rapporteur and members of the Legal Committee for their extremely useful report. Before finally leaving the Rules of Procedure, he drew attention to the fact that paragraph 2 of Rule 86, concerning the procedure for voting on amendments, had given rise to a great many difficulties at sessions of the General Conference. The possibility of changing that Rule might be considered for the future.

(2) The Spanish delegation had submitted a draft resolution (document 8C/DR/90) containing a proposal that a two-thirds majority be made necessary for the adoption of amendments to the Financial Regulations. The Chairman proposed that the resolution be referred for advice to the Legal Committee.

(3) Agreed.

**ITEM 9.4.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONTRIBUTIONS: SCALE, CURRENCY AND COLLECTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER STATES (documents 8C/ADM/34 and 8C/DR/87)**
(continued)

(4) Introducing the final report of the Contributions Committee, Mr. BOW (Rapporteur of the Contributions Committee) explained that it was divided into three parts: (1) currency of contributions; (2) collection of contributions; and (3) draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Chile (document 8C/DR/87). On the first page, the only alteration in the resolution on the currency of contributions was the provision to meet the request of Switzerland to pay, at its choice, in United States dollars, pounds sterling or French francs. As far as collection of contributions was concerned, the Committee had noted a decided improvement in the payment both of contributions and of arrears. A list of contributions receivable from Member States at 26 November 1954 was annexed to the report.

(5) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom), seconded by Mr. WENK (Switzerland) and Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico), moved adoption of section 1 - Currency of contributions.

(6) Mr. STEPANEK (Czechoslovakia), referring to his delegation's negotiations with the Contributions Committee, said that it had disputed its obligation to pay in respect of 1953 and part of 1954 - during which time Czechoslovakia had been out of the Organization. He noted that the Committee had disregarded that in its report, even though in another instance it had reserved its decision pending legal decision. The Czechoslovak delegation wished the point to be noted.

(7) The CHAIRMAN observed that the matter raised by the delegate of Czechoslovakia concerned the Contributions Committee, but he assured him that the point would be noted.

(8) Section 1 was adopted.

2. Collection of Contributions

(9) Adopted.

3. Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegation of Chile (document 8C/DR/87)

(10) Adopted.

(11) The whole report was adopted.

(12) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Contributions Committee) wondered if the Commission wished to discuss the question whether or not to have a Contributions Committee at the ninth session of the General Conference. There was a suggestion that the work of the Contributions Committee might in future be taken over by the Executive Board.

(13) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) recalled a feeling expressed that the Executive Board should meet less often. If it took over the tasks of the Contributions Committee, it would probably not be possible for it to hold fewer sessions.

(14) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) pointed out that page 4 of the Annex to the Contributions Committee's Report showed Poland as owing a sum of $159,898 for 1954, whereas, according to his information, Poland had paid $160,000 as its contribution for that year.

(15) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) replied that it was true that the sum had been paid by the Polish Government, but, under the Financial Regulations still in force, the payment had to be credited first to the Working Capital Fund and then against the contribution next due, which, in the present case, was that due in respect of 1953.

(16) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) took note of the Comptroller's explanation, while reserving the right to comment on it later if it did not concur with the

arrangement made by the Contributions Committee.

(17) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Contributions Committee) had no definite recommendations to make on behalf of the Contributions Committee and did not know how much work the Executive Board had before it; but he was sure that the Committee, if so desired, would be very glad to serve again at the ninth session.

(18) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) had not consulted the Board on the subject, but, personally, believed that the Board, which would be able to study the question of contributions over a period of two years, would discharge the task far better than a committee set up at short notice during the General Conference.

(19) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom), seconded by several delegations, moved that the future of the Contributions Committee be referred to the Executive Board for consideration, particularly when it came to the task of making plans for the organization of work of the ninth session of the General Conference.

(20) The proposal was adopted.

(21) Mr. STERNBERGER (Chairman of the Contributions Committee) wished to make one final remark. Everyone had paid tribute to the work of the Contributions Committee, but it would not have been able to settle any of the matters submitted to it, had it not had the very skilful and efficient help of the Secretariat.

(22) The CHAIRMAN was sure that the Commission would wish to place on record its appreciation of the fine work done by the Contributions Committee.

**ITEM 9.5 OF REVISED AGENDA: STAFF QUESTIONS (continued)**

Legal guarantees to be provided nationally for the staff of the Secretariat (document 8C/DR/74)

(23) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) submitted the Italian delegation's draft recommendation to give the staff of the Secretariat legal guarantees in addition to those already examined in document 8C/ADM/11 (Personnel recruitment standards and methods). The General Conference had asked the Director-General, at its seventh session, if, in the interests of continuity and stability, he could build up a permanent cadre of Unesco officials, but there was a second class of officials not to be overlooked, who worked for only a few years at Unesco, and then returned to resume their careers in their home country. Mr. Pompei said he would not dwell on that document, as it had already been brought before the Commission by the representative of the Executive Board; he would merely draw attention to the advantages of the guarantees provided in the draft recommendation: the recruitment of candidates for non-permanent posts would be given wider scope and in that way candidates would reach a high enough standard to comply with the Director-General's recommendations as to competence and efficiency. The draft recommendation, if accepted, would make it less awkward to terminate the contracts of officials, by doing away with certain personal and human aspects. The element of security would have a favourable effect on the official during his engagement, comparable to that of a permanent contract. Mr. Pompei wanted to make it clear that all that the Italian delegation wanted at present was a recommendation to Member States, since it did not think the time was yet ripe to ask them to take any more binding step; all that could be done for the moment was to appeal to their moral sense. The position of such officials varied a good deal from one country to another, which might cause a certain amount of difficulty; it should be possible to overcome that problem by taking suitable administrative steps, without resorting to special legislation. All that Member States were being asked to do at present was to ensure that, when their nationals returned home after occupying a temporary post at Unesco, they obtained a position at least equal to that held before they joined Unesco. Mr. Pompei thought the question had already been studied by other Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. He personally had been called upon to deal with situations of the kind, and had obtained satisfaction for Italian officials; his task would have been much easier if there had been a recommendation of that kind in existence. He concluded by stressing the fact that the Italian delegation was merely bringing the problem to the notice of Member States.

(24) Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay) confirmed the remarks made on the previous day by his delegation, requesting Unesco to offer its officials long-term contracts for 5, 6 or 7 years. He thought it advisable for Member States to extend insurance and retirement provisions granted to national civil servants, to those of their nationality who discharged the functions of international officials. The Italian delegation's draft recommendation did not go so far as the legislation of Uruguay on that matter. All things needed time to mature. His delegation would support the Italian draft recommendation.

(25) While sympathizing with the point of view of the Italian delegation, Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) thought that the resolution would be more likely to produce the desired results if Member States were asked, not to guarantee certain conditions, but to go as far as they could in the matter. He therefore suggested the following redraft of the resolution:

"Member States which release their officials to take up employment with the Secretariat should make every effort to see that, at the end of their service with Unesco, those officials are restored to a position in the Government service equal or equivalent to the position they previously held, and that, if possible or relevant, their service with the Organization should count for the purposes of seniority. For the same purpose, Member States should encourage private institutions or establishments, where appropriate, to give similar assurances to their members."

(26) The above amendments were acceptable to Mr. POMPEI (Italy) and Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay).

(27) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) stated that the matter was one of considerable interest to his delegation, which was very much in favour of the Italian proposal. He was happy to say that the United Kingdom had never been unwilling to release personnel, but had always considered individual applications on their merits. The question was whether the aim of the Italian resolution was to voice an aspiration or to start effective action. It seemed to him that both the Italian resolution and the United States amendment merely voiced an aspiration and would not produce any considerable or far-reaching results. He therefore moved that:

"The Administrative Commission ask the Director-General to report to the General Conference at a future session on the practice of Member States of Unesco in sanctioning the secondment of civil servants, members of the staffs of universities and educational institutions to the United Nations and Specialized Agencies".

(28) When that information had been collected, the Conference would be in a better position to make recommendations to Member States.

(29) Mr. C.W. CARTER (Canada) moved that the advice of the Legal Committee be sought before the Commission took any decision on the draft resolution in document 8C/DR/74

(30) Mr. KELLY (Australia) seconded the Canadian motion.

(31) Mr. DE HOOG (Netherlands) wondered whether it was really necessary to refer the resolution to the Legal Committee; if it were adopted, its results would only be felt at national level, so that it did not appear necessary to bring it before an international committee. He was accordingly opposed to that suggestion.

(32) The motion to adjourn the debate on document 8C/DR/74 until the Legal Committee had reported on it was put to the vote and adopted by 17 votes to 13, with 9 abstentions.

Measures to be taken to provide an in-service training programme (document 8C/ADM/12)

(33) The CHAIRMAN explained that no action was demanded on the document.

(34) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to paragraph 8 of document 8C/ADM/12, proposed that staff members be helped to acquire or increase their proficiency in Russian as well as in English and French.

(35) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) suggested that the Soviet delegation's proposal be referred to the Secretariat committee referred to in paragraph 9, which had been set up to advise the Director-General on linguistic training.

(36) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) asked that the International Civil Service Advisory Board report, referred to in paragraph 2 of 8C/ADM/12, be made available to members of the Commission.

(37) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) replied that a limited number of copies of the report, in English and French, had been circulated to all delegations the preceding Friday (26 November).

(38) Document 8C/ADM/12 was received.

Report on salary adjustments for staff in the Principal Officer and Director and Professional categories (document 8C/ADM/13)

(39) At the proposal of Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) the report was adopted.

Personnel policy, obligations and rights of staff members: proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations (document 8C/ADM/14)

(40) Introducing document 8C/ADM/14, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to the resolution on the first page, adopted by the General Conference at its second extraordinary session in July 1953. It would be remembered that, at that session, there had been an extensive discussion of certain aspects of the Organization's personnel policy and the Conference had finally passed the aforesaid resolution.

(41) It was impossible at the present time for Unesco to follow the policy of the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies, for the simple reason that there was no identically common policy. He had therefore decided to follow, in general, the policy of the United Nations; the aim of most of the recommendations in document 8C/ADM/14, therefore, was to bring Unesco's regulations into line with those of the United Nations. In developing the proposals before the Commission, the Secretariat had watched developments in the United Nations, studied papers presented by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly, and kept in touch with the other Specialized Agencies. The Director-General had decided to march with the United Nations and not to respond to incidents, involving problems for the Organization, as they might occur. He emphasized that point, because the incidents which had occurred in connexion with a United States national bore no relation to the proposals in document 8C/ADM/14. Therefore, in the case of Unesco, as in the case of the United Nations, the statement of the Secretary-General in paragraph 3 on page 2 was a true one, namely: "My proposals .... are, however, based on considerations of a general nature, and they are in no way adjusted to special circumstances prevailing at a particular time or in relation to a particular country". There had been no special circumstances prevailing at the time when the Director-General had drafted his proposals and submitted them to the Executive Board.

(42) It was desirable to introduce the word "integrity" as that was contained in paragraph 4 of Article VI of the Constitution. It was also desirable to make explicit reference to "independence" and "impartiality" as being qualities required of international civil servants which found their counterpart in the obligation of Member States, under the Constitution, not

to interfere with the work of members of the Secretariat.
(43) Similarly, in Regulation 1.7, it was proposed to adopt the United Nations text.
(44) With regard to Regulation 9.1, it was proposed to keep the text in the right-hand column of paragraph 4 (c). That would be followed by sections 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.3 and 9.3.1, as explained in paragraph 8 on pages 5 and 6 of document 8C/ADM/14.
(45) The deletion of Regulation 4.2.1 was proposed as that provision did not exist in the regulations of the United Nations or other Specialized Agencies.
(46) In conclusion, the Director-General emphasized again that one of his objectives was to develop a staff which was competent, efficient, loyal, impartial in dealings with Member States and independent of pressures of Member States - a staff of men and women willing to subordinate themselves to the interests of the Organization. Such staff members, in the conduct of their official business, would always be able to count upon the strong protection of the Director-General. The argument had been advanced that he did not need to change the wording of the Staff Regulations, because he could act under paragraph 4 of Article VI of the Constitution, but he had construed the first sentence of that paragraph broadly to mean that all his powers, in dealing with the staff, derived from the Staff Regulations. In his view, therefore, it was necessary to amend them.

(47) Mr. BENDER (Executive Board) thought it superfluous to say that the Executive Board had always been extremely concerned with the well-being of the staff, and particularly with their morale, which conditioned their capacity to serve the Organization to the best of their ability. In its discussions on personnel policy, the Board had always heard comments from a representative of the Staff Association, and he believed it very important that such a representative should be allowed to put the views of the staff.
(48) The question was one of the utmost importance, because the success of Unesco depended to a large extent upon the morale of the staff, and upon their liberty as international civil servants. The Administrative Commission would have to decide whether the amendments to the Staff Regulations proposed by the Director-General were in accordance with the principle of liberty proclaimed in paragraph 5 of Article VI of the Constitution. The Executive Board itself had been sharply divided, so that Mr. Bender would merely draw the Commission's attention to the Board's comments in Annex II on page 16 of document 8C/ADM/14.

(49) The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission if it would allow a representative of the Staff Association to make a statement.

(50) Agreed.

(51) Mr. HENQUET (representing the Staff Association thanked the Chairman and the Commission for giving him that fresh opportunity to put the views of the staff and said that the comments which he wished to make on behalf of the Staff Association were outlined in Annex I to document 8C/ADM/14.
(52) He wanted it made clear that, although the staff had been deeply disturbed by the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations, its confidence in the Director-General himself remained unshaken. It fully appreciated the patient attention he had given to staff suggestions and grievances and his readiness to leave the staff free to state their point of view while giving his own personal opinion equally frankly.
(53) Mr. Henquet then retraced the basic principles called in question by the proposed amendments, referring in turn to the general conditions governing an international civil service, the legal aspect of such a service and the historical background to the proposals now being submitted. The basic principle was that of the absolute independence of international civil servants; that had been formally upheld on many occasions and was embodied in Article 100 of the Charter and Article VI of the Unesco Constitution. As it currently stood, from an administrative standpoint, the Secretariat was in fact a genuine international civil service manned by a team of officials with a stable structure, working for the furtherance of the common good, and independent of any one country.
(54) The second principle was that of security of tenure; the international civil service must be based on the idea of a career, and a career in its turn on permanent employment; that principle of security and stability of tenure had been officially recognized ever since the report prepared by the experts of ILO and the League of Nations had appeared. Mr. Henquet pointed out that, whereas successive staff difficulties encountered by the League of Nations had been due to the lack of a sufficiently well developed international spirit, United Nations difficulties and those which threatened Unesco were due to national loyalties.
(55) The Staff Regulations had arisen from the need to guarantee the principles outlined above, and to ensure that they would be effectively carried out. Mr. Henquet recapitulated the history of the idea of such regulations, pointing out that the body of the regulations in its way constituted the common law of international administration, and he added that, while not wishing it to be regarded as unchangeable, the Staff Association was agreed that amendments must be based solely on the needs of the particular international organization in question, and should take due account of its nature, composition and structure. Unesco's Staff Regulations could not be amended simply because those of the United Nations had been changed; guarantees and obligations, where officials were concerned, could not be altered without good reason, and some assurance was needed that the reasons which were valid in New York also held good in Paris, and that did not appear to be the case. Mr. Henquet made it clear that in the case in point the Staff Association thought it doubtful whether the proposed amendments really were based on permanent considerations, and felt that there was every reason to believe that events in New York had played a dominant rôle in their preparation. That was a direct outcome of the crisis suffered by the international civil service, and he thought a brief historical outline was called for. He referred to the proposals put forward by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which were the basis of the present proposals, pointing out that one of the

reasons given for proposing the amendments was that the term "integrity" was covered neither by that of "unsatisfactory service" nor by that of "misconduct", so that the lack of integrity would not in itself constitute ground for dismissal, particularly as interpreted by the Administrative Tribunal. In order to demonstrate that the measures in question were dictated by special circumstances which obtained in a given country at a given time, Mr. Henquet reminded the Commission that twenty-one officials had been dismissed, in most cases because they refused to answer questions put to them by an Investigation Board or Parliamentary sub-Committee in their own country.

(56) On a point of order, Mr. KELLY (Australia) thought that the representative of the Staff Association should be asked to confine his remarks strictly to matters before the Commission and not to go into questions of concern only to Member States.

(57) The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the Staff Association to bear the point in mind.

(58) Mr. HENQUET explained that he had no intention of dealing with the question of relations between international civil servants and their own countries, but merely wished to draw the Commission's attention to the position of international civil servants vis-à-vis the Organization to which they belonged in the light of the duties which devolved upon them and guarantees granted to them by the Staff Regulations. He had felt compelled to refer to the position of the New York civil servants, because the proposed amendments were almost identical with those introduced into the United Nations Staff Regulations as a result of the fifth General Assembly.

(59) Mr. Henquet then proceeded to analyse the Director-General's proposals, reminding the Commission that the grounds for dismissal which the Director-General could invoke under the Staff Regulations were the following: abolition of the post, staff reductions, unsatisfactory service, ill-health, serious misconduct - all of which were traditional in the administrative laws of civilized countries. The Staff Regulations in that way circumscribed the Director-General's discretionary powers and in that restriction lay officials' most precious guarantee of independence and security.

(60) The proposed amendments set out in document 8C/ADM/14 were designed to supplement those recognized grounds by adding others of which subjectivity was the keynote, thereby adding considerably to the Director-General's discretionary powers. While there remained the possibility of appeal, that increase in discretionary powers reduced the value of such checks as existed.

(61) The proposed amendments covered standards of integrity, political activity, and an extension in the Director-General's discretionary powers. The first item, integrity, occurred in both the Charter and the Constitution, and in the eyes of the Staff Association there could be no serious objection to incorporating it in the Staff Regulations, if it were understood in a precise and generally recognized sense; taking the term in the sense of incorruptibility, dignity, professional conscience, there could be no objection to including it in the rules of conduct or recruitment standards for the Secretariat. Unhappily, experience of the United Nations proved that there was a close connexion between, and an inevitable overlapping of, the concept of integrity and that of loyalty, and it had been all the more difficult to define the concept since it had to be construed in such a way as to cover the special position of the international civil servant. Mr. Henquet recalled that the Executive Board had advised the Conference not to insert that expression in the Staff Regulations without a precise definition - and that had not been given. The Director-General was proposing to insert the term "integrity" in Regulation 1.4 (rules of conduct) and in Regulation 9.1 (reasons for termination of appointment). The reasons for that were quite clear. Above all, it was, as in the United Nations, a way of avoiding conflict between the administrative and the legal points of view. The boundary line between administrative considerations on the one hand and those of a strictly legal nature on the other was very vague and only thinly veiled its object: that of encroaching openly on the jurisdiction of the administrative authorities and making room, in the relations between the Organization and its officials, for a special preserve, within which the administration would enjoy discretionary powers. The Staff Association was very much disturbed by those proposals, which might well have a serious effect on staff morale, and it hoped that the Conference would reject them or at least give an exact definition of the word "integrity".

(62) Mr. Henquet then drew attention to the proposal to amend Regulation 1.7, prohibiting any political action, other than voting, which might reflect upon the independence and impartiality required of members of the Secretariat. That amendment was worded in far more general terms than the text at present in force and would not fail to raise a delicate problem of interpretation. Mr. Henquet recalled that the Executive Board had advised the Conference to adopt the amendment only if a suitable definition were given of the words "political activity". While it considered that the present wording of Regulation 1.7, interpreted in the light of Regulation 1.4, would suffice to safeguard the Organization's interests, the Staff Association hoped that, if the Conference saw fit to alter the text, it would take into account the recommendations of the Executive Board or of the Advisory Council on Personnel Policies, which suggested a narrower definition.

(63) Mr. Henquet pointed out that the body of the amendments proposed would result in a considerable increase in the Director-General's discretionary powers, since in addition to the accepted grounds for dismissal he asked the Conference to recognize his right to dismiss officials on the grounds of: (a) lack of integrity; (b) facts anterior to the appointment of a staff member and relevant to his suitability which would have precluded his appointment; (c) the interests of the good administration of the Organization. The Staff Association maintained that the reasons at present embodied in the Staff Regulations were such as to enable the Director-General to encompass the objects laid down in the Constitution while guaranteeing the independence and security of officials. It held that the proposed amendments were dangerous to the Director-General himself, who could not, after

all, always be in a position to resist outside pressure. With regard to the criterion of integrity, what had already been said on that subject was seen to be all the more to the point since the reasons for termination of appointment, even more than the rules of conduct, should be stated with precision and objectivity. The criterion of facts anterior to the appointment was, he submitted, unacceptable because of its subjectivity and because it bore the seed of general insecurity. Mr. Henquet accordingly pointed out that the Executive Board had advised the Conference not to adopt that text. With regard to the clause dealing with the good administration of the Organization, that proposal had resulted from the compromise reached during discussions held by the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations; that text, taken in conjunction with the Director-General's right to increase by 50% the amount of the termination indemnity payable (Regulation 9.3.1), looked very much like bargaining or at least an arrangement very different indeed from the traditionally accepted usage of public law and, in that case again, the Staff Association hoped that the General Conference would adopt the recommendation of the Executive Board to reject the proposal.

(64) Mr. Henquet then went into the motives behind the draft amendments, the aim of which, he said, was quite clear: what the promoters of those proposals had in mind was to make possible the dismissal of three officials whose loyalty to the Government of a Member State had been called in question; the fixed contracts of four civil servants had already terminated and had not been renewed for the same reasons, and the proposed reforms obviously aimed at increasing the powers of the Director-General, and at enabling him to dismiss permanent officials. Mr. Henquet hastened to assert that the Staff Association had no desire to take sides in a question of the relations of civil servants with the Government of their own country, and that all it wished to do was to maintain certain principles regarding the attitude of the authorities towards its officials.

(65) The recent decision of the Appeals Board on the non-renewal of the contracts of the four officials referred to was extremely interesting in that connexion. The Appeals Board had seen fit to enquire into the validity of the grounds for the Director-General's decision: in the case in point, to decide whether the fact of refusing to appear before an Investigating Committee of a political kind did or did not constitute a lack of integrity.

(66) The Board had decided that the refusal to appear did not in itself constitute a lack of integrity, and that, to preserve that integrity intact, those officials had no need to account to an Investigating Committee for acts of which they had not been given precise details. It had likewise considered that there was no proof that their refusal to appear had been contrary to the interests of the Organization, or incompatible with a desire to serve such interests.

(67) It had concluded, therefore, that the Director-General was not justified in refusing to renew the contracts of the officials concerned.

(68) If the Director-General did not adopt the recommendations of the Appeals Board, he would probably soon find himself condemned by the Administrative Tribunal to pay an indemnity to the staff members whose contracts had not been renewed. The same would apply a fortiori, were three permanent officials to be dismissed for the same reasons.

(69) It was not for the Staff Association to say whether such decisions, which had caused irreparable damage to the careers of seven officials of unquestioned competence and experience, were likely to uphold the prestige and serve the long-term interests of Unesco.

(70) Finally, Mr. Henquet wished to state that, in the view of the Staff Association, the present wording of the Staff Regulations was satisfactory, and that it would be well to call to mind, before altering it, that the changes in the United Nations Staff Regulations were provisional, and were to be reviewed at the United Nations General Assembly in 1955; he also pointed out that the attitude of the other Specialized Agencies such as WHO and ILO should not be overlooked, and that they had not seen fit to alter their regulations, even though they too, like Unesco, had been obliged to reconsider their basic texts in the light of those in force at the United Nations. If it were resolved to modify the Regulations at all costs, the Staff Association considered that due consideration must be given to the recommendations of the Executive Board.

(71) The Staff Association offered its comments to the Administrative Commission, in the belief that it was true to the underlying principles of a genuine internationalism, which must combine international loyalty with the national attachments of every international civil servant. A truly international spirit could not be created with words; it called for the harmonization of an international outlook with the traditional idea of nationalism - a harmonization which obviously became more difficult at times of ideological conflict; and that was why the creation of a suitable psychological climate was so important. It was in that spirit that the Staff Association had presented its views.

(72) The CHAIRMAN asked members of the Commission if they would approve the following procedure: (1) that there should be a general discussion on document 8C/ADM/14; (2) that the Chairman should refuse to accept any resolution or amendment relating to individual rules; (3) that he should not give priority to any member giving notice of a motion after the close of the general debate.

(73) The above procedure was approved.

(74) Mr. BROWNELL (United States of America) stated that, in the view of his delegation, the issue under discussion was of very great importance and far more fundamental than it might appear: the future of the entire Organization was at stake, and it was a matter of grave concern to his Government and country. The problem, however, transcended one country or group of countries and its solution would require real statesmanship.

(75) No organization could rise above the level of its secretariat, so that the quality of Unesco's staff members must be of the highest, or the confidence of all those who supported the Organization would be shaken or destroyed. The founders of the post-war international organizations had been fully aware of

the problem, as was evident from that fact that they had conferred special privileges and immunities upon their secretariats, at the same time calling for staff members conforming to the highest standards of integrity, efficiency and technical competence. Acting under their Charters and Constitutions, all those organizations had established staff regulations, setting forth in greater detail those privileges and immunities and squarely placing upon the executive heads the responsibility of maintaining the high standards required. Unesco's Staff Regulations had closely followed those of the United Nations, until the latter were amended in 1953. But those amendments were not designed to change the exacting standards for international civil servants, but merely to amplify those standards. Different interpretations of the original regulations had led to disputes between the Secretary-General and the Administrative Tribunal, and the regulations had therefore been amended to prevent further conflicts and clarify the original intent. While the United States Government had contested the Administrative Tribunal's interpretation of the regulations, it had supported those clarifications in order to dispel future doubts regarding the power of the Secretary-General.

(76) Now similar amendments to Unesco's Staff Regulations had been proposed, and the United States delegation could support them. On the other hand, the United States delegation continued to maintain that the amendments were not necessary to the discharge by the Director-General of his responsibility. As far as dealings with his staff were concerned, the powers he needed were inherent and explicit in the Constitution. The United States delegation was convinced that no adjustment or amendments to the Staff Regulations would ensure the maintenance of the highest standards of integrity, efficiency and technical competence required of international civil servants, unless, in the first place, the meaning of those standards was clear and, in the second, the Director-General was ready to enforce them. As far as the meaning of those standards was concerned, it was true that they did not lend themselves to strict legal definitions, and the executive head would have to use his best judgment in dealing with inefficiency or lack of competence. "Integrity" was even more difficult to define, but that was not a reason for discarding it. Perhaps the best definition, although not a strictly legal one, was to be found in paragraph 4 of the International Civil Service Advisory Board's Report on Standards of Conduct in the International Civil Service (document COORD/CIVIL SERVICE/5 - 1954). The same report contained many other passages, such as paragraph 20, designed to define integrity. All the standards laid down in the Report were explicit and should be upheld, or created if they did not exist. The confidence of Member States, and thence the very existence of Unesco, were at stake. If the standards were disregarded or their interpretation narrowed down, the Secretariat of Unesco would be turned into a self-serving institution, a refuge for misfits and dissidents, and that would be unfair to the Organization and particularly to the large number of staff members who were faithful, hard-working and frequently inspired individuals, doing their utmost to serve the best interests of Unesco and putting those interests above their own.

(77) The task of enforcing those high standards was incumbent upon the executive head of each organization and he could not shift that responsibility to any other body or find comfort in legal definitions and interpretations. There would always be a need for enlightened judgment on the part of the executive heads. They required sound judgment, tact, a keen grasp of the need to maintain the confidence of Member States, a courage which did not shrink from difficult decisions, and the will to act at all times in the best interests of the organizations of which they were the guardians. Appeals machinery existed to safeguard the individual against arbitrary decisions, but it should not paralyse executive action when the interests of the organization required such action.

(78) In conclusion, the delegate of the United States of America was convinced that, if all were clear on the points he had mentioned, a solution could be found. His delegation, for one, was perfectly willing to continue the discussions until a meeting of minds on the fundamentals of the situation had been achieved.

(79) Mr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) said that discussion turned upon the rights and duties of Unesco officials. He trusted everyone would agree that the citizen of a given country should not be deprived of human rights merely because he had become an international official. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights allowed those rights to all men. It was sometimes suggested that an official lost all rights except those granted to him by the statutes under which he worked. The speaker did not accept that postulate. On the contrary he upheld the rights of the individual, and maintained that an official could not, by reason of his office alone, lose the rights that were common to all mankind. Such rights must be harmonized with the duties his office imposed on him. When Minister of the Interior, the speaker had issued a decree recognizing the basic human rights of civil servants. Exceptions might arise when the exercise of such rights went against the rights of an official's function. For instance, in the matter of his right to free expression in public, in the press or over the air, an official bore a responsibility towards his function. He could not be false to the duties of his office. For instance, he could not publish any fact that had come to his knowledge through his acquaintance with secret documents. A publication of that kind would be the equivalent of stealing documents that did not belong to him as a private individual. The official was a servant of the public, and ought therefore to be scrupulously honest, able, industrious and loyal. Officials of Unesco were bound to fulfil such obligations. The delegate of the United States of America had attempted to interpret the concept of integrity. He himself would define it as "moral rectitude" governing not only an official's exercise of his functions, but also his private life. On the other hand, impartiality should not be carried too far, it was not desirable to turn an international official into a spiritual eunuch. The question was to harmonize individual rights with the duties and obligations of office.

The meeting rose at 7 p. m.

# TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.5.4.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: PERSONNEL POLICY, OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS OF STAFF MEMBERS: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE STAFF REGULATIONS (document 8C/ADM/14) (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to pursue the general discussion of the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations as contained in document 8C/ADM/14.

(2) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) stated that his delegation was ready to support the Director-General's proposals for amendments to the Staff Regulations, and based its attitude on contractual agreements which had been in force for a considerable time and made it incumbent on Unesco to bring its Staff Regulations into line with those of the United Nations. In that connexion, he referred to Article XIII of the Agreement between the United Nations and Unesco dealing with Personnel Arrangements, paragraph 1 of which read:

"The United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization recognize that the eventual development of a single unified international civil service is desirable from the standpoint of effective administrative co-ordination, and with this end in view agree to develop common personnel standards, methods and arrangements designed to avoid serious discrepancies in terms and conditions of employment, to avoid competition in recruitment of personnel, and to facilitate interchange of personnel in order to obtain the maximum benefit from their services".

(3) Under paragraph 2 (b) of the same Article, the two Organizations agreed to:

"Consult together concerning other matters relating to the employment of their officers and staff, including conditions of service, duration of appointments, classification, salary scales and allowances, retirement and pension rights and staff regulations and rules with a view to securing as much uniformity in these matters as shall be found practicable".

(4) Mr. Haguiwara further pointed out that the Agreement which he had just quoted had been based on the provisions of the Constitution itself, more particularly on the following passage in Article X:

"This Organization shall be brought into relation with the United Nations Organization as soon as practicable, as one of the Specialized Agencies referred to in Article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations. This relationship shall be effected through an agreement with the United Nations Organization under Article 63 of the Charter".

(5) Mr. Haguiwara repeated that it was in order to carry out the spirit of those different texts that the Japanese delegation would support the amendments to the Staff Regulations proposed by the Director-General in document 8C/ADM/14.

(6) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) regretted the unavoidability of discussing such matters as the one before the Commission. His delegation was somewhat concerned at the periodical appearance of such professional questions on the agenda, since it was not indicative of good health in the Organization.

(7) It was also his belief that there was no need, under the resolution of the General Conference, to revise the Staff Regulations, but merely to submit a report.

(8) With regard to the recasting of the Unesco Staff Regulations, he attached particular importance to the principle of the singularity of the Organization, which, he thought, should be reflected in its Staff Regulations. There were certainly a number of points in common between Unesco, the United Nations, and the other Specialized Agencies and it was important to be informed about developments there. But Unesco should not be bound by what had happened or might happen in those Organizations.

(9) The Staff Regulations should reflect the fact that political considerations were of less importance than in certain other organizations; they should also to a certain extent reflect the background of the host country of the Organization; they should recognize the essential responsibility of the Director-General and ensure that the life of the staff members was conceived in generous and liberal terms in keeping with the spiritual ideals of the Organization.

(10) Mr. KAVALEVSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) wished to know if there had been any conflict between the Director-General and members of the staff which, under the existing Staff Regulations, the Director-General had not been able to settle in accordance with the interests of the Organization as a whole.

(11) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the development of the proposals to amend the Staff Regulations had taken place over a period of several months independently of any specific cases awaiting solution, and to which the proposals referred. After the elaboration of the proposals and almost simultaneously with the issuing of the document under consideration, three cases had arisen which he had been unable to solve under the existing Staff Regulations. The members of the staff involved were still employed, although he thought they should no longer be employed, and he wished in that connexion to

obtain the necessary authority to terminate their contracts.

(12) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to reiterate the views of his delegation on two important points.
(13) He was firmly opposed to the exclusion from the Staff Regulations of Regulation 4.2.1, which instructed the Director-General to take the necessary steps to ensure that no persons who had discredited themselves by their activities or connexion with Fascism, Nazism, or militarist aggression, were appointed to the Secretariat. That provision was in keeping with the Constitution of the Organization and would contribute greatly to achieving maximum co-operation between all the countries concerned in the development of education, science and culture. It was inconceivable that the Organization, which had been set up following victory over the forces of Fascism, Nazism and aggression, should now accept representatives of those evil tendencies. His delegation would never accept such a decision, and he felt convinced that his views were shared by others. It was not sufficient to say that the provision in question was no longer to be found in the statutes of other international organizations; the main consideration to be taken into account was the attitude of the peoples whose representatives were present and who would never admit the partisans of Nazism, Fascism and aggression into Unesco.
(14) The Soviet delegation also saw no reason for increasing the powers of the Director-General, especially as the Staff Regulations in their present form had never prevented him from discharging his duties in the interests of the Organization. The three cases the Director-General had mentioned were individual cases which did not need to be taken into account from the point of view of enlarging his terms of reference.

(15) Mrs. KOCH (Denmark) agreed that the fundamental principle of freedom was involved, but thought it would be difficult to embody it in any one paragraph. Putting aside the detailed consideration of individual paragraphs, the Danish representative thought that the Staff Regulations were satisfactory in so far as they gave the Director-General sufficient authority to ensure the effective working of the Secretariat, and should therefore be retained without modification.She agreed also that the matter was of such importance that the future of the Organization depended on the decision that might be taken. It was dangerous, however, to accept the standards of any one of the Member States in order to base upon them the regulations of the Organization. It was the responsibility of the Director-General to settle staff matters and, even if it were not always possible to agree with him on individual points, the Organization had to respect the authority it had vested in him. She therefore proposed that the Staff Regulations be retained in their present form and any revision of those Regulations be postponed until the next General Conference in two years time.

(16) Mr. KAVALEVSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation was deeply concerned with the question of the Staff Regulations. The Staff Regulations depended not on the composition of the Secretariat, but on the spirit within the Secretariat. Any broadening of the powers of the Director-General would, in fact, increase the powers of a certain number of people, while what was needed was more authority for the Organization as a whole. His delegation would oppose any change in the Staff Regulations.
(17) His delegation would also oppose any proposal to omit Staff Regulation 4.2.1. His country had had proof enough during the last war of the terrible dangers of Fascism, Nazism and the horrors of military aggression. He would only add to the arguments already put forward by the representative of the USSR, that a decision to admit to the Organization persons advocating Fascism, Nazism or military aggression, would strike a fatal blow at the prestige of Unesco.

(18) Mr. TAMAS (Hungary) said that possibly some delegations did not attach much importance to the problem involved in the revision of Regulation 4.2.1 of the Staff Regulations, because it was obvious that the Director-General would not engage persons with Fascist or Nazi antecedents, or in anyway committed to military aggression. The Hungarian delegation however considered the matter to be of the greatest importance. Anything which had a bearing on Fascism, Nazism or military aggression should be taken very seriously. Hungary had suffered greatly from the Nazis; Budapest had been almost entirely destroyed. Ten years had not removed the traces of that destruction. If the Regulation under discussion were suppressed, it would mean that from then on it would be possible to engage staff who were connected with such ideologies and codes of behaviour. There should be no mistake about so vital a question.

(19) Mr. WIECHECKI (Poland) stated that his delegation was opposed to the deletion of Regulation 4.2.1, which was designed to debar from Unesco any persons who had discredited themselves by their connexion with Fascism, Nazism, or military aggression. The Regulation was not based on political considerations, but solely on the desire to safeguard humanity and culture. To delete it would be contrary to the very spirit of the Constitution, which explicitly stated that "the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races".
(20) The Polish delegation had accordingly decided to concur in the recommendations of the Executive Board and to vote against the deletion of Regulation 4.2.1.

(21) Mr. TVETERAS(Norway) said that the questions of staff policy in the United Nations and Unesco had caused some concern in Norway. In his country it was established that civil servants were entitled to enjoy all human rights as well as freedom of conscience. However, in view of the very different social and economic structures of the Member States, it was clearly difficult to know to what extent the freedom of the national of a country was compatible

with that of an international civil servant. If the primary aim of an international organization was effective administration, special claims would have to be made on the international civil servant. There was no need for the Staff Regulations of Unesco to be an exact copy of those adopted in the United Nations, but there were good reasons why they should be as close to the latter as possible. On the whole the Director-General had established a good balance between the effective functioning of the Organization and the fundamental rights of staff members. If staff members needed to be guaranteed maximum protection, it was also necessary for the Director-General to know if he trusted the staff. The delegation of Norway would therefore, subject to a few reservations on the lines of those made by the Executive Board, vote in favour of the proposals before the Commission.

(22) Mr. VAN SUCHTELEN (Netherlands) thought that Regulation 4.2.1 ought to be maintained in its present form. The Netherlands delegation and authorities recognized the right of each people to choose the government or regime it considered most appropriate to its national character. He considered that the time had not yet come for Unesco to admit staff with antecedents that could be included in the terms of the Regulation in question. Countries that had not directly suffered from the last war might not be able to understand that. The suppression of the Regulation might be acceptable in theory, but under present circumstances it was not yet possible to carry it out.

(23) Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that Australia in principle agreed with the proposals advanced by the Director-General, on the grounds that the highest standards of integrity, competence and efficiency should be observed by members of the staff of the Secretariat and that uniformly high standards should obtain in the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies.
(24) In the course of discussion too much emphasis had, he felt, been placed on the political autonomy of members of the staff and too little on their responsibilities to the Organization. It had to be remembered that a decision to accept responsible employment, whether in a trade union, a private corporation, a government department or an international body, not infrequently involved, on the part of the person concerned, a decision to forgo the public exercise of some of his political rights. The free acceptance of such employment involved the free renunciation of certain forms of political activity. That social fact gave rise to a principle of conduct, applicable in Unesco - the principle that no member of the staff should engage in political activity of a nature such that it tended to undermine the very character of Unesco. If members of the staff felt bound in conscience to engage in forms of political activity inconsistent with the circumstances of their employment as servants of an organization of Member States, those members of the staff were free to resign their employment.
(25) While the concept of integrity was a lucid concept and laid down a fundamental principle of conduct, it was clearly neither possible nor desirable to give such a concept or principle precise definition. It was for the staff to work in the light of that concept and for the Director-General to take action when he found members of the staff lacking in integrity. It was the speaker's impression that the Staff Association had failed to see all the implications of integrity. The suggestion by the Staff Association that the adoption of the Director-General's recommendations "might well have an effect on staff morale" was, he felt, an attempt to intimidate the Commission and was not an expression of the principle of integrity.
(26) His delegation was in favour of the proposal to amend the Staff Regulations.

(27) Mr. STAHL (Sweden) thought that many of the difficulties connected with staff matters might have been avoided if the actions of the parties involved had been guided by clearer principles. The greatest care should be exercised in dealing with such matters, particularly as regarded the distinction to be made between the national of a country as such, and the international civil servant.
(28) There had not been time for the international organizations to establish their own traditions of justice. No one Member State should impose its own criteria in that respect, but all should contribute to establishing the tradition. That would take time and patience. In the meantime, a modus vivendi was needed.
(29) Although some of the arguments against adopting the staff regulations of the United Nations were for the time being valid, the modus vivendi would nevertheless eventually have to be based on uniform regulations for all international organizations. It was illogical for regulations to vary in accordance with geographical location or membership.
(30) The modus vivendi would have to be based on a proper balance between the duties of the Director-General with regard to the effective working of the Organization, on the one hand, and the security of the staff members, on the other.
(31) The principle should also be adopted that the head of the organization was responsible for its work and should be in a position to select his collaborators in accordance with the staff regulations or, in certain cases, with the interpretation given to those regulations by the Appeals Board or the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization.
(32) Such restrictions and guarantees were adequate and the Swedish delegation was therefore, in principle, prepared, subject to minor reservations, to support the amendments proposed by the Director-General.

(33) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) stated that in many respects he shared the views expressed on the previous day by the United States delegate. He questioned whether the majority of the amendments proposed in document 8C/ADM/14 would make very much difference to the present state of affairs, either by lightening the task of the Director-General, or by lessening his responsibilities in staff questions. It would still lie with the Director-General to decide whether or not an official's conduct was such as to endanger the basic principles of the Organization and, where necessary, to take whatever disciplinary measures appeared to be called for. It still remained

open to the official in question to take his case to the Appeals Board and the ILO Administrative Tribunal, and those bodies would continue to base their decisions on an examination of the facts. The introduction of a notion such as that of integrity would therefore, in Mr. Ammoun's view, merely complicate the task of those Boards unnecessarily.
(34) Mr. Ammoun was anxious to pay tribute to the frankness with which the Director-General had explained exactly why he wished to terminate the contracts of the three officials whose cases had been brought to the notice of the Appeals Board. If he had not gone into those reasons, said Mr. Ammoun, the Director-General could have by-passed the Appeals Board altogether; his present attitude seemed therefore most praiseworthy.
(35) Mr. Ammoun further indicated that the Lebanese delegation did not agree with the proposals submitted by the Director-General regarding the deletion of Regulation 4.2.1, or with the text given on page 6 and suggested as a new Regulation 9.3.1.
(36) While he thought that the insertion of provisions such as 4.2.1 might have been dispensed with from the start, the Lebanese delegate took the view that, in the present circumstances, the cause of peace would best be served by the deletion of that regulation.
(37) As regarded 9.3.1, the aim of that regulation was to empower the Director-General to pay an increased indemnity to any staff member whose appointment he wished to terminate, without the disgrace of a cancelled contract or disciplinary measures. However, the publicity such a provision would entail, if included in the Staff Regulations, would inevitably defeat its purpose. A staff member who had been dismissed in the circumstances outlined above would be no more free from suspicion than if he had had his contract cancelled or been subjected to disciplinary measures.
(38) Mr. Ammoun concluded by stressing the difficulty of giving a precise definition of the term "integrity", and the danger of proceedings which might well result from the ill-considered use of such an indefinite criterion.

(39) Mr. RIAÑO JAUMA (Cuba) said that the Director-General had pointed out in document 8C/ADM/14 that the Staff Regulations of the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies contained no regulation covering the provisions of Regulation 4.2.1, the suppression of which was under discussion. That was an important consideration. The Cuban delegation believed that the measure had been a salutory one, but that Regulation 4.2, which also dealt with the matter, would suffice at that stage to settle whether or not an official might be employed in the Secretariat.
(40) The remarks made by the delegates of Hungary and Poland might be taken into account, but his delegation would support the suggestions set forth by the Director-General in his document, which deserved thorough consideration, as they were aimed at rising above a policy of prejudice, tension and cold war, which was contrary to the basic ideals of Unesco.
(41) The development of an Organization existing to foster peace and culture should not be hindered by political considerations. The Director-General should be supported in the matter, and the Cuban delegation was prepared to second his proposal to suppress the Regulation. The idea of classification on a moral or ideological basis for the selection of required staff was not only difficult; it was impossible. The selection could be made easier, without prejudice to Unesco. The Administrative Commission should study the question in the light of new ideas and in a liberal spirit.
(42) The Cuban delegation considered that the Director-General ought to be empowered to eliminate any legal difficulty that arose in the carrying out of his functions. In its early stages Unesco had tried to avoid employing anyone who might be labelled a Nazi. That policy had been the right one at the time, since Nazism had aroused the hatred of the whole free world, but it was no longer justified.
(43) The words of José Marti, the Apostle of Cuba, famed in Uruguay for having, as a great American, served that country well at the time of its financial reorganization, should be remembered in these crucial days of world division; they should indeed become a golden rule for Unesco: "With all and for the good of all". That should be Unesco's motto, the motto of an organization that through the co-operation of men was working for human welfare.

(44) MR. HUZAYIN (Egypt) did not think the proposals involved a new principle, but were rather an amplification of what was already contained in the Constitution and the Staff Regulations.
(45) The Director-General had spoken of integrity, but he had added two further important criteria: independence and impartiality, for which there was much need. He had furthermore shown a spirit of great toleration, without which the representative of the Staff Association would not have been able to make known his views in the way in which he had done. In that spirit of impartiality it would be possible to reconcile the rights of staff members with their duties.
(46) It was right that staff members should be entitled to freedom of convictions, but the same hardly applied where action was concerned, since, if all were free to take what action they pleased, the Director-General would be unable to ensure the effective work of the Organization. In order to obtain harmony of action the Director-General needed a set of regulations upon which to act. The Commission could examine those regulations in detail, but at the present stage the Organization needed a spirit of moderation coupled with a will to act. In that respect he disagreed with the representative of Denmark, who had proposed to defer consideration of the Staff Regulations to the next General Conference; that would only render more embarrassing the situation in which the Director-General, his staff and the Member States might find themselves. The Commission should agree to share the responsibility of the Director-General and not shrink from considering the proposals he had placed before it.

(47) Dr. MUDALIAR (India) appreciated the work the Director-General had accomplished in the interests of the Organization and commended his frankness and the freedom he had given the Staff Association to express its views.
(48) With regard to integrity, he agreed that it was

difficult to give a precise definition of the term, although an attempt to do so had been made in the Report on Standards of Conduct in the International Civil Service. More important than the work, however, were the conventions that grew up around it.
(49) He disagreed with one point made by the representative of the Staff Association. While all persons were entitled to enjoy fundamental human rights and freedom of conscience, it was not so in the case of freedom of speech, which could vary in accordance with the importance of the post occupied by the person in question.
(50) He also believed that the political rights of the international civil servant should be restricted.
(51) With regard to Staff Regulation 4.2.1, his delegation, while representing a country which had not been as closely affected by the last war as the countries of Europe, nevertheless agreed with the representative of the Netherlands that the regulation in question should be retained, and the matter given further consideration.
(52) Finally, the question of the revision of Staff Regulations was one which required maximum agreement, whereas the Executive Board had been unable to accept a number of the proposals made. In view of that fact, he was inclined to support the establishment of a small group to discuss the amendments to the Staff Regulations with a view to furthering the fundamental objectives of the Organization.

(53) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) supported the suppression of Regulation 4.2.1. The Philippines had suffered a great deal in the last war, but it should not be forgotten that men and women were subject to error but did not necessarily remain in error: they could repent and, if they did, Unesco might admit them to its staff, despite their regrettable antecedents. In such cases the question of integrity and impartiality should also be taken into account. If, in the opinion of the Director-General, an applicant had changed his views, he should be free to engage that applicant, provided the requirements in respect of those qualities were fulfilled. Naturally, those who continued in their past errors should be excluded.

(54) Mr. DUDNIK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) agreed that the staff of Unesco should be trusted by all the Member States. They could acquire that trust by their efforts to further the ideals and aims of the Organization. However, people who had been discredited by their activities in connexion with Fascism, Nazism or militarist aggression could only expect contempt, and the Organization should ensure that they had no access to it. He had been astonished to hear the proposal of the representative of the Philippines to delete Staff Regulation 4.2.1, and stated that his delegation would support the decision of the Executive Board and all those delegations which insisted on Regulation 4.2.1 being retained as it stood.

(55) Mr. HAYEK (Czechoslovakia) stated that the Czechoslovak delegation saw no need for the amendments to the Staff Regulations proposed in document 8C/ADM/14. Many of the delegates who had spoken in favour of those amendments had advanced one argument only: in their submission, Unesco was obliged to co-ordinate its actions with those of the United Nations. The Czechoslovak delegation was by no means convinced of the validity of that argument. The amendments introduced by the United Nations in its Staff Regulations were too recent for their results to be assessed, and it would in any case be impossible for Unesco to follow the same path without incurring very serious criticisms from its Staff Association. In Mr. Hayek's opinion, Unesco was under no obligation to follow the lead of the United Nations so closely. What really mattered was to secure for Unesco the services of a competent staff whose members would combine devotion to the cause of humanity with adherence to the countries of their origin in a way that could not fail to benefit the Organization. The various provisions of the Staff Regulations should be fashioned to that end. It was very important to make them sufficiently stable and precise and Mr. Hayek thought that some of the proposed amendments were at variance with that requirement. He cited as an instance the proposed revision of Regulation 1.7.
(56) Mr. Hayek then emphasized that the Czechoslovak delegation could on no account accept the deletion of Regulation 4.2.1. It should not be thought that that Regulation owed its existence to political motives, or to a desire for discrimination or for revenge. It was merely a very natural precaution designed to debar from Unesco those who had collaborated with the criminals sentenced at Nuremberg. Contrary to the assertions of certain delegates, it was by deleting, not by retaining, that provision, that the atmosphere of international co-operation which had hitherto reigned at the General Conference was most likely to be clouded. Mr. Hayek accordingly called on all those delegates who had declared themselves in favour of that deletion to think again.

(57) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) had two preliminary remarks to make before discussing the substance of the proposed amendments.
(58) He wished first of all to stress the fact that, as stated by the Director-General, the new arrangements had not been worked out as a solution to problems arising out of certain recent events. It might be that they inevitably called to mind certain concrete cases, but, even so, they were in fact designed to be applied permanently and impersonally to all members of the Secretariat, whoever they might be. With that in view their possible consequences should be studied very closely.
(59) Mr. Juvigny also wished to draw the Commission's attention to the fact that, although the closest possible co-ordination between Unesco's regulations and those of the United Nations was desirable, Unesco was under no written or positive obligation in the matter. The Director-General had, moreover, recognized that neither WHO nor ILO had seen fit to modify their Staff Regulations to bring them into line with those of the United Nations, and that, in staff matters, no common policy had been adopted by the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies. Accordingly, in examining the Director-General's proposals, his delegation was resolved not to allow itself to be influenced by any act on the part of the United Nations. In so doing, his delegation would

be conforming to the Director-General's wishes, since, in his report to the Executive Board (37 EX/32), he had called upon that body to consider only the intrinsic merit of those proposals.

(60) Mr. Juvigny then turned to the substance of the proposed amendments, which, he said, might have such serious consequences for the staff, or place the Director-General in such a delicate position, that they must be examined with great care.

(61) He spoke first of the difficulty of giving an exact definition of the word "integrity". Whereas that word, to the majority of French-speaking people, was synonymous with incorruptibility or probity, there was sometimes a tendency to broaden its sense and include in it a number of ideas such as those of dignity, professional conscience or general conduct. However, in the view of the French delegation, the general conduct of a staff member could only be invoked as grounds for dismissal if that charge were substantiated by a number of definite facts, for which evidence of time and place could be given. That led the French delegation to regard as dangerous the introduction of the word "integrity" into the Staff Regulations unless a more precise definition were found for it than that given on pages 3 and 4 of the report drawn up by the International Civil Service Committee.

(62) The Director-General had, moreover, in paragraph 11 of document 8C/ADM/14 explicitly acknowledged that, if the amended Regulation 9.1.1 were adopted, it would be necessary to instruct the staff as to the construction to be placed on the word "integrity" in that paragraph. There was no question of laying down fixed and unbreakable rules, or of giving a definition which would not leave out the slightest detail, but the notion did need the most thorough investigation. The action which the Director-General proposed to take after the amendments had been voted, should, in the opinion of the French delegation, be taken beforehand.

(63) That was not all, however. Mr. Juvigny pointed out that the desiderata for international civil servants under the amended Regulation 1.7 would also require closer definition. Paragraph (b) of the amended Regulation 9.1.1 raised a question of past activity which should be looked into very closely. The last words of Regulation 1.7 ("or might reflect upon") might well give rise to legal proceedings if the greatest care were not taken. Lastly, the provision of the amended Regulation 9.3.1, which empowered the Director-General, instead of dismissing a staff member, to terminate his employment by paying him an indemnity greater than the normal indemnity, might ultimately prove contrary to the aim attributed to it under paragraph 12 of document 8C/ADM/14, and to the Director-General's intentions as set forth in his different statements. If the aim of the proposed procedure was to conceal the blot which would otherwise appear on the staff member's file, there was no cause to grant him extra payment in addition to his normal indemnity. If, on the other hand, it was in the interests of the official to place his case before the Appeals Board and the Administrative Tribunal, he should not lend himself to a procedure which in practice would mean surrendering his right of appeal. The proposed amendments were incompatible with the staff member's freedom of consent.

(64) To sum up, Mr. Juvigny said that the amendments proposed in document 8C/ADM/14 raised a host of very important problems which required more thorough study than they had been accorded so far. While appreciating the efforts of the Director-General to safeguard the Organization's interests, while at the same time affording staff members the necessary guarantees, the French delegation could not wholly agree unless the draft amendments set out in document 8C/ADM/14 were first more closely studied and defined. The French delegate ended with an appeal to the delegates and to the Director-General to dispel whatever doubt remained as to the scope of the proposed texts. If the general discussion failed to reveal a fair measure of consent one way or another, his delegation would welcome, or even sponsor, any proposal which might lead to a satisfactory solution and assist the Director-General and the Conference both at present and in future.

(65) The CHAIRMAN thanked the French delegate for his statement, and proposed to close the meeting as it was getting late.

(66) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) asked if at the beginning of the next meeting those passages from the Agreement between the United Nations Organization and Unesco dealing with staff arrangements might be read out.

(67) The CHAIRMAN took note of Mr. Photiades' request.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

# TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.5.4.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: PERSONNEL POLICY. OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS OF STAFF MEMBERS: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE STAFF REGULATIONS (document 8C/ADM/14) (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN asked if it was the Commission's wish that countries should be allowed to speak for a second time during the general discussion of document 8C/ADM/14.

(2) It was agreed by 13 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions, that there should not be a second round of speeches during the general discussion.

(3) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) reminded the Chairman that he had asked, at the end of the morning, if the Legal Adviser would read Article XIII of the United Nations - Unesco Agreement.

(4) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) read out the article.

(5) Baron VAN DER STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) said that his delegation's attitude to the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations was based on two aims, to safeguard the independence of the international administration vis-à-vis the governments of Member States, and to respect the acquired rights of staff members.
(6) It was therefore unable to support any amendment which would either confer discretionary powers on the Director-General or lessen his independence. The first question which arose was how far the proposed amendments were compatible with observance of those principles, and the speaker confessed that the Secretariat's explanations had not altogether removed the doubts felt by the Belgian delegation, which could not but support those, among them the Indian and French delegates, who had asked for further elucidation of that point.
(7) A second question which would determine the way in which his delegation would vote was the significance to be assigned to the argument derived from the Resolution passed by the General Conference at its Second Extraordinary Session that the staff system in Unesco should be in accord with that used in the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies. In his delegation's view, being in accord did not signify being identical; each organization had its own special considerations, and those might justify differences in the various systems. Moreover, in the present context, that resolution was unavailing, since it referred both to the Staff Regulations of the United Nations, which had been changed, and to those of Specialized Agencies, e.g. WHO and ILO, which had not.
(8) In addition, as had already been rightly pointed out, the United Nations General Assembly had decided, when modifying its Staff Regulations, to review those amendments at its next session, in the light of further experience.
(9) Baron van der Straten Waillet therefore concluded that the Director-General's argument was not quite sound and might equally well be used to propose that the Conference postpone the vote until after the United Nations Tenth Session, i.e. until it knew what action the United Nations had decided to take in the light of experience.
(10) The third question which would decide his delegation's vote was whether the proposed amendments would in practice do what the Director-General hoped, i.e. whether they would strengthen his powers or give them better definition and whether they would prevent a repetition of the events that everyone had in mind. His delegation had to admit that it had not found the Director-General's statement altogether convincing on that point either. The Belgian delegate remarked that, after the proposed changes had been made, the responsibility for interpreting the Staff Regulations would still lie with the Director-General himself and that the repetition, in Regulations I and IX, of general terms which were already present or at least implied in Article VI of the Constitution and Chapter I of the Regulations, would not release him from that obligation; afterwards, as before, he would be obliged scrupulously to honour acquired contractual rights; his decisions would moreover still be liable to be contested or invalidated by the authorities concerned with administrative law, since they necessarily retained the right to interpret any and every Regulation, should a dispute arise. Accordingly, the Belgian delegation thought little real advantage was to be gained by the Director-General from his proposed amendments, and would only agree to vote for them if it could be proved that the future of the Organization depended on their acceptance.
(11) As regarded the deletion of Regulation 4.2.1, it recognized that any such enumeration must inevitably be incomplete, but at the same time feared that its deletion at the present juncture would be construed, whether in good or in bad faith, as indicating that it was open to Unesco, or even that Unesco intended, to engage people who had been connected with Fascism or Nazism. That was of course out of the question. The Belgian delegation therefore considered it inadvisable to delete that regulation at present. It wished, however, to make it quite clear that it interpreted the list of activities as an illustration and not in a restrictive sense. In conclusion his delegation regarded Regulation 4.2 as an adequate safeguard against the employment of anyone

who had been guilty of activities or relations incompatible with the service of the rights and principles for which Unesco stood.

(12) Mr. MATIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation agreed with those speakers who stressed the importance of the matter under discussion, and of the consequences for the future development of the Organization of the decision which the Commission was about to take. It therefore considered that the amendments to the Staff Regulations proposed by the Director-General should receive leisurely and very careful consideration. His delegation had attentively weighed the arguments put forward the previous day, both by the Director-General and by the representative of the Staff Association. The first thing to decide was whether the Staff Regulations did in fact require modification, or whether they did not already lay down in clear and precise enough terms the qualities and duties demanded of an international civil servant, and the nature of his relations with his own country. Did the Regulations, as they stood, provide adequate guarantees against any possible activity on the part of a staff member not in keeping with his status as an international official? And did they give the Director-General effective powers to protect the Organization and safeguard its prestige, in such an event?
(13) The Yugoslav delegation thought that satisfactory answers to all these questions were to be found in Article VI, paragraph 5, of the Constitution and Staff Regulation 1.4. Those two clauses were a clear statement of the principle of independence and of the strictly international character of such officials, as required by the aims and duties of the Organization.
(14) A further important point which arose from the discussion of the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations was whether those changes added to the clarity and precision of the existing text. His delegation did not think so. The addition of notions as ill-defined as integrity, independence, impartiality, political activity and good administration, far from clarifying the present provisions, might on the contrary open the way to the most varied interpretations. The proposed changes would arouse feelings of insecurity and apprehension among staff members, which would be detrimental to their work and to the Organization's future. The representative of the Staff Association had informed the Commission of the views which were shared by almost the entire staff, whose important task it was to give effect to the Organization's programme, and he had emphasized the danger of allowing an atmosphere of fear and uncertainty to develop in the Secretariat.
(15) The Yugoslav delegation was also unable to subscribe to the proposal to delete Staff Regulation 4.2.1, viz. the clause debarring persons discredited by their activities or connexion with Fascism, Nazism or militarist aggression, from appointment to the Secretariat. The Yugoslav delegation reserved its right to make a further statement on that particular matter when the Regulation came up for discussion.
(16) Mr. Matić drew attention to the fact that the Yugoslav point of view, which had been clearly stated at the General Conference held in Paris in 1953, remained unchanged.
(17) The Yugoslav delegation was of the same opinion as the Executive Board on the matters he had mentioned, and would vote accordingly, in the conviction that in doing so it would be best serving the Organization's interests, and helping to achieve the fundamental aim of Unesco: international collaboration and understanding for the furtherance of world peace.

(18) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) observed that in the last hundred years his country had been the seat of various international organizations - at one time of the League of Nations, and now, of the European Office of the United Nations, ILO, WHO, the Universal Postal Union, the International Telecommunication Union, and many others. The Swiss Government attached the very greatest importance to the independence of the international civil service, and would resist any interference by States that might detract therefrom. It would therefore, as it always had done, oppose any measure which would restrict the freedom of the staff of international organizations. In its view, the decisive factor in the conduct of an international official was loyalty and faithful service to the Organization. Mr. Merminod believed that in Staff Regulation 1.4 the reticence and tact rightly to be expected of an international official were stated in both moderate and felicitous terms. Should a staff member be in any doubt as to the propriety of his private activities, he had only to consult his superior, as was suggested in the Report of the International Civil Service Advisory Board.
(19) Regulation 4.2.1 contained certain notions which had given rise to a great variety of opinion and some very muddled thinking; moreover, they amounted to criteria of a political nature and the Swiss Government had always been firmly opposed to the introduction of politics into the Organization; it therefore agreed with the Director-General's recommendation on that point.
(20) Switzerland having in due time taken steps to suppress extremist agitations which were a threat to public order, the Swiss delegation's vote for the deletion of Regulation 4.2.1 could not be misconstrued.

(21) Mr. CHEN YUAN (China) stated that his delegation was not in favour of the deletion of Regulation 4.2.1, but not for the same reasons as those given by other delegations. The Chinese delegation was in favour of retaining it because it contained the words "militarist aggression", for, while Nazism and Fascism were dead and it was time to forgive and forget, militarist aggression was still rampant.
(22) The Chinese delegation would vote in favour of the rest of the amendments proposed by the Director-General, as it felt that they would strengthen his hands and enable him to make the Organization work more smoothly. Mr. Chen Yuan did not understand why there was so much feeling about terminology; the word "integrity" had always existed in the Constitution, and certain other words might be difficult to define, but that was no reason for discarding them.

(23) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) agreed wholeheartedly with what the delegate of Egypt had said that morning, namely, that it was a matter requiring a practical and positive approach. The

Commission had been debating what kind of Secretariat it wanted, and that was a vital question, because the Secretariat was not only the creation and instrument of the Member States; it was the Member States themselves. The Director-General, in dealing with his staff, was guided by a body of regulations laid down by the General Conference; he was therefore quite right in coming to the Conference for advice if he felt that they needed clarification, and it was for the Conference to help him. The delegation of the Union of South Africa was consequently in favour of approving document 8C/ADM/14 as a whole, subject to reservations in respect of some of the proposed amendments.

(24) Mr. KELLY (Australia) asked the Legal Adviser how far the Commission was bound by Resolution 10.12, adopted by the General Conference at its Second Extraordinary Session.

(25) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) replied that the General Conference was a sovereign body; while any decisions it took at one session should normally be followed by some action or other, it was always free to decide that it would not continue with a plan of action decided on at a previous session. In short, it was bound by its resolutions only logically and in principle. He then read out Resolution 10.12, which the General Conference had adopted at its Second Extraordinary Session, and which laid down the extent to which it had decided to fall in with the measures passed by the United Nations. The reservation with regard to the Constitution could not prevent the Conference from adopting provisions in keeping with those adopted by the United Nations, but required that such provisions be adopted by the appropriate bodies in Unesco. It further stated that the United Nations, as the parent body, had already adopted certain provisions, while the other Specialized Agencies had not so far altered their Regulations.

(26) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL warmly thanked delegates who had spoken kindly of his intentions, and also thanked the representative of the Staff Association, who had referred to the good relations existing between the Director-General and his staff.
(27) Referring to Resolution 10.12 on page 1 of document 8C/ADM/14, he agreed that he had not been required to make proposals, but he had been asked to submit a report on action taken to ensure that Unesco's policy as regarded the rights and obligations of staff members accorded with that of the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies. He had therefore thought that, in cases where it was impossible to follow the policy of the United Nations and other agencies, he should explain the reason why that was the case to the General Conference and make practical proposals. In dealing with the very important legal problems involved, he had decided to be guided by legal counsel, which he trusted. He was informed of how the United Nations Administrative Tribunal interpreted the various terms, such as "integrity", "misconduct", "serious misconduct" etc. He had decided to construe those terms in a manner favourable to the employee, whenever he had a serious doubt in mind. In some cases, he could have given a broader sense to "unsatisfactory services", but his conscience had prevented him from doing so; he had felt, with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, that executive heads should not abuse any of the legal concepts in order to escape from difficulties, but should wait and seek any necessary authority from their governing bodies.
(28) His difficulty was that the existing Staff Regulations were not adequate to enforce the requirements of the Constitution. Obligations were imposed upon staff members, but the Director-General did not have the power to ensure that staff members fulfilled those obligations. Many delegations seemed to think that the problem was to protect the Secretariat from interference by Member States, but that was not so. No Member State had interfered with the rights of members of the Secretariat. Demands of Member States were sometimes involved, but the Director-General clearly had the power not to respond to requests or demands from Member States, unless he felt that they were justified under the Constitution and Staff Regulations.
(29) It had been suggested that the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations would prevent incidents, but of course they would not; if they could, there would be no need for the Administrative Tribunal or the Appeals Board. However, he wished to point out that all incidents so far had arisen under the existing Staff Regulations, and not under the amendments which he was at present proposing.

(30) The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider each of the proposed amendments in detail.

Staff Regulation 1.4 (Section C, paragraph 6 on page 4 and Section B, paragraph 4 (a) on page 2)

(31) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that he had already explained that the result of the proposed amendment would be to add integrity, independence and impartiality to the qualities required of international civil servants. He drew attention to a slight misprint: in paragraphs 6 and 7 on page 4, the words "(See Section B 1 (a))" and "(See Section B 1 (b))" should read "(See Section B 4 (a))" and "(See Section B 4 (b))".

(32) Mr. KELLY (Australia), seconded by Messrs. CHEN YUAN (China) and DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines), moved approval of the proposed amendment to Regulation 1.4.

(33) The proposed amendment was adopted by 34 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.

Staff Regulation 1.7 (Section C, paragraph 7 on pages 4 and 5, and Section B, paragraph 4 (b) on page 3)

(34) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had issued a Staff Rule making contributions to political parties allowable. If the amendment to Regulation 1.7 were adopted, he would be prepared to issue a similar rule.

(35) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines), seconded by Messrs. C.W. CARTER (Canada) and FERNANDEZ

MORENO (Argentina), moved adoption of the proposed amendment to Regulation 1.7.

(36) Adopted by 36 votes to 0, with 11 abstentions.

Staff Regulations 9.1 and 9.3 (Section C, paragraph 8, pages 5 and 6, and Section B, paragraph 4 (c) and (d) on pages 3 and 4)

(37) The proposed amendment to Regulation 9.1 was adopted.

(38) The CHAIRMAN requested the Director-General to present Regulations 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.3 and 9.3.1.

(39) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the first point under Regulation 9.1.1 was that termination of an appointment should be accompanied by a statement of reasons, challengeable in terms of honesty and adequacy by the Appeals Board and Administrative Tribunal. In another document, he had requested that relations with the Tribunal be extended by vote of the General Conference.
(40) Under 9.1.1 (a), he drew attention to the fact that the word "conduct" was used; he thought it a good word to maintain, as it appeared in the Report of the International Civil Service Advisory Board (ICSAB). If the Commission desired, he would be prepared to extend the second line to read: "..highest standards of integrity required by Article VI, paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Constitution of Unesco".
(41) Regulation 9.1.1 (b) simply meant that he would be able, but would not be obliged, to terminate an appointment, if certain facts anterior to that appointment came to his knowledge. He would have to give reasons for such a termination.
(42) The next paragraph (unnumbered) was in accordance with the United Nations proposal. The Director-General would withhold action until he had obtained the advice of a special advisory board. He proposed to follow the plan of the United Nations and to ask the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate a chairman of the advisory board; he himself would then select its remaining members, in consultation with the Staff Association. The only purpose of the proposed new regulation was to enable him to ensure that the staff met the highest standards required under the Constitution.

(43) Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved approval of the whole of Regulation 9.1.1, on the understanding that there would be a specific reference to paragraph 5 of Article VI of the Constitution in sub-paragraph (a).

(44) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that in that case, as "integrity" was mentioned only in paragraph 4 of Article VI, it would have to be deleted in sub-paragraph (a) of Regulation 9.1.1. The Commission might wish to refer simply to Article VI, but it should also add a reference to Chapter I of the Staff Regulations. Sub-paragraph (a) would thus read:
"...highest standards required by Article VI of the Constitution of Unesco and Chapter I of the Staff Regulations".

(45) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) asked that a vote on Regulation 9.1.1 be taken, paragraph by paragraph, beginning with the first part down to the end of paragraph (a), continuing with paragraph (b) and then taking the last paragraph.

(46) The CHAIRMAN replied that the voting would be taken as requested by the delegate of France.

(47) Regulations 9.1.1 and 9.1.1 (a) as amended by the Director-General were adopted by 33 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

9.1.1 (b)

(48) Mr. TVETERAS (Norway) thought that more emphasis should be laid on present integrity, rather than on past facts. He therefore proposed the following amendment:
"If facts anterior... come to light which have been purposely concealed and which, if they had been known, etc."

(49) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) agreed with the intention behind the Norwegian delegate's proposal, but would prefer the following wording:
"If facts anterior to the appointment of the staff member and relevant to his suitability, and which reflect on his present integrity come to light which, if they had been known, etc.".

(50) Mr. TVETERAS (Norway) withdrew his amendment in favour of that of the United Kingdom delegation.

(51) The United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 32 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

(52) Regulation 9.1.1 (b), as amended, was adopted by 32 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.

Last paragraph of Staff Regulation 9.1.1(unnumbered)

(53) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) pointed out that, as the paragraph was worded, a staff member could still assert that the advisory board had been set up in an arbitrary manner. He therefore proposed that the paragraph be extended to include the explanation given earlier by the Director-General.

(54) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that it would be sufficient to have his statement in the records of the General Conference. He was against inserting it in the Regulations, as that would be tantamount to obliging the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate a chairman. He added that the first line should be amended to read: "No termination... shall take effect until the matter...".

(55) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) accepted the Director-General's explanation, but would nevertheless like the words "in consultation with the Staff Association" to be added at the end of the paragraph.

(56) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL had no objection to that addition.

(57) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) felt that the paragraph in question would in fact provide Unesco officials with an additional guarantee; the special advisory board was clearly not meant to hinder the operation of the normal legal channels, viz. the Appeals Board and the Administrative Tribunal.
(58) He had been about to ask the same question as that just put by the delegate of Ceylon, but in view of the Director-General's explanations, and in the absence of any indication as to its composition, he could not regard such a body as a guarantee; would its members be chosen by the Director-General, or would it be a joint body? Alternatively, would it be made up of independent members? It was not impossible that the Board would be an independent body up to a point, but, as from the explanations given he could not be sure that it would not merely be an emanation of the Director-General, he would be unable to vote for that clause.

(59) Sir Ben BOWEN THOMAS (United Kingdom) was against restricting the Director-General's consultations by adding the words "in consultation with the Staff Association", as he thought that the Director-General should also consult the Executive Board.

(60) Baron VAN DER STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) agreed with the delegates of Ceylon and France. To mention a special advisory body in a text incorporating a staff rule, without giving a precise definition of that body in the rule, would be a cause of difficulty. A special paragraph setting out the composition and functions of the Board was, he thought, essential.

(61) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) pointed out that the Conference had given the Director-General its confidence, so that it could trust him to set up the advisory board in the way he had described. It was unnecessary to insert the Director-General's statement in the Staff Regulations. He moved approval of the paragraph, with the slight drafting change mentioned by the Director-General.

(62) The paragraph, with the word "effect" substituted for "place" in the first line, was adopted by 32 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions.

(63) Regulation 9.1.1 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 34 votes to 10, with 5 abstentions.

Staff Regulation 9.1.2

(64) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed appreciation of the profound attention which the Commission had given to his proposals and said that, in a spirit of understanding and compromise, he was prepared to withdraw the proposed Regulations 9.1.2 and 9.3.1.

(65) Regulations 9.1.2 and 9.3.1 were thus withdrawn.

Staff Regulation 9.3

(66) Adopted unanimously.

Staff Regulation 4.2.1

(67) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, for the reasons which he had already given, he thought it preferable to delete Regulation 4.2.1. Not only was it not in the regulations of the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies, but the question of defining "militarist aggression" might give rise to additional problems. However, he realized that, whether it were deleted or not, some countries would not be satisfied. He would therefore withdraw his proposal to delete Regulation 4.2.1 on the understanding that any delegate who so desired could move that it be deleted.

(68) Since no delegation moved its deletion, Regulation 4.2.1 was maintained.

(69) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL announced that he was prepared to submit a report to the ninth session of the General Conference, accompanied by any comments which the Executive Board might wish to make, on measures taken to implement the amended Regulations and on action taken by the United Nations General Assembly at its Ninth and Tenth Sessions.

(70) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Commission had completed its consideration of document 8C/ADM/14.

(71) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) enquired whether it was necessary or customary to vote on the whole set of provisions which had been voted and approved seriatim.

(72) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was, in reality, a question of a series of separate regulations, accompanied by explanations given by the Director-General. If the Commission voted on the document as a whole, it would be voting, not only on the amendments, but also on the explanations. However, he would do whatever the Commission desired.

(73) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) said he would not press the point; he would fall in with the practice and rules of the Conference if that was how they should be interpreted.

(74) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) thought the Commission could rely on the Chairman's wisdom. It was not the Regulations as a whole that were being modified, but only some clauses in them. In explanation of his vote he referred to his statement at the previous meeting.

(75) Mr. JUVIGNY (France), without pressing for a vote on the document as a whole, wished to explain his vote.
(76) It seemed to him that, whereas the measures adopted resulted in increased powers, the guarantees had been weakened or diminished, and his delegation had consequently been compelled to refrain from voting on some items. He wished however to thank the Director-General for having voluntarily withdrawn the most controversial of his proposals.

The meeting rose at 6.0 p.m.

# TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

*3 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.7.1 OF REVISED AGENDA: REPORT OF THE HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE AND PROGRESS REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL (documents 8C/ADM/24 and 8C/ADM/24 Add.)**

(1) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Chairman of the Headquarters Committee) said that, while little comment was required on document 8C/ADM/24, he would draw attention to the proposal on page 2 of document 8C/ADM/24 Add., authorizing the Director-General to continue negotiations with ICAO in connexion with the installation of its Europe-Africa Office in the Unesco Headquarters Building, and to reach a satisfactory agreement.

(2) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), seconded by Mr. JUVIGNY (France), said that the resolution was a most satisfactory one, and he moved its adoption.

(3) The resolution on page 2 was unanimously adopted.

(4) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board), referring to paragraph 7 on page 3 of document 8C/ADM/24 Add. (building for the Executive Board), said that the original proposal had been for a separate building to accommodate the Executive Board, but on closer consideration he had come to the conclusion that the necessary space could be found within the headquarters building itself.

(5) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), seconded by Mr. SUNDARAM (India), moved a recommendation to the effect that the Director-General be authorized not to proceed with the erection of a separate building for the Board.

(6) The recommendation was unanimously adopted.

(7) Mr. JUVIGNY (France), seconded by Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), proposed that the Commission take note, with approval, of documents 8C/ADM/24 and 8C/ADM/24 Add.

(8) The proposal was unanimously adopted.

**ITEM 9.7.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: REPORT ON THE HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT AND UNESCO (document 8C/ADM/25)**

(9) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), seconded by Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines), moved adoption of the report.

(10) This proposal was adopted.

(11) The CHAIRMAN said that the speed with which the report had been adopted indicated the Commission's faith in the Headquarters Committee. All owed a debt of gratitude to the French Government for its remarkable generosity.

(12) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thanked the Chairman for the tribute he had just paid to his country, and stated that the Headquarters agreement was in course of ratification by the French Parliament. He hoped to be able to inform the Director-General of ratification within the next few weeks.

**ITEM 9.5.5 OF REVISED AGENDA: RULES OF THE APPEALS BOARD (document 8C/ADM/26)**

(13) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that it was laid down in the Staff Regulations that the Director-General should set up machinery for appeals. Such machinery was set up in April 1948 and the provisional rules of the Appeals Board were approved by the Executive Board and the General Conference. At each successive session of the Conference, a resolution had been passed carrying forward those provisional rules for another two-year period.

(14) In June 1953, in accordance with a resolution adopted at the seventh session, the Acting Director-General had entered into an agreement with the ILO Administrative Tribunal, with the approval of the Executive Board, accepting the jurisdiction of that body.

(15) The Director-General had considered it desirable to bring the statutes of the Appeals Board into line with those of the ILO Administrative Tribunal. The Executive Board had approved the draft statutes now before the Commission and recommended their adoption by the Conference. The new rules were generally very similar to the old ones.

(16) In paragraph 5 of the new statutes, the Appeals Board was authorized to consider appeals against an administrative decision or against any disciplinary action where a staff member alleged that it conflicted either in substance or in form with the terms of his contract, or with any Staff Regulation or Staff Rule relevant to his case. Thus the Appeals Board would consider appeals of exactly the same nature as those made to the ILO Administrative Tribunal.

(17) In paragraph 6, provision was made for a staff member, with the Director-General's consent, to appeal to the ILO Administrative Tribunal direct,

without passing through the Appeals Board.
(18) Paragraph 23 laid down that paragraphs 5 and 6 could be amended only by the General Conference, and the remainder of the statutes by the Executive Board only. The Director-General had taken the view that, since he himself was a party to appeals, some such measure was only just.

(19) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) drew attention, in connexion with paragraph 23 of the Statutes of the Appeals Board, to paragraph 2: the same measure should be adopted in the reform of paragraph 2 as in that of paragraphs 5 and 6, since, with reference to the composition of the Board, paragraph 2 had the same judicial importance.
(20) Paragraph 2 (c) provided that not more than three of the ten members in each group should be of the same nationality. That number should be reduced from three to two, because the representatives of two nationalities might come to form a majority within a particular group.

(21) Mr. KELLY (Australia) enquired whether the Staff Association had concurred.
(22) What was meant by the words "inefficiency or relative efficiency", in paragraph 5 (b)?
(23) He agreed with the suggestion made by the delegate of Spain in connexion with paragraph 2.

(24) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) pointed out that the Appeals Board was not, properly speaking, a judicial body, even though the word "jurisdiction" did occur in the first line of paragraph 6 of its Statutes. That body was not in fact a tribunal, but its decisions were delivered in the form of quasi-legal verdicts.
(25) It was moreover to be seen, from the general trend of the Appeals Board, that it was becoming more and more a quasi-legal body. That was shown in the opinion delivered in 1952 by the International Institute of the Administrative Sciences, which was composed of eminent lawyers from many lands.
(26) The Statutes of the Appeals Board enabled it to examine in a truly independent spirit all cases submitted to it. It was the first instance of appeal to which the Unesco staff might resort, the second being the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization.
(27) Since the aim of the Appeals Board was to provide the staff of Unesco with certain guarantees, it had very properly been recognized that its jurisdiction could only be defined by the General Conference. Further, the French delegate thought there were no grounds for granting the Executive Board sole responsibility for altering the rules of procedure of that body.
(28) The questions of composition and procedure were very important indeed. If the composition of the Appeals Board were not laid down satisfactorily, the Board would be in danger of losing its independence. The fact that the appellant was allowed a hearing, on the other hand, afforded him a very sound guarantee which certainly ought to be retained.
(29) It might be maintained that the provisions of paragraph 23 had been approved by the Executive Board, but the Executive Board that had studied those draft regulations, was not the same as the Board, with its members representing 22 governments, that would be called upon, if necessary, to modify them.
(30) The Commission had already dwelt on the need to achieve equitable geographical distribution in the Secretariat. In conformity with that policy, the Secretariat would tend more and more to open its doors to officials from an increasing number of Member States. The guarantees offered to those staff members should consequently emanate from the General Conference alone.
(31) To avoid prolonged discussion of the different Rules, the French delegate proposed that the following sentence be substituted for paragraph 23:
"The present Regulations may be amended only by the General Conference".
(32) That new text should not be taken to mean that the Executive Board would lose all authority in the matter. It would still have the option of recommending to the Conference any changes it deemed desirable.
(33) The French delegation also had certain remarks to make regarding paragraph 6, whose provisions were much the same as those of the provisional regulations. Mr. Juvigny did not question the practical value of that clause, since it enabled the procedure to be speeded up.
(34) In questions such as those submitted to the Appeals Board, however, the Director-General was one party and the appellant (the staff member) the other. But the two parties were not truly equal, since the Director-General possessed powers which enabled him, in all good faith, to influence the appellant. Such a clause might therefore well be regarded as deceptive.
(35) On the other hand, there was no doubt that the Appeals Board enquired very seriously indeed into cases submitted to it. The verdicts of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization had acknowledged the value of the decisions of the Unesco Appeals Board, which served as a tribunal of first instance. The work carried out by the Appeals Board was therefore of considerable assistance to the Administrative Tribunal judges. In the circumstances, the French delegation considered that paragraph 6 might be abolished, and he moved that a separate vote be taken on the point.
(36) In conclusion, Mr. Juvigny remined the Commission that the Director-General had emphasized the fact that all his decisions might be examined by the Appeals Board and by the Administrative Tribunal, and that he was ready to grant staff all necessary guarantees. The French delegation was of the opinion that the modifications it suggested would give more weight to the Director-General's intentions.

(37) Miss LAISE (United States of America) was somewhat concerned at the turn the discussion was taking.
(38) As the delegate of France had said, the Appeals Board was intended to be a piece of internal machinery, not a judicial body duplicating the work of the Administrative Tribunal.
(39) The Appeals Board was designed to provide the Director-General with assistance in reaching carefully considered decisions.
(40) The proposed statutes, if compared with those

of the very effective United Nations Appeals Board, showed considerable room for improvement. In Unesco, the appeals procedure was exceedingly cumbersome and appeals might drag on for months.
(41) Thus, since the General Conference met but once every two years, there ought to be some provision whereby the rules governing the operations of the Board could be reviewed and if necessary amended in the light of experience.
(42) For that reason she was emphatically against the French proposal, to the effect that the General Conference only should be empowered to amend the statutes of the Board.

(43) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) agreed that the Appeals Board was not, strictly speaking, a tribunal, but pointed out that its very name proved that it was an instance of appeal. On the other hand, although it was true that the Director-General had to appoint members to the Board, the Board would only be able to give sound opinions if it could base them on an adequate knowledge of the legal factors involved.

(44) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) pointed out a typographical error in the first line of paragraph 4 of the French text. The English text: "The Bureau of Personnel and Management and the Staff Association..." was correct.
(45) As regarded the question raised by the delegate of Australia in connexion with paragraph 5 (b) (inefficiency or relative efficiency), the idea was that the Director-General might decide not to renew an appointment, or to terminate an appointment, because the staff member concerned had not given satisfaction, or had given less satisfaction than might have been expected.
(46) It had been asked why authority was being given to the Executive Board to change the statutes of the Appeals Board. The point was that under the previous rules certain practical difficulties had arisen (for example, it might not be possible to find people of the right nationality to serve on the Board). Accordingly, it was undesirable to have to wait two years until the General Conference could change the statutes.
(47) The delegate of Australia had asked whether the Staff Association had concurred in the proposals. Yes, it had.

(48) Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that, since the Staff Association had expressed itself favourably, he could accept the whole of the Statutes, including paragraph 23, and he would move their adoption.

(49) Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay) supported the two proposals submitted by the French delegation for the suppression of paragraph 6 and the amendment of paragraph 23. Now that the structure of the Executive Board had been altered, the French proposal was all the more important, and should be taken into account.

(50) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Board had discussed paragraph 6 at some length. The opinion of the majority had been that the staff member ought to be quite free to appeal to the ILO Administrative Tribunal direct, if advised to do so by the Staff Association. The initiative must come from the staff member, not from the Director-General.

(51) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) pointed out that it would be more logical to call that body "Consejo" in Spanish rather than "Junta". The document under discussion had been translated from the English, but it was preferable to take the Spanish version from the French. Apart from etymological reasons, the word Junta was, historically speaking, not unexceptionable. The proposed body should be called in Spanish: Consejo de Apelación.

(52) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Secretariat accepted the proposal of the delegate of Spain.

(53) Paragraph 1 was adopted unanimously.

(54) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) formally submitted his amendment to paragraph 2 (c), according to which the last line should read: "Not more than two of the ten members in each group shall be of the same nationality".

(55) The amendment was adopted.

(56) Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

(57) Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 were adopted unanimously.

(58) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) moved the deletion of paragraph 6.

(59) Mr. KELLY (Australia) asked what was meant by saying that a staff member could "waive the jurisdiction of the Board", in paragraph 6. He would propose the following wording: "Waive his right of recourse to the Board".

(60) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was willing to accept the change proposed.

(61) The amendment was adopted.

(62) Paragrapn 6, as amended, was put to the vote and adopted by 28 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

(63) Paragraphs 7 and 8 were adopted.

(64) Mr. BOW (Canada) moved the deletion of the last sentence ("Evidence shall be voluntary".) in paragraph 15. It was clear that the Board had no power to compel a witness to give evidence, and the effect of the sentence might merely be to frighten the timid.

(65) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) thought that the last sentence served a purpose. While the Chairman of the Appeals Board could require a staff member to appear, the refusal to do so could not carry with it any sanction. He thought that that should allay the fears of the Canadian delegate.

(66) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought there was no idea of compelling an official to give evidence. The Chairman of the Appeals Board could only question

witnesses who came forward. In the circumstances, he did not understand either the comments of the Canadian delegate nor the reply of the French delegate.

(67) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that a statement to the effect that evidence should be voluntary might give the impression that he was unable to oblige staff members to testify. In fact, it was important that he be empowered so to do.

(68) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) thought it desirable that both parties should enjoy equal privileges. It would not be very easy to require witnesses brought forward by the Director-General to testify if those of the appelant were at liberty to appear or not as they chose. It was therefore better to accept the fact that there was no right of compulsion.

(69) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that there appeared to be some misunderstanding. He ought to be able to compel a staff member to give evidence if the appellant so desired. Not for one moment had he wished to suggest that he should be authorized to call witnesses on his own behalf only.

(70) Mr. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon), having enquired what the Staff Association thought about the proposal, it was agreed to interrupt discussion on paragraphs 9-20 until a representative of the Staff Association could be present.

(71) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) warmly appreciated the generous interpretation of the clause in question just given by the Director-General. He thought, however, that if it were decided to alter that paragraph, it should be so worded as to leave no ambiguity of meaning.

(72) The Commission passed to paragraph 21.

(73) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether there was not some contradiction in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). How could the proceedings of the Board be confidential if appellants could examine previous reports?

(74) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that the confidential records of the Board dealt with what was said by the Board, meeting in camera. The word "report" was the Board's final considered judgment on a case, and was not the same as a summary record of its proceedings. Experience had shown that it was helpful if an appellant could examine the reports on previous similar cases in deciding whether or not to go forward with his appeal.

(75) Paragraph 21 was adopted.

(76) Mr. BOW (Canada) proposed, in respect of paragraph 22, that the words "the appellant may nevertheless attend..."in the last line but one, should read "the appellant has a right nevertheless to attend...".

(77) This amendment was adopted.

(78) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) wondered whether it would not be fairer to empower the Chairman of the Appeals Board to decide whether the appellant should be present.

(79) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) approved the Swiss delegate's suggestion.

(80) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, since the Board was merely an advisory body, to give the Chairman of the Board such authority would be going too far.

(81) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) thought justice required that the decision be left with the Chairman of the Appeals Board. His proposal in no way implied lack of confidence in the Director-General; it merely aimed at providing a procedural guarantee.

(82) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, if the Swiss proposal were adopted, and a case were pending in Paris, the Chairman of the Appeals Board would be able to recall the entire Secretariat from Montevideo if he saw fit.

(83) Miss LAISE (United States of America) moved the following amendment: "If the Director-General, after consultation with the Chairman of the Appeals Board, decides that the presence....".

(84) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) supported the United States amendment. The Appeals Board was merely an advisory body. Since the Director-General was ultimately responsible for the finances of the Organization, it was only just that he should have the final decision.

(85) In view of the changes proposed by the United States delegation to the amendment to paragraph 22, and of the comments of the United Kingdom delegate, Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) supported the United States text.

(86) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) said he would not press the point, and withdrew his proposal.

(87) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, if a staff member appealed to the ILO Administrative Tribunal against a decision by the Board, and the Tribunal decided that his presence was necessary, he would always be sent.

(88) The United States amendment was adopted.

(89) Paragraph 22, as amended, was adopted.

(90) The Commission then resumed its study of paragraphs 9-20.

(91) Mr. HENQUET (representing the Staff Association) stated that the Staff Association was in favour of retaining the last sentence of paragraph 15, which guaranteed that witnesses' evidence should be voluntary.

(92) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) said that the sentence "Evidence shall be voluntary" was ambiguous

It might be interpreted as meaning that the Director-General could not compel staff members to give evidence. It was obviously desirable that he should have such authority. Or it could be interpreted as meaning that a staff member was not compelled to answer questions put to him by members of the Appeals Board.

(93) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, as he interpreted the paragraph, he would still have authority, even if the last sentence were deleted, to compel staff members to appear before the Board. But a staff member could not be compelled to answer all conceivable individual questions which might be put to him by the Board.

(94) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) asked for an explanation of the last sentence in paragraph 15. It should provide that a staff member was compelled to appear before the Board, but not to give evidence. A distinction should be made between the obligation to appear, and the non-obligation to answer questions. He added that the Spanish word "deponer" should be replaced by the word "declarar".

(95) Mr. BOW (Canada) said that, in view of the explanations given, he would withdraw his proposal.

(96) Paragraphs 9-20 (procedure for appeal) were adopted.

(97) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the delegate of France had proposed that paragraph 23 read: "The present regulations may be amended only by the General Conference".

(98) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, with the amendment adopted in paragraph 2 (c) the whole scheme might become inoperative. Nearly all staff members in the General Service category were French or British, with some Belgians and Swiss, since they were locally recruited. Thus it might be impossible to ensure that not more than "two of the ten members in each group" should be of the same nationality.
(99) It was precisely to cope with such difficulties in the intervals between sessions of the General Conference that provision was made in paragraph 23 for the Executive Board to amend the statutes of the Board, apart from paragraphs 5 and 6.

(100) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) agreed that the amendment adopted in paragraph 2 (c) might occasion material difficulties which had not been foreseen. However, the substantive arguments he had put forward remained intact. He felt he should reopen discussion of that amendment, since not all its consequences had been pointed out at the time of its adoption. Mr. Juvigny therefore wondered whether the Spanish delegate would agree to the following version of paragraph 2 (c):

"of the ten members in each group, a maximum of two members shall be of the same nationality, unless this is materially impossible".

(101) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) would accept any reasonable formula, such as that proposed by the French delegate. As an alternative he suggested that the officials of the same nationality in Group I should be fixed at two, while those in Group II were maintained at three. He left the choice to the Director-General.

(102) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said he had merely given an example of the sort of thing that might make a change in the statutes desirable.
(103) Unkind things had been said about the new Executive Board. In its old form, the Board had exercised powers of the kind described in paragraph 23 with outstanding fairness, and he was sure that the new one would do so too.

(104) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) pointed out that the French delegation had no intention of adopting a rigid attitude which would paralyse the work of the Appeals Board. The jurisprudence of most countries distinguished between "basic provisions" and "incidental formalities". There was clearly always room for a liberal interpretation of certain dates and formalities when there was no threat to the appellant's basic guarantees. What was really important was to ensure that those guarantees were not liable to be questioned at any moment.

(105) The CHAIRMAN observed that he could not receive amendments to paragraph 2 as adopted, unless somebody formally moved that the Commission revert to that paragraph.

(106) Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved that a vote be taken forthwith on paragraph 23.

(107) The CHAIRMAN ruled that the Australian motion had priority.

(108) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) announced that he accepted the priority of the French proposal. If that were rejected, the Spanish delegation would move that the General Conference be empowered to amend not only paragraphs 5 and 6 of the statutes, but also paragraph 2.

(109) The French amendment to paragraph 23 (to the effect that the statutes of the Appeals Board might be amended by the General Conference only) was rejected by 19 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions.

(110) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) again submitted his amendment as previously announced: the first sentence of paragraph 23 should read: "Paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 may be amended only by the General Conference". Paragraph 2, which dealt with the composition of the Board, was just as important as paragraphs 5 and 6, and should be subject to the same terms of amendment.

(111) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) seconded the Spanish delegate's proposal.

(112) The Spanish amendment to paragraph 23 ("Paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 may be amended only by the General Conference...") was adopted by 16 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

(113) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought that the

General Conference had the right to amend all the paragraphs in the statute, and that, in drafting paragraph 23, the aim had certainly not been to grant the Executive Board the sole right to amend certain clauses. The main object of those arrangements had been to stipulate that the Director-General should not be authorized to alter the statutes. Accordingly he moved that the words "or by the General Conference" be added at the end of paragraph 23.

(114) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thought it should be enough to remove the negative and to read: "The remainder of the statutes and the Appendix may be modified by the Executive Board".

(115) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) maintained his proposal as being perfectly explicit.

(116) The amendment proposed by Mr. Haguiwara was approved.

(117) Paragraph 23, as amended, was finally approved by 35 votes to nil, with four abstentions.

(118) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) said that, in view of the explanations given by the Director-General, he accepted the principle of including no more than two officials of the same nationality in Group I, and no more than three of the same nationality in Group II.

(119) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought that there need be no hesitation in restoring the original wording of paragraph 2 (c), since the principle of equitable geographical distribution was clearly stated in the following sub-paragraph (d).

(120) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) preferred the original text of paragraph 2 (c) as proposed by the Director-General, under which there was no danger of inequitable geographical distribution of members of the panel. He was, however, prepared to vote in favour of the Spanish amendment. In view of the difficulties invoked by the Director-General, he could not support the Japanese amendment.

(121) The Spanish amendment to paragraph 2 (c) was adopted by 30 votes to 0, with 9 abstentions.

(122) Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted.

(123) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) did not see any need to submit the Appendix to the Commission for its approval. It was an administrative formula, not a legal text, and there was no call for such a proceeding.

(124) The CHAIRMAN ruled that the Appendix should be submitted to the Commission for its approval, as paragraph 23 read "The remainder of the statutes and the Appendix may be amended only by the Executive Board", which meant that the Commission's approval of the Appendix was also required.

(125) The Appendix was adopted.

(126) Document 8C/ADM/26 as a whole was put to the vote and adopted by 39 in favour, none against and 2 abstentions.

**ITEM 9.5.9 OF REVISED AGENDA: RECOGNITION OF THE COMPETENCE OF INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS (document 8C/ADM/18)**

(127) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the purpose of the document was merely to extend for another two years the authorization given to the Director-General to arrange for the ILO Administrative Tribunal to hear cases of the sort mentioned in the document.
(128) It was also proposed that the jurisdiction of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal be permanently accepted in appeals by Unesco staff members alleging non-observance of Pensions Fund Regulations.

(129) Mr. ATTAGARA (Thailand), seconded by Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa), moved that the Commission recommend the Conference to adopt the resolution in paragraph 6.

(130) The proposal was unanimously adopted.

(131) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that adoption of the resolution raised an incidental problem.
(132) The Administrative Tribunal had recently awarded a few hundred dollars to a Unesco staff member. He had assumed that acceptance of the jurisdiction of that Tribunal would automatically involve authorization to spend money to pay such awards. The auditors, however, had questioned the regularity of such a decision. Although they had eventually accepted his explanations, he needed some authorization to cover cases of that kind.
(133) No provisions were made in the budget for such awards, and it was exceedingly difficult to estimate in advance how much money would be required for the purpose.
(134) There was a possibility of using the Working Capital Fund; that could be done by adding a clause to the resolution on extraordinary and unforeseen expenditures.
(135) Alternatively, the Conference could amend its resolution carrying forward a surplus of $600,000 to the ninth session. That, to him, seemed the more attractive course. But he would like advice from the Commission before the question was raised in the General Committee, since it was a serious matter to reopen a decision already taken by the Conference.

(136) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) asked whether there were any cases pending.

(137) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL: No.

(138) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought the procedure whereby such awards would be paid from budget surpluses was too complicated. It would be simpler to consider such outlays as unforeseen expenditure and to pay them from the Working Capital Fund.

(139) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that such a

procedure would involve submitting a resolution to the ninth session to the effect that the money be repaid to the Working Capital Fund.

(140) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that she had abstained in the vote on document 8C/ADM/26.
(141) As regarded the matter under discussion, she would point out that the Working Capital Fund belonged to governments and had to be replenished. It seemed simpler to have recourse to a system which would not entail reimbursement.

(142) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) said that the Conference had already decided not to apply the Financial Regulations to budget surpluses, i.e. to carry those surpluses forward pending a decision at the ninth session. If, now, the eighth session used such surpluses for the payment of awards, the ninth session would be unable to use them in accordance with the Financial Regulations. Its hands would be tied.
(143) The Working Capital Fund seemed the obvious source for such payments, but the problem was a difficult one, needing further study. He would therefore abstain in any vote on the matter.

(144) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) enquired what would be the maximum expenditure for any one case. Could it be covered by transfers effected by the Board?

(145) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL could give no idea of the amount of such awards. There might be no awards at all. Nevertheless, he required an authorization to make such payments.

(146) Miss LAISE (United States of America) agreed that more time was needed. Account should be taken of experience acquired by the United Nations, which was setting up a fund for such purposes, to be financed out of the Staff Assessments Scheme.

(147) Mr. POHL (Union of South Africa) suggested that the Commission decide in favour of the principle involved, and consider later where the money should come from.

(148) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) pointed out that it was impossible to foresee how many such cases might come before the Administrative Tribunal, in how many the administration might be declared liable, and the amount it might be required to pay. It seemed to him moreover that, once Unesco had recognized the jurisdiction of the Administrative Tribunal, it must likewise accept the possible outcome of that decision. The opinion expressed on 13 July 1954 by the International Court of Justice left no doubt on the point.
(149) Mr. Juvigny proposed therefore that the Commission first take its decision of principle, and leave till later the question how payment should be made.

(150) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) concurred in the comments of the South African and French delegates. He suggested that the Conference should authorize the Director-General to pay any amounts which Unesco might be required to pay as a result of a verdict delivered by an administrative tribunal recognized by the Organization. The Director-General would have the right to use the Working Capital Fund for the purpose, subject to a decision to be taken by the Conference at its ninth session on ways of reimbursing the Working Capital Fund.

(151) Miss LAISE (United States of America) was against taking any such decision. The regulations of the ILO Administrative Tribunal made provision for further appeal to the International Court, and it might in certain circumstances be argued that Unesco had no obligation to pay. It would be better merely to authorize the Director-General to use certain funds to meet such expenditure, if any.

(152) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said that at the afternoon meeting he would submit a written proposal to the effect that the Director-General be authorized to draw on the Working Capital Fund for such purposes.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

# TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

*3 December 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand)

**ITEM 9.4.3: ADMINISTRATION OF THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND (document 8C/ADM/9) AND**

**ITEM 9.5.9 OF REVISED AGENDA: RECOGNITION OF THE COMPETENCE OF INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS (document 8C/ADM/18) (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegate of Belgium wished to make a proposal amending document 8C/ADM/9.

(2) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) returned to the proposal he had submitted at the previous meeting, the text of which he had now revised in consultation with the Comptroller of the Organization.
(3) His proposal was that a sub-paragraph (c) be inserted in document 8C/ADM/9 (Administration of the Working Capital Fund), under B (ii), to read as follows:
"(c) awards of compensation ordered by the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization".
(4) He further proposed to delete the last paragraph of that section of the document, and to substitute the following:
"The Director-General shall report to the next ordinary session of the General Conference all advances made under this clause and the circumstances relating thereto. At the same time he shall submit proposals for the reimbursement of such advances to the Working Capital Fund".

(5) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked if any items being discussed by the Programme and Budget Commission were likely to affect the Working Capital Fund resolution.

(6) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that he would find out from the Secretary of the Programme and Budget Commission what the position was.

(7) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) pointed out that the question raised by the United States delegate did not concern the current session of the Conference, since reimbursement of the Working Capital Fund would only come up for discussion at the next session.

(8) Miss LAISE (United States of America) recalled that the unforeseen and unpredictable expenses which could be met by drawing from the Working Capital Fund were strictly limited to: (a) those arising from requests from the United Nations; (b) salary adjustments; (c) awards of compensation. Unesco might, for example, wish to draw on the Working Capital Fund to meet the cost of co-operating with the United Nations in its scheme for the peaceful use of atomic energy. That item would either have to be earmarked in the budget, or covered by funds drawn from the Working Capital Fund; if the latter solution were to be adopted, Section II, 2A (page 1 of document 8C/ADM/9) would have to be broadened.

(9) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Programme and Budget Commission had been given a work plan for co-operation with the United Nations in its scheme for the peaceful use of atomic energy, involving expenditure of $40,000, which was included in the budget. It was believed that that was a reasonable proposal in terms of the resolution adopted by the committee of the General Assembly. However, plans might change during the two-year period, and it might be wise to provide for the possibility of drawing on the Working Capital Fund, in case Unesco were called upon to shoulder additional responsibilities.

(10) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) moved adoption of the Belgian amendments.

(11) The Belgian amendments in document 8C/ADM/9 were adopted.

(12) Mr. NOGUEIRA (Uruguay), on a question of procedure, remarked that neither the Spanish-speaking delegates nor interpreters could follow the discussion in detail since the words which had been added to the original text had not been given out in Spanish. He pointed out with all due respect that, to avoid similar difficulties, the Commission ought not in future to discuss documents which had not been distributed in all the working languages.

(13) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Belgian amendments had been proposed in the course of the meeting and there had not been time to translate them into Spanish. He apologized to the delegate of Uruguay.

**ITEM 9.5.4.1: STAFF REGULATIONS AND STAFF RULES (document 8C/ADM/27)**

(14) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) stated that the changes in the text were not clearly brought out in document 8C/ADM/27; he recalled the discrepancies already noted between the original English text and the French version, some of which had far-reaching implications. It would have been better to arrange the document in two columns, one giving the original text, and the other the text as amended.

(15) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) explained that the divergencies discovered in 1953 between the English and French texts related to the Staff Regulations and not to the Staff Rules. With the exception of the divergency in Regulation 4.5.1, mentioned by the delegate of Belgium, all were minor, drafting differences. Amendments to the Rules had not been indicated because, as stated by the Director-General in his Annual Report, the amended Rules had been completely revised to bring them into line with the amended Staff Regulations and with the Rules of the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies.

(16) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) was satisfied with the explanation given by the Secretariat.

(17) The Commission decided to take note of document 8C/ADM/27.

(18) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) recalled that under the new Regulation 9.1.1, adopted by the Commission at its previous meeting, the Director-General was to set up a special advisory board and to ask the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate a chairman. In order to provide for payment of that chairman, Mr. Farr asked if the Commission would agree to add an entry in paragraph 39 of Part IV of the Budget; the entry would be $840 in 1955 and $840 in 1956 to cover the chairman's honorarium and expenses.

(19) Mr. DE LOS SANTOS (Philippines) moved adoption of the Secretariat's proposal.

(20) Adopted.

**ITEM 9.3 OF REVISED AGENDA: LEGAL QUESTIONS (document 8C/JUR/6)**

(21) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur of the Legal Committee) presented the first part of the Fifth Report of the Legal Committee, referring to the interpretation of Article V, paragraph 3, of the Constitution (re-eligibility of members of the Executive Board).

(22) Mr. JUVIGNY (France) proposed that the interpretation given by the Legal Committee be accepted.

(23) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal, which was adopted.

(24) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) then presented the second part of the Report, dealing with amendments to the Rules of Procedure resulting from the adoption of Russian as a working language of the General Conference. He explained that the point of the revised title to Rule 53 was merely to enable the language of the country where the General Conference was being held to be used during that session.

(25) Mr. POMPEI (Italy), supported by Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), proposed that that part of the Report be adopted.

(26) Adopted.

(27) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) then proceeded to the third part of the Report: "Amendments to the Financial Regulations" (Draft Resolution submitted by the Spanish delegation (document 8C/DR/90)). He read out the suggested wording which the Legal Committee was submitting to the Administrative Commission for inclusion in its Report, saying that the wording satisfied the Spanish delegate and had been unanimously accepted by the Legal Committee.

(28) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Legal Committee had foreseen at what stage there would be a change in the Financial Regulations.

(29) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) replied that a proposal to that effect must be filed by a Member State or by the Director-General in time for it to be submitted to the General Conference at its next session.

(30) The CHAIRMAN explained that the proposal was that the Director-General should study the proposals and submit a report to the General Conference at its ninth session.

(31) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain), seconded by Mr. COLOMBO (Argentina), moved adoption of the third part of the report.

(32) Adopted.

(33) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) submitted the last part of the report: "Legal guarantees to be provided nationally for the staff of the Secretariat", a draft recommendation submitted by the Italian delegation (document 8C/DR/74) and amended by the United States delegation (document 8C/DR/74(rev.)). The Legal Committee had decided that a second draft resolution, submitted by the United Kingdom delegation (document 8C/DR/113), was not an amendment to the Italian recommendation and should be dealt with as a separate proposal.

(34) The CHAIRMAN hoped that the Commission would accept the opinion of the Legal Committee that the United Kingdom motion was not an amendment of

the Italian motion, as amended by the United States delegation, but a separate motion. He would put them to the vote in the order in which they had been presented. He asked the delegates of Italy and the United States of America whether they had any objection to the change in the title.

(35) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) was happy to accept the conclusions of the Legal Committee, which he found reassuring; his motion was only a recommendation to Member States and its object was moral rather than legal. He agreed to the new title proposed by the United Kingdom delegation, which left out the word "guarantees". He asked the Chairman to put the Italian proposal to the vote, as amended by the United States delegation.

(36) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) announced that his delegation would withdraw its motion in favour of that of Italy, as amended.

(37) The Italian resolution, as amended by the delegation of the United States of America, was adopted.

(38) In reply to Mr. C.W. CARTER (Canada), who asked whether the Administrative Commission had examined the Fourth Report of the Legal Committee, Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) explained that that report had been passed directly to the General Committee and not to the Administrative Commission, which had no call to discuss it; the report was solely concerned with nominations.

(39) Mr. GOMEZ ROBLEDO (Mexico) asked that note be taken of the Mexican delegation's wish to refrain from participating in the decision taken on Draft Resolution 8C/DR/74 (rev.).

**UNESCO JOINT STAFF PENSION FUND – REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL (document 8C/ADM/17)**

(40) The CHAIRMAN explained that the Commission had two duties to perform in connexion with document 8C/ADM/17; (1) to pass the draft resolution in paragraph 4 on page 3; and (2) to elect three representatives and three alternates to sit on the Unesco Staff Pension Committee. As a result of consultation with governments, the names of six Member States with permanent representatives in Paris who would be willing to serve on the Committee had been received. Those States were: Australia, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon and the United States of America. Other countries could, however, be proposed from the floor.

(41) Miss LAISE (United States of America), seconded by Messrs. C.W. CARTER (Canada), ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) and DE HOOG (Netherlands), proposed that the first three countries in alphabetical order be elected as members and the three others as alternates.

(42) The proposal was adopted.

(43) Mr. C.W. CARTER (Canada), seconded by Messrs. ABEYWICKREMA (Ceylon) and DE HOOG (Netherlands) moved adoption of the resolution in paragraph 4 on page 3.

(44) Adopted.

(45) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Commission had concluded its business. He requested it to meet on Monday morning, 6 December, at 10 a.m. to consider its report, which would be distributed to members on Monday morning at 9 a.m.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.

# CHAPTER VI

# ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

## FIRST MEETING

*1 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

(1) As the Committee had not yet elected its Chairman, the meeting was opened by the Head of the Bureau of Conference Planning.

(2) Mr. MONTAGNIER (Head, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) began by reading the list of the 15 Member States nominated by the seventh session of the General Conference to send representatives to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, and welcomed all present. He then paid a tribute to the late Mr. Hodson, Chief of the Bureau of Programme and Budget, who had played a most active part in the drafting of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 and had lately been killed in a tragic accident.

(3) Mr. Montagnier went on to recall that the terms of reference of the Committee were set forth in resolutions 13.1 and 13.5 of the seventh session of the General Conference, which he then read. The Committee would have to give its opinion on the new draft resolutions submitted by Member States. Some 30 drafts had so far reached the Secretariat and 13 had been reproduced under the reference numbers 8C/DR/1 to 8C/DR/13.

(4) The Agenda of the Committee was given in Section II of document 8C/1, items 7.1 to 7.7. Mr. Montagnier proposed that the Committee should proceed to elect its officers. In that connexion it would be remembered that, in accordance with Rules 34 and 35 of the Rules of Procedure, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget or, in his absence, the Vice-Chairman, would serve as an ex officio member of the General Committee of the Conference.

**ITEM 7.1: ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN, VICE-CHAIRMAN AND RAPPORTEUR**

(5) Miss LAISE (United States of America) seconded by Mr. JUNANKAR (India), proposed that Mr. Gardner Davies (Australia) be elected Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

(6) The proposal was adopted and Mr. Gardner Davies took the Chair.

(7) The CHAIRMAN expressed his deep appreciation of the honour that was being conferred upon his country and himself. First of all, he wished to thank the Uruguayan Government and people for their hospitality and kindness in receiving the Conference in their country and allowing it to meet in the imposing precincts of the "Palacio Legislativo". Secondly, he wished to join in the tribute which had been paid to Mr. William Hodson, whose death left all those connected with Unesco with a very real sense of personal loss; the draft programme and budget for 1955-56 was the result of his able and devoted service to the Organization over a period of years and the Conference would miss him very sorely indeed.

(8) The Chairman then called for nominations for the posts of Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

(9) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), seconded by Mr. SILLER (Mexico), proposed the name of Professor Sommerfelt (Norway) as Vice-Chairman.

(10) The proposal was adopted.

(11) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), seconded by Miss LAISE (United States of America), proposed that Mr. Cabouat (France) be elected Rapporteur.

(12) The proposal was adopted.

**ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA:** (document 8C/1, Annex I, Section II, page 4)

(13) Subject to the Committee's right to add items or change the order of existing items in the course of its work, the Agenda in Section II of Annex I of document 8C/1 was adopted.

**ITEM 7.2: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION** (documents 8C/5 and 8C/5 Corr.)

(14) The CHAIRMAN proposed first to ask the Assistant Director-General to make a general statement on

the programme and budget policy embodied in document 8C/5, and then to ask Mr. Rao to give a brief technical explanation of its preparation. The Committee would then hold a general discussion on programme policy and the budget practice implemented in the programme.

(15) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) conveyed to the Committee the regrets of the Director-General, who had had to remain in Rio de Janeiro and had asked him (the speaker) to present on his behalf the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 as given in document 8C/5 and amended in part by document 8C/5 Corr.

(16) In the first place, as directed by the General Conference, the budget for the proposed programme was drawn up at two levels. As would be seen from paragraph 17 of the Introduction to document 8C/5 and from the comments of the Executive Board (8C/5 Add. 1, paragraph 22), the "present budgetary level" and "higher budgetary level" were notions which could be given at least two different interpretations, of which one, if adopted, would have brought about a considerable rise in the level of expenditure; it was the other - involving a smaller increase only - which the Director-General had in fact adopted.

(17) Mr. Maheu went on to explain that the Director-General had conceived his programme as a single whole and that, in his view, the projects included at higher budgetary level were no less important than those coming within the limits of the present budgetary level. Incidentally, the Executive Board in its comments (8C/5, Add. 1, paragraph 24) had expressed the view that the total proposed programme at both levels can and should be carried out .

(18) It should also be pointed out that almost the whole of the sums requested at the higher budgetary level were intended for programme operations, 4.40% of them only being expendable for general administration and common service costs. Considering the budget as a whole (after deduction of expenses for the General Conference and the Executive Board), it would be seen that the appropriations for general administration and common service costs, which had amounted to 24.43% in 1953-54, had dropped to 20.92% in the present proposed programme.

(19) Lastly, though the Director-General did not desire in any way to influence the decisions of the General Conference, he had felt that the only data he could use for his estimate of income were:

The United Nations scale of contributions for 1954, allowance being made for the number of Member States in Unesco;

The anticipated percentage of unpaid contributions accepted by the General Conference at its seventh session for the 1953-54 budget.

(20) Turning to the structure of the programme, the Assistant Director-General pointed out that the division into chapters corresponding to Unesco's main fields of action - Education, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Cultural Activities, Mass Communication, etc. - had been retained. Each of these chapters had, however, been arranged in accordance with a uniform plan which brought out the sub-division into two sections that was a feature of the whole programme and constituted the framework upon which it had been built. The Executive Board had expressed its satisfaction with that innovation (8C/5 Add. 1, paragraph 7).

(21) Section I comprised the general activities of the Organization and Section II the special activities. Among the special activities, a distinction had to be made between planned undertakings and technical aid supplied to Member States at their request. Those two kinds of activities, although inspired by the same desire to adapt the Organization's efforts as closely as possible to the diversity of conditions encountered, were, in fact, representative of materially different types of operations. Fuller details could be found in paragraphs 56 to 65 of the Director-General's Introduction.

(22) As regards the actual content of the programme, each section was sub-divided into projects. Each project was headed by a title and preceded by a budget summary and one or more resolutions. There were 69 projects altogether, compared with 242 in the programme for 1953-54, which meant that considerable concentration had been effected by the systematic regrouping of activities. That concentration had notably simplified the programme and budget document; it should also greatly facilitate the work of the Advisory Committee and of the General Conference.

(23) The Assistant Director-General went on to explain briefly the main considerations which the Director-General had had in mind in drawing up the programme before the Committee. Firstly, he had been concerned to develop the practical side of Unesco's work. No less essential was the desire to bring the Organization's work more closely into line with the needs, aspirations and resources of Member States. Much effort had also been devoted to the task of accentuating the concentration. Not only had the number of projects been notably reduced, but in some instances a more or less close connexion had been established between several projects appearing in different chapters. The programme had thus been concentrated to a far greater extent than might appear from a first reading of the document, and the Director-General, in pursuance of the Executive Board's recommendations (document 8C/PRG/13, paragraphs 48 to 60), was prepared to embark upon a still more radical concentration. He did not, however, feel entitled to do so until the General Conference had debated the matter in full knowledge of the facts and consequences, and had provided him with clear-cut instructions.

(24) Lastly, the proposed programme before the Committee was a collective work, in which all the main specialists of the Secretariat, in addition to the Heads of Departments, had taken a share. It bore the stamp more especially of the late William Hodson, to whose memory the speaker paid heartfelt tribute.

(25) The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Maheu for his clear statement. Before calling on Mr. Rao, he wished to welcome Professor Secco Ellauri and to ask him to transmit the Committee's greetings and gratitude to the Government of Uruguay.

(26) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) expressed his own sorrow and that of his colleagues at the death of Mr. Hodson, which had shaken Unesco to its foundations. Members of the Bureau of Programme and Budget felt that they had

lost, not only a guide and a friend, but almost a member of the family. Mr. Rao said that he had brought with him Mr. Hodson's copy of the Programme and Budget, which had in it several notes made by him, so that although he (Mr. Rao) would be speaking, the thoughts behind his words would be Mr. Hodson's.

(27) Mr. Rao pointed out that, in preparing the budget estimates for 1955-56, the Secretariat had kept in mind two guiding principles: firstly, the Director-General had endeavoured to carry out the various recommendations of the Budget Committee of the seventh session of the General Conference and, secondly, in the light of several opinions voiced at previous sessions of the Conference, an effort had been made to simplify the document by cutting out all unnecessary details, while maintaining the elements essential to an examination of the programme. For example, the large number of summary tables which appeared in previous budget documents were now reduced to the essential ones - summaries by major objects of expenditure and by major projects for each department or service.

(28) The budgetary standards adopted in the computation of the budget estimates were based on past experience and had been tested in the light of the 1953 expenditure records. In some instances, however, when it was possible to have actual facts, the estimates were calculated on the basis of these facts rather than by applying the standards.

(29) Mr. Rao pointed to the use of two new methods not employed in previous years' budget documents. Firstly, it had been considered very useful to try to distribute staff costs among the various resolutions to which they related, rather than give such details as the salaries of each staff member. Secondly, an effort had been made to compare the budget estimates for the major projects for 1955-56 with corresponding ones in 1953-54. Certain difficulties arose from the fact that it was not always possible to equate the projects between the two financial periods, but the figures in the 1953 and 1954 columns indicated the approximate budgetary relationship between 1953-54 activities and those proposed for 1955-56.

(30) Mr. Rao then enumerated the various methods by which the specific recommendations of the Budget Committee of the seventh session of the General Conference had been incorporated. In passing, he mentioned that for easy reference the paragraphs of each department had been serially numbered in the right-hand column of each page; the delegates would find it easy to refer to all three versions by reference to these paragraph numbers.

(31) In conclusion, Mr. Rao assured the Committee that, although various details were not given in the draft programme and budget, every care had been taken to ensure that the estimates were reasonable and accurate; the Secretariat would be only too glad to provide any additional information.

(32) After thanking Mr. Rao, the CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to hold the general discussion on the draft programme and budget, reference being made to the Executive Board's Report on the Remodelling of Unesco's Future Programme (document 8C/PRG/13).

(33) On behalf of the United States Government, Miss LAISE thanked the Government of Uruguay for its hospitality. Also on behalf of her Government, and as a friend of William Hodson, Miss Laise expressed sorrow at his death, but confidence in those responsible for carrying on his work.

(34) With regard to the draft programme and budget, the task of the Advisory Committee and of the Conference would be made much easier by the improvement in its presentation and content. The United States delegation regretted, however, that the calculation of this higher budgetary level had been based on estimated contributions forthcoming from new Member States. She agreed with Mr. Maheu that, in examining the work plans, the Committee should keep its discussion fairly general, querying proposed plans in the light of past experience and the need for concentration of efforts. The Committee should avoid dwelling on detail, since experience had shown that the Secretariat, in implementing a two-year programme, must retain flexibility and be able to change details in the course of the two years. In its discussion, the Committee should take account of the previous recommendations of the Budget Committee, the Executive Board's report on the remodelling of the programme and the Auditor's comments. Some matters of expenditure would, however, have to be considered, and the United States delegation wished the Secretariat to supply, if possible, the following information:

(1) a chart containing up-to-date information on surpluses;

(2) a chart showing 1954 obligations for the first three quarters of the year;

(3) a statement of actual 1952 expenditures by object of expenditure;

(4) a chart showing the number of established posts and their level and indicating how many had been filled;

(5) estimates for draft resolutions and supplementary items as soon as possible.

(35) She hoped that, as a result of its deliberations, the Advisory Committee would submit a report to the Commissions, emphasizing the major programme and budget issues, so as to facilitate the work and decisions of the Commissions.

(36) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) associated himself with the deep regret expressed at the death of Mr. Hodson. He had been a pillar of the budget and would be greatly missed. The delegate of India also warmly thanked the Government of Uruguay for its hospitality.

(37) The Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 was briefer and more intelligible to Member States and represented a real effort to meet their needs more effectively. Its salient feature was the division into permanent services and special activities; as far as the underdeveloped countries were concerned, it was the series of major projects designed to meet the needs of Member States which should become the pivot of Unesco's activities. Unesco had catered long enough for the needs of the intellectual aristocracy and should henceforth concentrate on the needs and aspirations of the common people, the majority of whom were still steeped in ignorance. It was necessary to form an effective system of priorities, calculated to achieve tangible results in the foreseeable future and, with that end in view, the Government of India had sent a series of draft resolutions

indicating a number of basic tasks. The following questions, for example, were considered to be of primary importance: the establishment of an International Educational Development Fund, research on the utilization of nuclear energy, and the spreading of knowledge of Eastern culture in the West.

(38) In conclusion, the delegate of India emphasized the need for Member States to make larger resources available to Unesco. The Organization would not survive unless its basic purposes could be fulfilled within a reasonable time, and that could not be done without a larger budget. An appeal should therefore be made to Member States to divert money used for destructive purposes towards building up the constructive activities of Unesco.

(39) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) asked the Committee's forgiveness for his late arrival, which had been due to circumstances beyond his control. He had been detained by the Minister of Education to discuss Unesco business.

(40) Turning to the proposed programme and budget, he recalled that he had himself taken part in the preparatory work for it in the Executive Board and, broadly speaking, found it acceptable. He approved the innovations which the Board had made in it. The proposed programme and budget had been drawn up when Unesco was passing through a period of difficulty and to some extent of financial crisis. The Director-General had remarked on one occasion that they might be "spreading the butter on too much bread"; what they were now doing was to reduce the amount of bread to get a better and smoother spreading of the butter. Unesco's suit might, at the moment, perhaps be on the tight side and not a perfect fit, but it was such that the Organization could wear it without sacrifice of dignity or effectiveness.

(41) Mr. Secco Ellauri supported the requests made by the representative of the United States of America. He drew attention to the excellent work done by the Secretariat, in co-operation with the Executive Board, in introducing in the draft programme the changes already mentioned.

(42) He was in favour of the method suggested by the Chairman to ensure the effectiveness of the Committee's proceedings, namely, to begin with a general discussion and then go on to a more detailed study.

(43) The speaker wished to associate himself with the tributes paid by other members to the memory of the late William Hodson, who had met a tragic end in the Shannon accident. Mr. Hodson had combined drive and great ability with exceptional personal modesty. The circumstances of his death made the loss of him more grievous still.

(44) Mr. Secco Ellauri thanked the Chairman for his friendly references to the Uruguayan authorities and people. However, they were still only on the threshold of the Conference: Uruguay's attentions and courtesies would increase steadily as the work of the Conference progressed. The holding of the General Conference in Montevideo was a great honour for Uruguay. And there was evidence that Unesco's presence in the capital had already begun to yield fruit. In no more than a single month, there had been a notable increase in awareness of Unesco's principles among the general public. The Conference would undoubtedly make the aims and objects of the Organization more widely known. Lastly, the speaker explained to delegates that they would only remain foreigners to the extent that they themselves wished; by the people of Uruguay they would quickly be accepted as friends and brothers. As time went by, these links would grow stronger, and, as Unesco and Uruguay got to know one another better, a true affection would develop between them.

(45) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thanked the Committee for the honour it had done him in electing him Rapporteur. He expressed the gratitude of the French delegation to the Government of Uruguay for the generous hospitality it was extending to the General Conference in Montevideo. He also associated himself with the tributes paid to William Hodson and suggested that a message be sent to Mrs. Hodson conveying the Committee's condolences.

(46) As regards the proposed programme and budget, Mr. Cabouat said that the Director-General and the Secretariat were to be congratulated on having produced a document which, as a working tool, would prove far superior to those of previous years. The French delegation was prepared to approve the main lines of the programme proposed in that document and noted with satisfaction the reduction in the proportion of administrative costs to programme expenditure. However, in the view of the French Government, the projects both at the higher and at the present budgetary level should be examined on their merits and not in the light of the more or less extensive additional resources that might become available to the Organization through the accession of new Member States. The total figures for each of the two budgetary levels should, in his opinion, be regarded simply as guide marks, between which the total figure of the budget voted could be determined.

(47) With regard to the sub-division of the programme into two sections, relating to general activities and special activities, the speaker pointed out that, whilst Unesco might use two different methods to attain its ends, both methods should serve the same ideal. Thus, in the final count, the object of both general and special activities should be the same - to raise the cultural level of all the countries in the world. This fundamental unity of all Unesco's activities should, in his view, be strongly emphasized, and close relations should be established between the officials or services concerned with those in either category.

(48) Mr. Cabouat drew particular attention to the help Unesco could secure from international non-governmental organizations towards the execution of its programme. To his mind, such organizations should be still more closely associated, not only in the permanent activities of Unesco but also in those projects designed to afford direct aid to Member States.

(49) Without wishing for the moment to go into the detail of the proposed programme, the French delegation greatly regretted that no provision was made for carrying further the investigations undertaken in earlier years into ways in which the subjects taught in schools could contribute to international understanding. These investigations had aroused the liveliest interest in educational circles and it was extremely regrettable that they were thus being broken off.

(50) Having thanked Mr. Cabouat for his statement, the CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to consider its programme of work. He tentatively suggested that it meet in the mornings from 10 a. m. to 12.45 p. m. and in the afternoons from 3.30 to 7 p. m. In view of the Committee's heavy agenda, he emphasized the need for punctuality.

(51) The times of meeting suggested by the Chairman were approved.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p. m.

# SECOND MEETING

*1 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION** (continued)

(1) Discussion being resumed on Item 7.2 of the Agenda, the CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. Sommerfelt.

(2) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) thanked the Committee for the honour done to his country in electing him Vice-Chairman. He associated himself with the reference made at the morning meeting to Mr. Hodson.
(3) The Norwegian Government agreed on the whole with the new form in which the programme had been drafted and with the programme itself. While wholeheartedly in support of the Indian delegate as to the necessity of helping underdeveloped countries, he recalled that Unesco's other aims in the field of international collaboration should not be overlooked. He also supported the view of the French delegate on the necessity for collaboration between the important non-governmental organizations, especially in the fields of science and culture.
(4) With regard to subventions, he thought that it would be wise for the Committee to advise the General Conference as to amounts, since, if no limit were fixed, discussion on totals would be duplicated.

(5) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that, owing to the limitations of the budget, it would be necessary to compromise on the programme. The fields of activity would have to be limited but not to a point at which the aims and purpose of Unesco were defeated. The Indian delegate had advocated concentrating on the masses in underdeveloped countries. It was obvious that Unesco must work in those countries but it was also necessary for it to work amongst educated peoples.
(6) Referring to the remarks made by the French delegate, he agreed that Unesco could not be a Ministry of Education for the whole world. It could advise countries on education but could not do their work for them. It should attempt to make underdeveloped countries aware of their own responsibility in developing culture amongst their people.

(7) There being no further speakers at this stage, the CHAIRMAN asked the Committee how it wished to proceed in its examination of the programme and budget. The delegate of the United States, he added, had already made suggestions in that matter.

(8) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat would probably be able to supply on the following day the information requested that morning by the United States delegation. As regards the order of the discussion, the directors of Departments were prepared to adopt whatever order was preferred by the Committee. However, they thought it advisable to begin with the programme of the Education Department, since that would, in their view, afford the best means of understanding the way in which various aspects of the programme had been linked up.

(9) The Committee agreed to begin with a detailed examination of the Chapter on Education and then to decide in what order the other Chapters should be taken.

(10) The CHAIRMAN said that the question raised by the Norwegian delegate on consideration of the budget total came within the competence of the Committee in its advisory capacity, but he suggested that such consideration should be postponed until a scrutiny had been made of the budget proposals.

(11) Agreed.

**CHAPTER 1: EDUCATION** (document 8C/5)

(12) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Deputy Director of the Department of Education should be asked to give a brief account of what the department was proposing to do and that members of the Committee should then be asked to comment generally on his statement. Following this general discussion, the Committee would discuss each proposal in detail.

(13) Agreed.

(14) Mr. GUITON (Deputy Director, Department of Education) first drew the Committee's attention to document 8C/5 Corr., page 7, which contained a correction to the chapter on education, paragraph 94 (English text only). He went on to describe the broad outline of the education programme, in the light of the explanations given by the Assistant Director-General on the sub-division of each chapter into two main sections: general activities and special activities. In the previous programme, a distinction had been made between general activities, which were grouped under the heading "improvement of education through the exchange of information", and activities relating to "extension of education". That distinction had been discontinued, as being purely artificial: exchange of information was necessary to the extension of education no less than to its improvement. In the programme for 1953-54 two separate aims had been assigned to special activities: extension of education and education for living in a world community. That arrangement had been somewhat illogical and had done little to assist co-ordination between different projects undertaken in pursuit of both these aims. Fundamental education, for instance, seemed to be treated as a matter apart from education for living in a world community. Adult education appeared to relate exclusively to the first aim, and work with youth to the second. Such a separation was in line neither with Unesco's chief concerns nor with educational practice. In Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the one aim prescribed (that laid down in paragraph 2) was the extension and improvement of education so as to promote international understanding and co-operation. In the proposed programme for 1955-56, which had been planned with that sole aim in view, the only distinction made was between two forms of education: pre-school and school education on the one hand, and education out of school on the other. In each of these two sections, mention was made of long-term objectives and short-term objectives (1955-56).

(15) The budget estimates for general activities - about $700,000 - amounted to one-fifth of the total sum provided for education, and a little over a quarter of the estimates for special activities. The latter included, in each of the above-mentioned fields of action, an important project the cost of which was estimated at about a million dollars for the two years: development and improvement of school systems, and fundamental education.

(16) The CHAIRMAN congratulated the Secretariat on the clear presentation of document 8C/5. In the absence of a member of the Executive Board at the Committee's meeting, he drew attention to a general remark by the Board in paragraph 11 of document 8C/5 Add. 1 and suggested that a member of the Board might be asked to enlarge on it at a later date. He called for observations on Chapter 1 as a whole.

(17) Mr. LEE (United States of America) praised the Secretariat for its presentation of Chapter 1. He thought that the projects to be included or excluded were also commendable and welcomed the emphasis given in the document to the programme on education.

(18) He drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that a meeting was at present taking place in Paris on the question of education for international understanding and co-operation for living in a world community and wondered whether the Committee would not be well advised to postpone decisions on the question until it was seen whether any decisions were taken on it in Paris.

(19) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat hoped soon to receive the report of the Committee of Experts which was then meeting in Paris. However, that report could not reach Montevideo before 11 November. The Committee could therefore decide either to postpone consideration of that particular question or to have a preliminary discussion, subject to a more detailed study in the light of the experts' recommendations.

(20) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed with its examination of the question, reserving the right to return to it if necessary.

(21) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) welcomed the introduction to the chapter given by Mr. Guiton. It expressed clearly and categorically what he himself had tried to say that morning. He had not intended that Unesco should be a super Ministry of Education nor had he meant to suggest that Member States should sit back and expect Unesco to do their work for them. He had meant that Unesco should act as a catalyst, that it should give help to all Member States when required and that it should popularize the Declaration of Human Rights by implementing it.

(22) In his opinion, Chapter 1 was sound in principle. If it could be effectively carried out, great progress would be made. He welcomed the scheme for assisting national fundamental education centres. With regard to the subvention to the International Association of Universities, he understood that members were recruited from individual universities and wondered whether it would not be better to grant a subvention to an association which recruited members from assimilated bodies.

(23) The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Junankar to remind the Committee of this point when the projects were discussed in detail.

(24) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought that the terms "in school" and "out of school" were not sufficiently precise and asked whether the term "school-age education" could not be substituted for the term "in school".

(25) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that fundamental education was also intended for school-age children who had no opportunity of attending school. In that case, education was "out of school" for school-age children. In his opinion, it was very difficult to work out an entirely satisfactory terminology.

(26) The CHAIRMAN appreciated the preoccupation of the delegate of Israel and suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to bear in mind that greater precision in terminology would make for greater understanding by Member States.

(27) Mr. CABOUAT (France) stated that the French delegation was satisfied with the efforts made by Unesco for the promotion of co-operation with non-governmental organizations. He noted that the subventions in the Education chapter had increased from $32,000 in 1954 to $103,500 in 1955 and in 1956. Mr. Cabouat thought, however, that international and even national associations of teachers could play a yet more important part in the implementation of Unesco's programme. The French Government noted with satisfaction that Unesco proposed to continue its subventions to the Institutes for Education and for Youth in Germany, which were also receiving financial support from France. Mr. Cabouat thought the time had come to make those institutes effective instruments of international co-operation by granting them the necessary assistance. The French delegation was satisfied with the programme submitted, in so far as fundamental education was concerned. In regard to the International Advisory Committee on the School Curriculum, that body's responsibilities should be more clearly defined, and in that connexion use might be made of the example offered by the International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences programme. Mr. Cabouat reminded the meeting that in the morning he had already explained his delegation's opinion with regard to education for international understanding. The French delegation intended to ask for larger funds to be allocated, particularly for the promotion of co-operation with youth movements, trade unions and teachers.

(28) There being no further comments of a general nature on Chapter 1 of document 8C/5, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee proceed to a detailed study of the contents of the Chapter.

Project 1.11 (document 8C/5)

(29) The CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. Guiton for introductory remarks.

(30) Mr. GUITON (Deputy Director, Department of Education) mentioned that document 8C/PRG/19, which was to be distributed very shortly, contained a detailed account of the financial situation of Unesco's Institutes in Germany.

(31) The CHAIRMAN called for comments on paragraphs 15-19.

(32) Mr. BOW (Canada) remarked that from the document it appeared that there had been no clear evaluation of the comparative values of projects as a whole or as between the various chapters of the programme. After consideration of the programme and budget as a whole, the Canadian Government would like to see a priority allocated to each project in each chapter. Such an allocation would be of great assistance to the General Conference in making decisions on the various projects. The indispensable integration between departments and the chapters of the programme made it necessary to co-ordinate the programme carefully.

(33) The project under discussion provided an example of a lack of evaluation and of the need to allocate a priority. The Canadian Government had no clear conception of the value of each project and was unable to make any considered decision with regard to them. Criteria existed for the allocation of subventions, one of which was that an organization should be truly international in character. The Canadian Government had misgivings about the truly international character of some of the organizations to which it was proposed to grant subventions. While realizing the limitations of the Secretariat in the matter of its programme and budget, he wondered whether the criteria used were always satisfied and whether the proposed activities were of immediate value to Unesco in the field of international understanding. In each case, full consideration should be given to whether the organization in question met the established criteria.

(34) The CHAIRMAN said that the two questions now raised were whether or not the Committee thought it would be desirable to allocate priorities to the various projects and what were the present criteria governing the allocation of subventions. With regard to the first question, he thought that a useful purpose might be served if the Committee allocated priorities to the different projects, though only experience would tell whether a system of priorities was practicable. The second question might be answered by asking for information from the Secretariat during the detailed discussion of each project.

(35) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the delegate of Canada had raised two important questions of general interest. With regard to the desired justification, he pointed out that delegates would find in the Director-General's Report for 1953-54 precise information on the assistance the organizations receiving subventions had given Unesco in the execution of its programme, and in document 8C/ADM/20, full particulars regarding each of the organizations - its membership, headquarters, aims, amount of the subventions granted and use made of those subventions. The latter document was intended mainly to assist the discussion of item 9.6.2 of the agenda: quadrennial review by the Executive Board of the employment of subventions (1950-53). The Secretariat could also supply delegates with additional information on any particular organization. The Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations, which had just been mentioned, was a confederation of several international organizations with a total of four million members from all parts of the world.

(36) In regard to the question of priorities, the Assistant Director-General thought it impossible to take a decision during the first examination of the projects. The Committee could reject projects which it considered unsatisfactory, but it could not assess the relative value of each project until it had studied the whole programme.

(37) The CHAIRMAN thought that the suggestion of the Assistant Director-General was wise and provided the only practicable solution. At the end of its detailed discussion, the Committee should recommend projects for higher or less high priority.

(38) Mr. BOW (Canada) said that, as the Committee would be unable to allocate priority by evaluation, the suggestion of the Assistant Director-General would meet his point. The Canadian Government felt that a grading of priorities should be a standard operation.
(39) The introduction to document 8C/ADM/20 provided an example of the point he had made with regard to subventions and criteria. It showed that the criteria were very wide and ambiguous and that it would be very difficult to decide the value and nature of an organization. The wording of the document was ambiguous and vague. He also wondered if attention was being paid to whether certain non-governmental organizations would gradually become self-supporting.

(40) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) was of the opinion that the term "international" should not be used. Unesco might be interested in putting forward ideas in a certain part of the world and might want to assist an organization to put forward those ideas although that organization was not of an international nature. That had happened in the case of the Unesco institutes in Germany.

(41) The CHAIRMAN asked the Assistant Director-General to remind the Committee of the general policy on criteria.

(42) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Administrative Commission had to consider, under item 9.6.2. of the agenda, the employment of subventions during the past four years, and also, under item 9.6.3, the directives concerning relations with international non-governmental organizations. That question had already been given most careful consideration at two sessions of the Executive Board. He thought that the members of the Committee would wish to study those documents and take them into account during their discussions.
With regard to the criteria governing the allocation of subventions, the Assistant Director-General said that, for the first time, the membership of the organizations receiving subventions was indicated in the proposed programme and budget. It was therefore possible to ascertain their international character. The second criterion concerned the services rendered to Unesco, either directly, or because the activities of the organization in question made it unnecessary for Unesco to take action in a particular field. With regard to the incomes of the organizations, he felt sure that many private associations of intellectuals giving valuable assistance to Unesco would never be entirely self-supporting. Any reduction in the subventions they received from Unesco would be liable to destroy their efficiency and Unesco would, in the long run, have nothing to gain from taking such a decision. Admittedly, some organizations were better endowed, but it has to be remembered that, apart from any consideration of financial needs, the Constitution expressly stated that Unesco should encourage co-operation among the nations in all branches of intellectual activity.
The Assistant Director-General thought that the Secretariat had scrupulously applied the criteria in force and that it was for the Administrative Commission and not for the Committee to consider whether they should be altered. Lastly, he said that the Secretariat had reached the conclusion that, for a subvention to be effective, it should amount to at least $2,000; any smaller sum was liable to have no more than a token value.

(43) The CHAIRMAN said that the remarks of the Assistant Director-General were very useful and that, as it would be impossible for the Committee to go through document 8C/ADM/20, he suggested that discussion should be resumed.

(44) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) said that, in connexion with the allocation of subventions, a distinction had to be made between the criterion adopted for the award of subventions and the application of that criterion. The criterion might be satisfactory but its application unsatisfactory. As had been explained by the Assistant Director-General, there was a criterion according to which subventions could be granted to organizations that had a spiritual kinship with Unesco and were engaged in activities in keeping with its universal character. Organizations covering only regional or national fields of interest to Unesco were also included in that criterion and deserved to be granted subventions.
(45) There was yet another criterion, enabling subventions to be granted to institutions through which Unesco put its programme into effect at less expense than it would do by carrying out the activities itself. The aim here was to lighten Unesco's task and to organize its work more efficiently and economically.
(46) A danger that might arise out of the Canadian delegate's proposal was that subventions might be granted and later withdrawn. Subventions should be allocated for a sufficient length of time if they were to yield useful results for Unesco. It was unthinkable that any State should withdraw subventions from the concessionnaire of any service so long as that service was maintained.
(47) Another matter for consideration was the application of the criterion to existing situations. It was the Committee's responsibility to exercise financial supervision and, with the utmost vigilance, to ensure that the sums granted were used in accordance with the criterion governing each particular case.

(48) Miss LAISE (United States of America) shared the opinion of the Canadian delegate on the question of the method used to determine projects for the programme and suggested that the Committee should call the attention of the Director-General to their dissatisfaction on this point and express the wish that he should institute a work programme which would eliminate projects shown by the value of their past activities to be unproductive, and which would advise governments on the usefulness of projects. The United Nations had instituted a committee to undertake such a task and on its basis the Secretary-General had made constructive proposals to the Economic and Social Council for eliminating activities and rationalizing work in the economic and social fields. That initiative had been welcomed by governments. It should be possible for Unesco to make a similar self-evaluation. She concluded by asking whether it was to be assumed that all the organizations

to which it was proposed to give subventions were above mediocrity level.

(49) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) after replying in the affirmative to Miss Laise's last question, said that he could not help being a little alarmed by the remarks of the United States delegate. The Economic and Social Council had indeed taken action to lighten work connected with reports and documentary studies, but it had taken no decisions concerning subventions. Furthermore, as the delegate of France had pointed out at the morning meeting, Unesco was bound, under its Constitution, to encourage co-operation among the nations in all branches of intellectual activity. The award of subventions had proved one of the least costly ways of taking action in that respect. The Economic and Social Council had, of course, granted priority to the development of the underdeveloped countries. The General Conference of Unesco, at its last session, had also recognized that priority, and the Secretariat had endeavoured to maintain it in the proposed programme. But the speaker questioned whether there was any ground for supposing that greater assistance would be given to the underdeveloped countries by abolishing or reducing subventions to international organizations. On the contrary, he thought that one of the best services that could be rendered to the underdeveloped countries was to make use of subventions - many of them small - for the purpose of bringing together intellectuals of these countries, who were only too often working in isolation and encouraging them to join the large existing organizations. It might even be possible to make more systematic and widespread use of subventions to help intellectuals in the underdeveloped countries to attend international congresses of specialists. Thus, any proposal to reduce subventions would run counter to Unesco's aims. As the whole question of subventions was to be considered by the Administrative Commission, it seemed a little rash for the Committee to put forward any recommendations at that stage.

(50) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, although it might not be inappropriate for the Committee to make recommendations to the Administrative Commission on the question of subventions, it would be better to discuss such recommendations after a detailed study of the programme.

(51) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that the discussion should be postponed in order that members of the Committee might study document 8C/ADM/20. He proposed that the Committee should proceed to discuss the programme item by item.

(52) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that she was willing to postpone discussion if the Committee would agree to come back to this point later.

Paragraphs 20-22 - Chapter 1 of document 8C/5

(53) No comments.

Paragraphs 23-25 - Chapter 1 of document 8C/5

(54) Miss LAISE (United States of America) suggested that, to speed up work, the Committee should consider the section as a whole up to and including paragraph 62.

(55) In reply to a question from Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), Mr. GUITON (Deputy Director, Department of Education) explained that the International Federation of Organizations for School Correspondence and Exchanges was carrying out work which would devolve upon Unesco if the Federation did not exist. The sum of $3,000 allocated to it did not reflect the value of the services rendered, but indicated the importance Unesco attached to them.

(56) The CHAIRMAN wondered whether the payment involved here was not rather by way of contract.

(57) Mr. GUITON (Deputy Director, Department of Education) said that it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between a special service requested of an organization that was engaged in many other activities and services rendered by an organization that existed for a single purpose. In the case under consideration, a subvention seemed to be involved.

(58) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) pointed out that, at its seventh session, the General Conference had asked the Director-General to keep funds for subventions and contracts separate. Subventions were given to non-governmental organizations to carry out programmes of their own which were of interest to Unesco, whereas contracts were placed with organizations to do specific work for and on behalf of Unesco.

(59) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) enquired whether the subvention under discussion fell under the heading of contracts.

(60) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the subvention contributed towards the general expenses of the Federation's work. IFOSCE was an organization performing useful work in a field of interest to Unesco.

(61) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway), referring to paragraphs 45-47 of Chapter 1 of document 8C/5, concerning the International Association of Universities, asked whether the subvention of 14,000 dollars was the amount requested by the Association and whether the Association was satisfied with the amount.

(62) Mr. GUITON (Deputy Director, Department of Education) thought that the organization in question was satisfied.

(63) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that organizations usually asked for more than they finally received. In the case under consideration, the amount proposed seemed to be a reasonable compromise between the amount requested and Unesco's resources.

(64) Speaking as delegate of Australia, the CHAIRMAN

wished to know why the Secretariat proposed the same subventions for each of the years 1955 and 1956, whilst paragraph 47 stated that the General Conference of the Association would involve additional expenditure.

(65) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the conference would be held in 1955, but its proceedings would not be published until 1956. If necessary, a transfer would be made from one year to the next, in accordance with the financial regulations in force.

(66) Miss LAISE (United States of America) considered that throughout the section no new subventions were justified, and moved that, with the exception of the subvention for the Unesco institutes in Germany, proposals for the granting of new subventions should be suppressed.

(67) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that Miss Laise's suggestion amounted to a request to maintain the status quo within each Department in the matter of subventions. The different Departments had not, however, all developed their subventions policy at the same pace. Some, like the Natural Sciences Department, had resorted extensively to that method from the outset. The Department of Education, on the contrary, had lagged behind in that respect. The Director-General had thought it advisable gradually to alter the situation, as it would be regrettable to have fewer contacts with teachers than with scientists. The Secretariat proposed accordingly to allocate to the Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations an annual subvention of $2,000, equal to that granted to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

(68) Miss LAISE (United States of America) recalled that she had said no new subventions except in the case of the Unesco institutes in Germany. If the principle of selection was to be followed, it would have to take into consideration the overall need. Available information did not justify taking on new subventions. The question was not one of justice but of obtaining the best results.

(69) The CHAIRMAN said that the United States proposal was to suppress the subventions proposed in paragraphs 34, 37, 40 and 54 of Chapter 1 of document 8C/5.

(70) Mr. CABOUAT (France) noted that the United States delegation's proposal was that no new subventions should be granted to organizations, even though they were serving the main purposes of Unesco. In the case under consideration, there were two organizations which, although they were pursuing similar aims, would be given different treatment, if Miss Laise's proposal were adopted.

(71) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that it was really a matter of criteria. No new subventions should be allocated unless there was adequate justification for them. It appeared that there was no real justification in the two cases mentioned, either because they did not offer the best method of carrying out the work or because their work duplicated or overlapped that of other organizations already receiving subventions.

(72) Mr. CABOUAT (France) supposed that the Secretariat had acted on information justifying the new subventions proposed.

(73) Mr. GUITON (Deputy Director, Department of Education) pointed out the difficulty of ascertaining which were the really specialized organizations in the field of education. There were, of course, large numbers of groups having some concern with education. The Secretariat had considered it essential to keep in close touch with teachers and particularly with those responsible for adult education. It had thought it necessary to recognize the services rendered to Unesco by the International Federation of Children's Communities, whose work lay in a field in which Unesco had, at the outset, taken a special interest. Lastly, the International Association of Vocational Guidance was in a position to give valuable assistance in connexion with development of the underdeveloped countries.

(74) Mr. BOW (Canada) seconded the United States motion. He had found the discussion very interesting as it had illustrated the vagueness with which subventions were allocated. It was for this reason that he supported the motion.

(75) Mr. CABOUAT (France) presumed that the programme was the outcome of detailed study; it had already been twice considered by the Executive Board. He thought it premature to take an immediate decision on Miss Laise's proposal. He himself would vote against that proposal, and he regretted that a vote should be taken in such circumstances.

(76) The CHAIRMAN said that the decision lay with the Committee. If the United States delegate did not withdraw her motion, he would put to the vote that the Committee should recommend in its report that the proposals for subventions contained in paragraphs 34, 37, 40 and 54 should be suppressed.

(77) Miss LAISE (United States of America) in reply to the French delegate, said that she was prepared to postpone bringing her motion to the vote until later.

(78) Mr. CABOUAT (France) enquired whether the adoption of Miss Laise's proposal should be interpreted as a decision of principle, applicable to all chapters of the programme. No specific criticism had actually been levelled against any particular organization.

(79) The CHAIRMAN explained that the motion put forward by the United States delegate referred only to the four subventions contained in paragraphs 34, 37, 40 and 54 of Chapter 1 of document 8C/5.

(80) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) reminded the Committee that the whole question of subventions was to be discussed by another body.

(81) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States motion, which was rejected by 2 votes in favour, 6 against and 1 abstention.

(82) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) thought that proposals such as that put forward by the United States representative should be accompanied by figures showing the cost involved in the previous and present budgets and the financial repercussions of acceptance or rejection of the proposal. All such suggestions should be assessed in that way, so that their financial importance could be more clearly realized.

(83) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the Committee that a general table of proposed subventions was contained in Annex I of the Proposed Programme and Budget.

(84) He agreed with Mr. Secco Ellauri that any new proposal should be accompanied by exact figures showing its budgetary repercussions.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p. m.

# THIRD MEETING

*2 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN welcomed the delegates of Indonesia and the United Kingdom, and asked Mr. Maheu to reply to some of the questions put by members of the Committee the previous afternoon.

(2) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that he would not attempt to reply forthwith to the points raised the day before by various delegations concerning the proposed programme and budget. He would prefer to give explanations of concrete cases when they arose during consideration of the document, so as to make it clear, for instance, that the difference between the present and higher budget levels was not based on any idea of priorities and to show how the Director-General had intended Sections I and II to be closely linked and carefully balanced. Of the five specific points raised by the United States delegation, the first four were answered in a document then being distributed. Information on the fifth had been requested in Paris.

(3) He also drew attention to document 8C/PRG/21, containing the observations of non-governmental organizations having consultative status with Unesco on the proposed programme for 1955-56. It was the first time that those organizations had been so closely associated by the Director-General in the preparation of the programme; their representatives had been convened to two meetings, one at an early stage in the drafting of the programme, and the other in September last, when the programme had reached its final stage; the document before the Conference was the report of the latter meeting.

(4) In conclusion, the Assistant Director-General proposed, as an experiment, discussing fundamental education projects irrespective of the programme chapter in which they were included (Education, Social Sciences, Cultural Activities, Mass Communication, Exchange of Persons). That method would bring out the close interdependence of the programme chapters. Of course, after discussing the fundamental education projects as a whole, each would be taken up in its appropriate chapter, so as not to interfere with the inner cohesion of each of the programme chapters. The Assistant Director-General emphasized that it would be an experiment, an exceptional measure, but one worth trying out.

(5) With reference to document 8C/PRG/21, containing the observations of non-governmental organizations on the draft programme, the CHAIRMAN asked the Secretary to draw the Committee's attention to points relating specifically to subjects under discussion, as they arose, and also to inform the meeting of any comments made on them by the Executive Board. He fully supported the proposal by the Assistant Director-General that the projects on Fundamental Education should be followed through the various chapters of the budget document and requested the Secretariat to prepare a document showing the points which would have to be taken up.

(6) The Chairman opened the discussion of Project 1.12: Clearing House and Advisory Services. He asked the Committee whether it would address its remarks to the project as a whole, or whether it would prefer to split it up into its three sections: the introduction and section A; section B; section C.

(7) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked for a fuller explanation of the proposed expenditure shown under higher level estimates in paragraph 63.

(8) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that this expenditure referred to staff costs. It was not possible to distinguish

between staff time on the present, and on the higher budgetary levels, but a certain part of staff costs had been attributed to the latter.

(9) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) drew attention to paragraph 402, where two additional posts were mentioned, and asked whether it was to be inferred that they were in the higher level.

(10) Mr. RAO (Acting Head, Bureau of Programme and Budget) referred to the staff tables given in paragraphs 411-414. An attempt had been made to attribute a certain percentage of staff time to the present level, and another to the higher.
(11) The two additional posts mentioned were without reference to the budgetary level. Throughout the document as a whole 10% of staff time had been attributed to the higher level.

(12) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that there were projects in the higher budgetary level elsewhere in the Chapter which, if accepted, would have to be serviced by the clearing house.

(13) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) wished to know how any savings on staff could be effected if the higher level were not adopted.

(14) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) found it difficult to see how, if the higher level were not voted, 10% of a staff member could be dismissed.

(15) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) was glad that point had been raised. When the Conference had finished examining the programme and budget, there would not be a present and a higher level budget but only one integrated budget. Whatever reductions in the proposed staff posts might be necessary, they could not be foreseen until that stage had been reached.

(16) Project 1.12 was approved.

(17) The CHAIRMAN opened discussion of project 1.21, the development and improvement of school systems and school teaching (paragraphs 112 to 142), and asked Mr. Elvin to introduce the subject.

(18) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Director-General had felt it was time that Unesco, so often asked to encourage a particular branch of studies, looked into the balance of the work of schoolchildren as a whole.

(19) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that his delegation regarded this section as one of the most important of the entire programme. It was essential that the Director-General should know the views of the delegations on the way in which the three resolutions should be carried out.
(20) The United States delegation had some criticisms to offer with regard to terminology, procedures and subjects for international conferences, which were too broad in scope.
(21) He suggested that Member States or groups of Member States should be invited to take more resolute measures to help themselves, by making long-range plans and setting schedules for the achievement of specific goals, with sufficient precision for the Director-General to take them into account as criteria in his extension of assistance.

(22) The CHAIRMAN asked for further comments of a general nature on the section under discussion.

(23) Mr. BOW (Canada) agreed with the remarks by Mr. Lee but was opposed to the implication in the draft budget that technical aid to Member States could only be given if the higher budgetary level were adopted.

(24) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that an exchange of views would be more useful when sections B and C were being discussed, but he could forthwith assure the United States delegate that the Secretariat shared his views on the substance of the problem and thought that international assistance should not relieve States of the need for taking action at the national level. International action was intended to supplement, promote and co-ordinate national activities, but not to take their place, and the more carefully those activities were planned, the easier it would be to integrate international action with them. Speaking to the delegate of Canada, the Assistant Director-General explained that it was along those lines that the Secretariat had planned s technical aid to Member States, auxiliary action pending on proper planning. That was the very reason why that project had been shown under the higher budgetary level, like all other technical aid activities, which accounted for 60% of that level. The project had been placed on that level, not because of its degree of importance but because it presuppose planning. The distinction thus established was purely one of logic. That also was why the first two resolutions had been placed on the present level and the third on the higher budgetary level. The question of priorities was entirely unaffected and the Assistant Director-General pointed out in that connexion that the Canadian delegate's question had been answered by the United States delegate, when he had expressed the view that all the activities in question should be given priority, though he might subsequently indicate which projects he regarded as less important.

(25) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) had understood that the idea of dividing the programme into two budgetary levels had been adopted in order to avoid the difficult task of deciding what to cut out, if a lower budget were voted. In that case, items on the higher level could be disposed of, and the Conference would still have a complete programme before it. But if, once again, the programme, on a higher or lower budgetary level, was to form an integrated whole, it would be faced with the same problem as in the past. The United Kingdom approved the plan formulated by the Assistant Director-General, of dividing the programme into three sections: continuing services, special activities carried out by Unesco, and technical aid to Member States, but maintained that the division should not be tied to present and higher budgetary levels as they had been.

(26) The CHAIRMAN stressed the importance of that point, which would have a bearing on the discussions of the next ten days.

(27) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the meeting that in the United Kingdom delegate's absence he had set forth the Director-General's views in his introductory statement and tried to show along what lines the latter had planned his programme; he had also drawn attention to the fact that the Executive Board had unanimously approved that stand and had regarded it as a perfectly sound interpretation of the General Conference's instructions. According to the Director-General, the programme was a single whole; the two budget levels did not correspond to different degrees of priority. Consequently, if the budget passed by the General Conference should happen to be below the Director-General's total reductions (i.e. total of the two budgetary levels) and if it were therefore found necessary to cut the programme, such cuts could not be automatically made at the higher level. Admittedly, that concept was opposed to the view adopted for the 1953-54 programme, according to which the higher level carried priority B. But that did not mean that the Director-General had misinterpreted the intentions of the working party set up by the General Conference at its seventh session to study the future programme and development of Unesco. Far from it. Indeed, when selecting certain items which might be adopted if the budget were increased, the working party had clearly chosen the most important projects, those that would be given super-priority. The Director-General, in declaring that the projects on the higher level were at least as important as the others, had thus been true to the spirit of the working party's report. The General Conference and the Committee would no doubt be obliged to make a choice; if, however, they were not given a chance of making a choice and using their discretion, they might rightly feel that they had been faced with an accomplished fact. It was out of deference to the General Conference and, more especially its Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, that the Director-General had made a point of granting them greater latitude for establishing the priorities to be given to the various projects at the two budgetary levels.

(28) The CHAIRMAN considered that a discussion of the theoretical question arising out of a difference of interpretation between the United Kingdom delegation on the one hand, and the Director-General and the Executive Board on the other, would not be fruitful at that stage. The Committee would have to propose its own order of priorities. He suggested that it should first commend certain activities and draw attention to those that were less useful, and then go over the programme again in order to eliminate some of them, if necessary.

(29) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) wanted to know, if the programme was looked upon as a whole, what was the point of dividing it into present and higher levels at all.

(30) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the meeting that, whilst the Conference had requested the Director-General to draw a distinction between two budgetary levels, it was nowhere said that those levels had to correspond to different degrees of priority. However, a reading of the working party's report showed that the higher level had been reserved for the most important projects. For his part, Mr. Maheu did not see why an expansion of the programme should consist exclusively of secondary projects. For all those reasons, he felt justified in saying that the Director-General, faced with ambiguous instructions, had acted perfectly correctly.

(31) The CHAIRMAN thought it logical that, if the budget were voted at the present level, the projects actually adopted should be those put forward by the Director-General at the lower level.

(32) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) emphasized that, in any case, the Committee had to make some choice, and, as the competent authority, to establish priorities which it was not for the Secretariat to prejudge, the main function of the General Conference being precisely to discuss the programme. Apart from the Director-General's proposals, delegations had put forward proposals; 33 draft resolutions had already been submitted and there would surely be others. It was for the Committee to assess their merits, and the Assistant Director-General saw no reason why such an assessment should not be extended to include the entire programme. If the higher budget were not adopted by the General Conference, the Director-General would still be entitled to propose cuts in order to help the Committee, but only at the end and in the light of the discussions of the Programme and Budget Commission; any such proposals would bear upon both budget levels.

(33) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that, since it was difficult to evaluate priorities in the General Conference, the Committee should facilitate Conference action by making recommendations on what might be given priority if the present budgetary level were adopted. The Secretariat could then be asked to formulate specific proposals in figures.

(34) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that that was the only proper way to proceed. During its preliminary discussion, the Committee could already indicate what it considered important without taking a final decision. Only on completion of that preliminary discussion and discussion of the draft resolutions submitted by delegations - could the Committee put forward recommendations concerning the relative priorities of projects in the programme. The Secretariat was naturally at the Committee's disposal to assess the budgetary repercussions of its evaluation of the various parts of the programme. It would be dangerous to go further.

(35) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the proposal. There might be other possibilities, besides the present or higher level budgets.

(36) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) agreed that it would be wrong to prejudge the budgetary level at that stage.

(37) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that the French delegation's interpretation of the two budgetary levels was roughly the same as that of the United Kingdom delegate, and that it proposed to ask for some projects to be transferred from one category to the other, thus linking the idea of priority with that of level. However, in view of what had been said, Mr. Cabouat, on behalf of the French delegation, supported the Israeli delegate's view. Speaking as Rapporteur, he hoped that the report would include all the factors which would enable them to form an opinion on the relative importance of projects.

(38) The CHAIRMAN said that, as the Committee was agreed on the method of procedure, it would pursue the discussion of section A, paragraphs 137-142.

(39) Mr. LEE (United States of America) wished to convey the dissatisfaction of the Education officials of his country with the conduct of the international conferences convened by the International Bureau of Education. A great deal of time was wasted on formal discussion of matters that were well known, without anything very useful being achieved.

(40) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Australian delegate, mentioned the suggestion by his delegation that reports on developments in Education should be made to the International Bureau of Education not yearly, but every two, three or four years, while reports from Member States on a specific aspect of education could be furnished in the interval, with more fruitful results. Could Mr. Elvin take this suggestion into account in his reply to the delegate of the United States of America?

(41) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) reminded the meeting that the conferences were convened jointly by Unesco and the International Bureau of Education. He added that the conferences always considered a major and a minor topic of international importance, in addition to the reports of Member States. The suggestion by the Australian delegate would be studied by the next meeting of the joint committee of the two bodies.
(42) He suggested that the criticisms by the delegate of the United States of America referred perhaps to earlier conferences, since at the last meeting the United States participants had declared themselves satisfied with the improved arrangements made. The recommendations by those conferences were often considered platitudinous by countries which enjoyed an advanced system of education, but they were illuminating for the less fortunate in this respect. Many countries had made plans for educational development after the conferences. However imperfect, Mr. Elvin felt there had been a marked improvement in these conferences.

(43) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought that the Conference should change from a reporting to a working conference.

(44) The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the delegate of the United States of America wished his remarks to appear in the report or in the records only.

(45) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked for more information. He gathered that the 1951 Conference on Public Education had dealt with general problems concerning the extension of school education, the 1952 Conference with equal access of girls and women to education, the 1953 Conference with the training and status of primary school teachers, and the 1954 Conference with the problem of secondary school teachers. He wished to know if he had been correctly informed.

(46) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the main subject at each of the conferences had been connected with the extension of school education.

(47) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) thanked Mr. Elvin and said that he had regarded the work of the International Conference on Public Education as consisting mainly in the submission of official reports on the progress made in education in the various States.

(48) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) agreed that the conferences had improved considerably and considered that much of the United States criticism had been met. Their value lay not so much in the resolutions as in the work that went into the making of them.

(49) The CHAIRMAN asked the Rapporteur to include some references to the foregoing remarks by members of the committee.

(50) Mr. CABOUAT (France) speaking as Rapporteur, thought that the report should mention the United Kingdom delegate's view that some working methods had improved, and the hope expressed by the United States delegate that the conferences would to an increasing extent become working conferences instead of meetings where reports were heard on the situation in various countries.

(51) Section A was adopted.

Section B (paragraphs 143-146)

(52) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the Executive Board's attitude was clear; it had voted for the principle underlying project B, and had also considered that the form it might take should depend on whether it could be carried out. He explained that the United Nations had an important project for setting up a special Economic Development Fund, which could be partly used for educational development. The representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations would no doubt have an opportunity to lay this matter before the General Conference. But, though it seemed very unlikely that the project could be carried into effect in the near future, it was quite possible that other forms of assistance might be put into operation before very long. Detailed measures were already under consideration. The situation might be expressed as follows: Unesco had gone as far as it could with technical studies and the publicizing of information. In addition, technical aid was provided for States requesting it, but experience had shown that shortage of funds was essentially the obstacle to the development of education in the underdeveloped countries.

Expert advice would not solve the problem; hence the idea of setting up a special international fund to assist countries which lacked the resources necessary for that purpose. Should the United Nations fund or other forms of direct assistance materialize in the near future, Unesco would gladly drop its plan for an International Educational Fund, but the Director-General wondered whether the Organization should continue large-scale propaganda in favour of primary education if there was no chance of adequate international financial support. It was a matter of deep concern to him, for hopes might be raised only to be bitterly disappointed. Mr. Maheu concluded by saying that the project which the Director-General was submitting to the General Conference was essentially a political and moral question.

(53) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) agreed with Mr. Maheu that the crucial question at the basis of the entire project was that of financial resources. The proposed international fund could be the pivot of the education programme. It had been adopted by the first conference of the Indian National Commission, in January.

(54) Mr. Maheu had put a difficult question: if you raise hopes and cannot fulfil them, what happens? It was desirable, whatever the response, to focus attention on the problem. Public opinion must be mobilized by means of an intelligent campaign.

(55) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed that the matter was of the highest importance, but regretted to find a small work plan proposed for such an important problem.

(56) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the proposal under discussion was to consider, in conjunction with the United Nations, the possibility and expediency of setting up an Educational Development Fund and not to raise the fund itself. A report would be submitted to the next session of the General Conference which would thus have more precise and detailed proposals before it.

(57) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) supported the delegate of the United States of America on the question of the actual budgetary entry. What exactly was proposed to be done with the sums mentioned?

(58) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that the modest sum mentioned was intended for travel to the United Nations and its organs to spur them on to including education as an object of expenditure in any more general fund, and for a pamphlet to launch the idea. The question was whether Unesco should continue with that line of propaganda as a separate movement.

(59) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that comments by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and by certain Specialized Agencies on the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 were contained in document 8C/PRG/20. Annex II, reproducing a letter dated 15 September 1954 from the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Director-General, established the link between Unesco's project and the project of the United Nations.

(60) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) understood the budgetary difficulties, but, as a member of the committee, he would like to see a more forceful recommendation for the creation of such a fund.

(61) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) sympathized with the Committee. The project was too important, even if planned to keep expenses down, to be reduced to a single paragraph in Unesco's programme, but the General Conference could express its views on the basis of a draft resolution. He believed the Indian delegation was preparing a proposal on the subject.

(62) The CHAIRMAN understood Mr. Maheu to propose that the report should put forward a text indicating the importance members of the Committee had attached to the proposal. He requested the Assistant Director-General to prepare a text for discussion, and opened the debate on section C, paragraphs 147-152.

(63) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that that project might afford an opportunity of giving effect to the general ideas previously expressed by the United States delegate. The primary purpose of a conference such as that proposed for Latin America might be to get Ministers of Education in that region to set realistic targets and frame detailed plans for development at the national level. Those plans would then be considered by Unesco at the international level and from the technical point of view. Once those conditions obtained, other countries might very well supply additional funds. A combination of these three methods - national action, international technical aid and assistance from other countries - would very possibly overcome the financial obstacle referred to earlier.

(64) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that this would be the third Regional Conference on Free and Compulsory Education convened by Unesco. At the end of 1952 there had been one in Bombay, another was to be held in two months' time in Cairo.

(65) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) wondered whether it would be wise to hold the Regional Conferences at such short intervals, and whether it would not be preferable to wait until practical results achieved by the previous ones had shown their value. He suggested that the proposed Regional Conference should be postponed until 1957 or 1958.

(66) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that, unless a different way could be found for dealing with the financial problem, he would be inclined to agree with the United Kingdom delegation. If the conference was to be a repetition of the one held in Bombay, it would probably be satisfactory from the technical angle, but, if no outside financial help were forthcoming, it seemed pointless to speed up a purely technical action. Furthermore, as the Organization of American States was intending to convene a conference of Ministers of Education, Unesco's failure to participate would hardly be understood. In conclusion, the Assistant Director-General

hoped that a new procedure, such as he had outlined, would emerge.

(67) Mr. LEE (United States of America) looked on the approach suggested by the Assistant Director-General as a far better solution of the question.

(68) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), in view of the Committee's attitude towards project A (International Conference on Public Education) and project B (International Educational Development Fund), thought it necessary to maintain project C. He asked the United Kingdom delegate if he would be willing to withdraw his proposal for the postponement of a regional conference on free and compulsory education.

(69) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed a compromise: regional conferences should not take place too frequently. The Latin American Conference could be held in 1955 or 1956 and the African one in 1957.

(70) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) remarked that, from the point of view of the region in which it was held, the Conference was always the first. Mr. Arthur had said that time was necessary in order to evaluate its usefulness. The results of the Bombay Conference could only be known until the financial question had been settled, but there were other effects, in particular those arising from a better acquaintance with the practice of neighbouring countries.

(71) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) pointed out that the Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American countries would be meeting early in 1955. Although that meeting and the proposed regional conference on free and compulsory education in the Latin American States would be dealing with different subjects, he thought it would be advisable to hold the latter conference at the end of 1956 so as to leave as much time as possible between the two meetings.

(72) Mr. LEE (United States of America) referred back to section B. He wished to make certain that the resolution called for would be framed to give the Director-General authority and latitude, but without prejudging an answer.

(73) The CHAIRMAN replied that that was the type of draft text he and the Director-General had in mind. He asked whether the delegate of the United Kingdom could not withdraw his suggestion of delaying the proposed conference for a couple of years.

(74) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) would not press his point although he considered a delay would be wiser.

(75) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) saw no reason to refrain from holding a conference where it might be as useful as previous ones had been.

(76) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) thought the meeting should recognize the fluidity of a position which developments in the next year (such as a Conference organized by the Latin American States) might modify. The item should be marked as neither a high nor a low priority one.

(77) Section C was adopted.

(78) The CHAIRMAN asked for a reference in the Committee's report to the views of the United States delegation on the type of conference to be held, and to the reservation made by the delegate of the United Kingdom.

Section D: paragraphs 153-159

(79) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) introduced the section, saying that, in reply to a criticism made at the last General Conference, certain aspects of child development had been put in this section of the programme. He referred to the establishment in Thailand, in 1953-54, with considerable assistance from the Thai Government, of an Institute designed, firstly, to introduce this relatively new concept in that country and, secondly, to show Member States how methods could be successfully transferred from one country to another (document 8C/PRG/20).

(80) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 158, enquired how far the Secretariat had tried to discover what was at present being done to prevent overlapping.

(8) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that it was not Unesco's intention to embark on a new study, but to bring an international point of view to bear on subjects often well studied in depth.

(82) Section D was adopted.

Section E: paragraphs 160-162

(83) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that this section attempted to meet the feeling that fundamental education work and the work of school-teachers were closely linked. The future village school teacher could become aware of the problems of fundamental education. A pilot project was proposed for the modification of some teacher training institutes through work in association with a fundamental education centre.

(84) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) asked whether the Secretariat had any particular training institute in mind.

(85) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said they had not started with any particular institute in mind, although they had received suggestions. The sum of $1,000 was intended for one long journey to a country distant from Paris.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p. m.

# FOURTH MEETING

*3 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN welcomed Sir Ronald Adam, Chairman of the Executive Board, and the Director-General.

(2) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he intended to attend meetings of the Advisory Committee whenever his presence was not required at the Executive Board. The Advisory Committee, in the setting up of which he had participated as a member of the United States delegation, had an important part to play in the activities of the Conference, and the Secretariat would give it full co-operation in performing its work.
(3) The Secretariat was trying to base its ideas on the needs and possibilities of Member States. To that end it was necessary to know the situation in each country and to have a more realistic and less theoretical outlook. In fact it was hoped to make Unesco more of a Specialized operating Agency without lessening its guiding character - a difficult balance to achieve. The plans set out in the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 were not intended to be permanent: it might later on be found necessary in some cases to expand, or in others to retract; it was for the delegates of Member States to give instructions.
(4) He wished to pay tribute to the part played by the Executive Board in the preparation of the new programme, reflecting a trend which had started at the Executive Board's session of November 1953 and been confirmed at the session in March/April 1954, in which the Board had considered the first draft programme and budget.
(5) Much help and information had been gained from discussions with member governments during visits by the Director-General and members of the Executive Board, especially to countries in Latin America and Asia.
(6) The General Conference was the occasion when Member States expressed their wishes, and the Secretariat was ready to give all possible assistance in the discussions.

(7) The CHAIRMAN thanked the Director-General and said that the Advisory Committee, with the help of the Secretariat, would do everything possible to ensure that its consideration of the programme was of use to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(8) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman, Executive Board) expressed his regret that no member of the Executive Board had so far attended the Advisory Committee; the member appointed in his place had not been able to be present. He hoped that it would be possible for a representative to attend future discussions and said that he himself would like to participate in the discussions on remodelling the programme. He stressed the importance of the Advisory Committee's work.

(9) The CHAIRMAN asked for the detailed discussion of the programme and budget to be resumed.

1.2 Pre-school and school education

Project 1.21: The development and improvement of school systems and school teaching (continued)

Paragraphs 163-167

(10) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that he had nothing to add to his statement at the previous meeting. The Director-General considered that, although there had been many suggestions on subjects to be taught in schools, it was Unesco's responsibility to study the problem of the school curriculum as a whole.

(11) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Executive Board's comment in paragraph 10 of document 8C/5 Add. 1.

(12) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the matter had been carefully considered by the National Commission in his country, which was aware of the difficulties described by Mr. Elvin. The United Kingdom was, however, in a rather special position, since the paragraph in question implied a degree of State control of school curricula which was not the practice in that country. An international Advisory Committee on the School Curriculum would not, therefore, be as useful to the United Kingdom as it might be to other countries.
(13) Considering the matter from the financial angle, he wondered whether an international advisory committee was really necessary, since the school curriculum seemed to be a national rather than an international problem; alternatively, if it were really necessary, need it meet twice a year? In his view it would be better for such a committee to meet once a year and for $26,530 to be saved.

(14) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that Unesco had not the power to change the school curricula of Member States; what was envisaged was an interchange of experience and practice in different countries, which would

surely be of interest to the United Kingdom.

(15) With regard to the number of meetings, there was much work to be done, and studies for submission to the 1957 and 1958 international conferences on public education would have to be prepared well in advance. In his view it would be necessary for the international advisory committee to meet twice, in the first year at least.

(16) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that the Advisory Committee had already, under paragraph 141, agreed to recommend the allocation of funds for a study by the International Bureau of Education of the school curriculum, and was now being asked, under paragraph 166, to approve the setting up of an international advisory committee on the same subject.

(17) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), in reply, said that the International Bureau of Education study would be based on the replies of governments to questionnaires, whereas the studies proposed under paragraph 166 would be based on the views of the teaching profession.

(18) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) still considered that there would be duplication of work, since the international advisory committee would also, no doubt, use questionnaires.

(19) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that both aspects of the problem - government educational practice and the professional view - were important and neither should be overlooked.

(20) Mr. LEE (United States of America) wished to associate himself with the remarks of the United Kingdom delegate. With regard to the questions raised by the delegate of Israel, he hoped that use would be made of the work done by the Education Clearing House, since there had already been a considerable amount of research on school curricula.

(21) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) assured Mr. Lee that the resources of the Education Clearing House would be at the disposal of the international advisory committee. It was true that much work had been carried out on the curriculum problem, and the committee would have to co-ordinate the results. While the problem had been given much attention in such countries as the United States of America, in other countries, for example India, there were still difficult problems to be faced, and studies and comparisons of national practice would be valuable.

(22) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the delegate of Australia, asked Mr. Elvin whether he was satisfied that the setting up of an international advisory committee was the most satisfactory method of dealing with the problem. Since the question was to be considered on an international level at the Conference on Public Education, he wondered whether it might not be more useful at the present stage for the Secretariat to prepare the necessary material on the basis of information supplied by the National Commissions or experts in Member States.

(23) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, while the Secretariat would not oppose any suggestions made by members of the Advisory Committee or during the Conference, the international advisory committtee appeared so far to be the best solution. Some National Commissions were ready and able to make studies requested by the Director-General or the Conference, but the same could not be said of all countries.

(24) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that the funds allocated for a meeting in 1955 be deleted from the programme and budget and that during that year further studies should be made on the lines suggested by the Australian delegate, with the help of the National Commissions and the international non-governmental organizations.

(25) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to an important point which had not yet been considered, namely, that the international advisory committee would, after one or two years' work, be able to advise individual countries on the most suitable educational systems. He instanced certain Asian and Latin American countries which had provided education unsuited to the careers available and wanted advice on reorganizing their educational systems to suit the country's economic needs, advice which was difficult to give, involving as it did such aspects as effect on human character. If the international advisory committee could have the participation of leaders in curriculum-making, and experts to study the needs of countries, and did not confine its interests to the preparation of publications based on special studies, it could become a world curriculum adviser and help in the development of education generally.

(26) The CHAIRMAN suggested that it might be logical for the Advisory Committee to emerge from the Conferences on Public Education. He asked for comments on the Director-General's statement.

(27) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that he would need a more detailed statement before making a decision. His interpretation of the word "curriculum" was rather more restrictive than that of the Director-General.

(28) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the essence of his remarks was contained in the second sentence of paragraph 166, which said that the function of the committee would be to advise the Director-General as to the co-ordination of all Unesco activities bearing on the school curriculum, whether at Headquarters or through its experts in the field. Many parts of Unesco's programme had a bearing on the school curriculum, but, to keep the document short, it had not seemed advisable to list them in detail. If the Committee desired, further paragraphs could be added.

(29) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the United Kingdom delegate wished to amend or withdraw his proposal.

(30) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) replied that on

the contrary the Director-General's words reinforced his views on the need for preparatory studies. He therefore maintained his proposal. In reply to a further question from the CHAIRMAN, he did not think a large budgetary allocation would be necessary.

(31) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL found himself in a difficult position in relation to the Advisory Committee and the Programme and Budget Commission. He did not consider that he could accept, at this stage, changes recommended by the Advisory Committee. Member States not represented on the Committee might show interest in certain projects in their original form, and he, for one, would prefer to await the discussions of the Programme and Budget Commission to consider changing his proposals.

(32) The CHAIRMAN said that the Director-General had raised an important point. The Committee could not expect the Director-General to agree to recommendations which would preclude his submitting his proposals to the Programme and Budget Commission. However, it was the task of the Committee to submit to that Commission its views on the proposals which were before it.

(33) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) understood that the Advisory Committee was competent to speak on programme as well as on budget matters.

(34) The situation was clarified by the CHAIRMAN, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL and Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) to the effect that the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget could make recommendations but could not at the present stage bind the Director-General or prejudice his freedom of action in relation to the Programme and Budget Commission

(35) The CHAIRMAN asked for comments on the United Kingdom delegate's proposal, and the delegates of Norway and the United States of America expressed their support.

(36) It was agreed that the Rapporteur should record approval of the United Kingdom delegate's proposal.

(37) Miss LAISE (United States of America) hoped that the decision would not prevent the Committee from having the advice of the Director-General on programme priorities and other important questions.

(38) The CHAIRMAN also hoped that the Director-General would give advice to the Committee even if he might not agree with its final recommendations.

(39) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured the Committee that it would have the benefit of the Secretariat's views.

Paragraphs 168-173: Improvement of school education in certain fields

(40) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Director-General had sent copies of the proposed programme and budget to the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies; and the International Labour Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization had both expressed interest in paragraph 169 concerning a conference on vocational and technical education in schools for the Arab States of the Middle East. A joint meeting of representatives of those organizations had been held and provisional plans made subject to agreement of the respective governing bodies. The objectives of the conference were to make the participating countries aware of the importance of vocational and technical education in furthering the interests of workers and the community; of its place in the scheme of general education; of the material needs and requirements of such education; and of its co-ordination with the needs of employers and in relation to national plans for economic development.

(41) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the conception of a tripartite conference would have budgetary repercussions.

(42) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the ILO representative had considered Unesco's initial budgeting seriously inadequate, since considerable funds would be needed for equipment. He thought, therefore, that the budget estimate should not be reduced, even though Unesco would be responsible only for a proportion of the total cost. In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, he could not at present say when a decision might be expected from ILO and FAO, as he did not know when their governing bodies would next be meeting.

(43) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether Member States in the areas concerned would contribute to the cost of the conference.

(44) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that Unesco would pay per diem allowances for the duration of the conference, but not the cost of travel.

(45) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that the budget estimates covered thirty-five days' per diem for thirty participants.

(46) Paragraphs 168-173 were approved.

Paragraphs 174-175: Evaluation of national pilot projects in school education

(47) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the National Commission in the United Kingdom considered that such projects were useful, but their value depended on where they were carried out and by whom. He asked what the Member States concerned would contribute.

(48) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the contribution of Member States would be in the form of participating in the work.

(49) Paragraphs 174 and 175 were approved.

(50) Mr. CABOUAT (France) in reply to the CHAIRMAN, who had opened paragraphs 176 to 196 to general discussion, said that the French

delegation was specially interested in the development of activities which were of particular value in fostering international understanding and co-operation. He was glad to see that Unesco attached great importance to those activities - a point which, incidentally, emerged also from the comments of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the proposed programme and budget of Unesco. Work for the development of international understanding and co-operation was concerned not only with the development of the teaching of languages of wide communication, the improvement of textbooks and teaching materials, teaching about the United Nations, and the scheme of experimental activities, but also with the activities listed under the higher budgetary level and in other parts of the chapter dealing with the Department of Education. Other projects designed to achieve the same purpose appeared in the programmes of other departments.

(51) Because of the importance of that branch of Unesco's work, Mr. Cabouat was surprised that the administrative unit dealing with all those projects had been abolished. There was, for instance, a close connexion between the co-ordination of school curricula and the production of reading materials for people who had just learnt to read.

(52) He wondered what was the object of abolishing a co-ordinating body which was already in existence and had been responsible for administrative liaison between the various activities concerned. He therefore asked the Director-General to state: (1) the range of all the activities relating to the development of international understanding and co-operation; and (2) the measures he intended to take within the Secretariat in order to secure the co-ordination of all those activities.

(53) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that activities relating to international understanding or education for international understanding were distributed throughout the programme and were the basis of Unesco's work, and it was difficult to define precisely which activities came within that category and which did not. References could be found throughout the programme and budget, and detailed elaboration was unnecessary.

(54) Administrative and staffing arrangements were largely the responsibility of the Director-General and it was not always practicable to have separate staff or units to deal specifically with international understanding. For example, under education, the staff member concerned with improving textbooks would automatically take account of international understanding.

(55) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Advisory Committee on Education for Living in a World Community had made a recommendation on co-ordination at its first session, but no action had been taken as yet, since the matter needed careful consideration and the Secretariat wished to have the reactions of the Conference. The Committee was at present holding its second session in Paris, and was likely to make recommendations on the subject. He understood unofficially that certain members were in favour of a special committee being set up under the Director-General's guidance to ensure co-ordination of activities, an idea which he would view favourably.

(56) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Director-General's remarks satisfied the French delegate.

(57) Mr. CABOUAT (France) welcomed Mr. Elvin's explanations. He added that Unesco's very existence, and all its activities, helped to promote international co-operation and understanding. He was not asking for a special section to be inserted in the Education Chapter or for a special unit to be set up in the Department. He was very glad, however, that the Director-General intended to set up a co-ordinating committee to take special charge of activities relating to the development of international understanding and co-operation throughout the Organization.

(58) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that he too had been concerned at the lack of adequate emphasis on education for international understanding and with the necessity for achieving co-ordination. It was a theme which should permeate the activities of Unesco by virtue of its mandate, and he was not entirely satisfied that that was the case.

(59) The CHAIRMAN asked for consideration of paragraphs 176-178.

Paragraphs 176-178: Developing the teaching of languages of wide communication

(60) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) asked whether the Secretariat had any special country in mind with which to make a contract.

(61) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, while it would not be proper to state names, at least one country was known to have an institution ready to collaborate in such work.

(62) The CHAIRMAN said that it would be inappropriate to ask for the information at the present time, before the Executive Board had considered the matter.

(63) Paragraphs 176-178 were approved.

Paragraphs 179-185: Textbooks and teaching materials

(64) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that better progress would be made by bilateral discussions than by international conferences. In the interests of budgetary economy he proposed suppressing one of the suggested conferences.

(65) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, considering the nature of the proposed conferences, it would be difficult to decide which to cancel.

(66) The CHAIRMAN suggested that it would be better to retain the two conferences, but to defer one to a later budgetary period.

(67) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the Chairman's suggestion and was supported by Mr.

AVIDOR (Israel). He asked for information on what had been achieved in Asia, since, after several years' study, little progress had been made in Western Europe.

(68) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked which of the two conferences it would be more convenient to hold.

(69) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the project would be ruined if one conference were suppressed: the Committee must decide whether or not it was a high priority project.

(70) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that there was already more work than could be done within the limits of Unesco's budget, and suppression of a project did not reflect on its merits. If priorities were being considered, he would favour the conference which would promote the most speedy understanding of the East by the West.

(71) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that there were eight participating countries from Asia, namely: India, Israel, Japan, Nepal, Pakistan, Ceylon, Iran and Iraq, and ten in the West, namely: German Federal Republic, Belgium, Greece, Canada, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, United States of America, France, Norway.

(72) The CHAIRMAN said that the United Kingdom proposal was supported by the Israeli and United States delegates and asked the Rapporteur to record that the Committee recommended deferment of one of the conferences.

(73) Mr. CABOUAT (France) in his capacity as Rapporteur, asked the delegate of the United Kingdom to say which of the two conferences he proposed to cancel for the 1955-56 budgetary period.

(74) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) considered that the Asian conference should be postponed, since more work had been done in Europe.

(75) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the Secretariat regarded the two proposed conferences as interdependent. The idea was to make a comparison between the two regions. If one of them was simply dropped, the whole project would lose its point. If Mr. Cowell's proposal were adopted, it would no longer be possible to make a comprehensive report to the General Conference at its ninth session. It would be better to arrange for experts from both regions to hold a single joint meeting. Fewer facilities would be available and it would therefore produce less satisfactory results, but it would have the advantage of enabling the desired comparison to be made between East and West.

(76) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that he would approve the Assistant Director-General's suggestion, but asked whether it would involve any financial saving. In reply to a remark from Mr. ELVIN, he said that that was not the main consideration, but it was always the duty of the Committee to watch for ways of economizing.

(77) The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was obliged to consider financial aspects and to make savings where possible with a view to increasing allocations for more important activities. In reply to a question from Mr. ELVIN, there was no question at the present time of cutting down ceiling expenditure.

(78) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported the Assistant Director-General's proposal. With regard to the United Kingdom delegate's question on what had been done in Asia, work was already in progress on the improvement of textbooks in India.

(79) Mr. CABOUAT (France) wished to add something to what the Indian delegate had said; there had been several bilateral discussions between governments in Europe and extensive bilateral contacts within the framework of the Council of Europe. The French National Commission had done a great deal of work on the development of international understanding and co-operation and it would be regrettable if Unesco's appropriations for activities in that field were reduced. The French delegation would support the compromise proposal made by Mr. Maheu; it would like either to have both conferences held or to have one conference of experts, covering the whole world, convened.

(80) A vote was taken on Mr. Cowell's proposal, which was rejected by 7 votes to 4.

Paragraphs 186-192: Teaching about the United Nations and Human Rights

(81) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the remarks of the Secretary-General of the United Nations set out in document 8C/PRG/20.

(82) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) stressed the need for more emphasis on national effort and described an experiment in the form of a model Unesco Conference which had been carried out by students in his country. A particularly valuable aspect was that students had had to impersonate representatives of other countries, which was an aid to international understanding.

(83) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) referred to paragraphs 214, 215 and 216 of the draft programme and budget, in which it was proposed to give assistance to six national seminars. Unesco was planning to spend less on international seminars and intended, for example, to finance one instead of two for the World Federation of United Nations Associations, while devoting more to the teaching of international affairs through the International Association of Universities.

(84) Paragraphs 186-192 were approved.

Paragraphs 193-196: Scheme of Co-ordinated Experimental Activities in Education for International Understanding and Co-operation

(85) Approved.

Paragraphs 197-213: Technical aid to Member States, for the development of school education

(86) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, in meeting requests from Member States, the Secretariat had favoured areas where the need was most urgent. A list of priority subjects had been drawn up and appeared in paragraph 208. The total allocation of funds was large in order to meet expected requests.

(87) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested that an additional criterion in deciding priorities should be the encouragement of countries which already showed a positive approach to the problem.

(88) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that the proposal for technical aid to Member States for the development of school education was a new project in the history of Unesco. In that connexion he agreed with Mr. Lee's views.

(89) The CHAIRMAN said that the suggestion by the representatives of the United States of America and France was a good one.

(90) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) confirmed that the project for technical aid was a new departure to which the Director-General attached particular importance. Mr. Maheu drew attention to the two criteria mentioned in paragraphs 207 and 208, and said that the Secretariat would observe a third, which was not mentioned in the proposed programme and budget document, namely, assurance of success. Member States asking for aid from Unesco must be doing work at the national level in the field in question, work with clearly specified aims; and at least some initial results must already have been achieved, to serve as a basis for international aid.

(91) Mr. Maheu explained that the aid in question would be supplied on much the same lines as technical assistance for economic development, but on lines that would extend beyond the economic sphere to every aspect of social progress. They would include the despatch of experts, the award of fellowships for the training of specialists, and the supply of the equipment needed by the experts for training national specialists.

(92) Two important points should be noted. Firstly, the Executive Board would no doubt be called on to pronounce upon the requests sent in by Member States. As the Board would thus be performing the functions that TAB exercises in the programme of technical assistance for economic development, it would naturally be the final authority for taking decisions on projects involving not only technical questions, which came within the purview of the Secretariat, but also political questions. Secondly, there should be close contacts between the staff responsible for supplying technical aid and the permanent services of the Secretariat. Experts had a certain amount of freedom in their dealings with governments but they should constantly benefit by the experience acquired by the Secretariat, and their services to Member States should be tied in with the work of the permanent services and planned undertakings of the Organization. In the Director-General's view, Unesco could not supply technical aid efficiently unless it placed at the disposal of the experts its own experience and the skills available to it through its contacts with non-governmental and other international organizations. Technical aid was a natural extension of established services and planned activities.

(93) The CHAIRMAN thanked the Assistant Director-General and, in view of the large sums involved, asked Mr. Rao to give an outline of budgetary procedure.

(94) In reply to a question from Mr. CABOUAT (France), the ASSISTANT DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Organization could make service contracts with competent non-governmental organizations. But it could not shift all its responsibilities to them for carrying out agreements made with governments.

(95) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that there were two types of expenditure: the cost of engaging experts and the cost of equipment. In calculating the former, there were many unknown factors, such as the country of origin, or the number of dependents. It was also necessary to conform to the technical assistance rules in engaging experts; for example, on a mission for six months or more, an expert was entitled to bring his dependents at the Organization's expense provided that they stayed with him for six months at least. Experts were allowed an installation allowance, but were not entitled to pension or medical benefits. The average figure arrived at was set out in Annex VI, page 254 of the programme and budget. Standard figures had been used throughout the document and every effort had been made to keep costs to a minimum. Another factor was that the receiving country had to bear certain expenses, such as local transport, office and lodging. With regard to equipment, it should in most cases not exceed 10% of the whole project.

(96) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said, in connexion with the various forms in which technical assistance was provided, for example by experts, equipment or fellowships, that there would, he hoped, be sufficient elasticity to allow for adjustment of the proportions to suit the needs of the countries concerned.

(97) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that in general there was that elasticity. Unesco had tried to learn from past experience. Thus, in the early stages, experts were sent to give advice, and the country was left to follow the advice or not. That practice was changed, and three methods were indicated in paragraph 210: the assigning of a permanent expert to a region; the sending of an expert for a specific piece of work; the provision of assistance to Member States for setting up their own workshops or training courses.

(98) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that there was also the provision of fellowships to implement technical aid in the exchange of persons programme, for which $60,000 was provided for 1955 and $140,000 for 1956.

(99) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether, in considering the rather costly but very important item of technical assistance, it would be useful to have a list of individual projects to facilitate consideration in the event of the budgetary provision having to be cut down.

(100) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Secretariat could provide a list of the projects concerned.

(101) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) mentioned that, in a document which would probably be issued the following day, the Secretariat would list all the technical aid projects, stating their scope and cost. It would show how technical aid fitted in with the planned undertakings and permanent services of Unesco. The Committee might, if it wished, attach that document to its report.

Paragraphs 214-216: Assistance to national regional seminars on school education for international understanding and co-operation

(102) Approved.

Paragraphs 217-244: Project 1.22: Emergency Educational Assistance

(103) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that discussions had recently taken place between the Director-General and the new Director-General of UNRWA, and he was not fully informed of the situation. In previous years Unesco's contribution of $90,000 had formed a very small proportion of the total educational budget of UNRWA, and it was now proposed to use it for the payment of certain staff members of Unesco working in the field under the responsibility of UNRWA. A request had been made for three staff members in addition to the existing four, and he felt that the correct action was to report the request.

(104) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that the request put forward by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) raised a question of quality rather than quantity. The Agency's programme of educational assistance would exceed $3,000,000 in the current year and Unesco was in charge of the technical side of this large-scale programme. That was an excellent example of co-operation between two international organizations of different types.

(105) UNRWA had asked for all senior educational officials to be supplied by Unesco. Unesco would have to recruit, pay and second seven specialists instead of the four mentioned in paragraphs 235. Although he had no formal proposal on the matter to submit at the moment, the Director-General was anxious that, if budget cuts were made elsewhere, an additional sum of $25,000 should be released in 1955, and $26,000 in 1956, in order that the request could be fully met. It was less a question of giving a little more money than of tidying up the administrative position. Moreover, the money would represent an insiginificant sum compared with the total of UNRWA's educational budget.

(106) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the request from the Director-General on UNRWA would be presented to the Conference as a document; whether the request had been approved by the governing body of UNRWA, on which governments were represented; and whether the three new posts were permanent or temporary.

(107) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) clarified three points: (1) in order not to put the Director-General in an awkward position, the Director-General of UNRWA had made his request orally. If the Committee felt it was necessary, the Agency could be asked to confirm its request officially in writing; (2) the request had not been approved by a governing body of UNRWA because there was no such body; UNRWA had no Executive Board but an advisory commission of four members, the Director-General of UNRWA was directly responsible to the General Assembly of the United Nations; (3) the proposed posts were temporary because the Agency itself was temporary, being prolonged from year to year by the United Nations General Assembly. They were, however, shown as "established" in the budget in accordance with customary administrative terminology, but the operation itself was temporary.

(108) The CHAIRMAN said that it would be difficult for the question to be discussed by the Committee unless it were taken up by a member, as no formal proposal had been submitted by the Director-General. He suggested that the Committee take note of the information given by the Director-General and of his statement that he would be interested in making a formal proposal if funds were found available at a later stage.

(109) It was so agreed.

(110) The CHAIRMAN proposed that paragraphs 238-244 and project 1.31 should be postponed until the next meeting.

(111) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the document dealing with project 1.31, fundamental education, was not long but that all the directors of departments had to help in drafting it. It would be distributed during the afternoon meeting and could be more usefully discussed at the meeting to be held the next morning, when members had had time to study it.

(112) The proposal was approved.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

# FIFTH MEETING

*3 November 1954 at 3.45 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**
**DOCUMENT 8C/5, CHAPTER 1: EDUCATION (continued)**

(1) Discussion was resumed on the projects proposed by the Department of Education for the period 1955-56.

Paragraphs 238-244 - Emergency educational assistance to Korea

(2) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, as a result of the recommendations of the Unesco mission to Korea to study educational reconstruction, it was proposed to create three educational posts in Korea. The first was that of educational adviser having a D.1 grade, the second, that of Director of the Fundamental Education Centre, a post which had already been filled on a temporary basis, and the third was that of technical education officer, which post would be filled in 1956. The educational adviser would be administratively responsible to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency and technically responsible to Unesco.
(3) There were no further comments on paragraphs 238-244.

(4) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had decided to postpone discussion of project 1.31 until the following day and he proposed continuing the discussion with project 1.32.

Paragraphs 313-336

(5) No comments.

Paragraphs 337-339

(6) No comments.

Paragraphs 340-350

(7) The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to Annex II of document 8C/PRG/20, which contained a letter from the Director-General of ILO to the Director-General of Unesco on the subject of collaboration with Unesco in the matter of technical aid to Member States, and he asked Mr. Elvin if he could give the Committee any clarification on this point.

(8) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that his Department had taken for granted that it would have the collaboration of ILO on this project and had therefore not mentioned such collaboration specifically in document 8C/5.
(9) There were no comments on paragraphs 340-350.

Project 1.33 - paragraphs 351-371

(10) The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the letter from the Secretary-General of the United Nations contained in document 8C/PRG/20 and asked Mr. Elvin whether Unesco had collaborated with the United Nations in its youth work.

(11) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that, although there had been no specific collaboration with the United Nations in this field, there had been contacts between the two organizations, and the Department of Education would be happy to extend collaboration at any time.
(12) There were no comments on paragraphs 351-371.

Paragraphs 372-384

(13) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that it had been difficult in the past to focus the work on youth activities. The framework for the proposed Associated Youth Enterprises would be similar to that of the Associated Projects Scheme in the field of fundamental education. Members of the Associated Youth Enterprises would be encouraged to carry out work which was of interest to themselves and to Unesco and through them it was hoped to achieve some unity in the field of youth activities.

(14) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) doubted whether the Associated Youth Enterprises would yield practical results and feared that it might only produce a crop of officials.

(15) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that an attempt would be made to see that the work of the Associated Youth Enterprises did not overlap with work done by other organizations and would be of some practical use. He emphasized the experimental nature of the programmes contemplated (paragraph 376).
(16) There were no further comments on paragraphs 372-384.

Paragraphs 385-395

(17) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that paragraphs 385-395 were concerned only with Unesco's liaison with the Unesco Youth Institute at Gauting in Germany.

(18) Mr. BOW (Canada) said that, although it might not be appropriate to say so at this stage of the discussion, he would like the Committee to know that, after careful study of all available information, his Government had grave misgivings about the value, in relation to the whole programme of Unesco, of the three Unesco Institutes in Germany, particularly in the case of the Institute for Social Sciences in Cologne. He agreed that the work done by these institutes was important and interesting but wondered whether it was of sufficient urgency to justify expenditure by Unesco when its budget was so limited.

(19) In reply to a question from Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) whether Mr. Bow's remarks were for general discussion, the CHAIRMAN said that, as the meeting was informal, the Committee could discuss them.

(20) Mr. BOW (Canada) pointed out that the only proposal his Government had to make in regard to the three institutes was that they should be given a lower priority in Unesco's programme than other projects.

(21) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that, before he could judge about priority, he would require more information.

(22) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) gave a brief outline of the history of the three institutes. They were the outcome of a resolution passed by the fifth session of the General Conference of Unesco, which had been inspired by the thought that, in the process of re-educating Germany, the results of setting up such institutes in that country would be more fruitful than if they were set up elsewhere. As Western Germany was then occupied by the forces of three other countries, it had been thought advisable to set up the institutes in three different towns. The three institutes had had varied degrees of success. The Hamburg Institute had been particularly fortunate and soon became a centre for educational contacts, particularly for Europe and North America. The Youth Institute had been less fortunate and the question whether continued support should be given to it had been raised by the Executive Board, which had appointed a committee of investigation. This committee had reported its feeling that the Youth Institute was a worth-while project and should be allowed to continue for the immediate future. It had continued in close collaboration with the Department of Education and had established itself in a suitable building. He felt that it would be bad to abandon such an excellent organization, especially as it was now on its feet and did not duplicate the work being done by the Youth Section of Unesco's Department of Education. He felt that the question of future priority would have to be decided but warned the Committee that, if the project were abandoned, Unesco would lose prestige. (23) With regard to the financial aspect, there had been, in previous years, no contribution from Unesco's normal budget. One P.4 and one P.1 official and a secretary had been employed to help raise money for the institutes but this was no longer the case. The institutes could carry on if Unesco provided one-third of their total budget.

(24) In answer to a question from Mr. BOW(Canada) why Unesco's support had been withdrawn, Mr. ELVIN said that it had not been completely withdrawn. In the past surplus funds from the United States and French occupational authorities had been available for the institutes but they were no longer so. An effort had been made to replace those sources (8C/PRG/19), but so far contributions had not been sufficient.

(25) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that his views corresponded to those of Mr. Elvin. The National Commission of the United States of America had made enquiries and felt that, as the institutes were so young, it would be a pity to withdraw support from them. It thought, however, that it would be desirable to evaluate the performance of the institutes so that, at the next session of the General Conference, consideration could be given to a means of gradual withdrawal by Unesco. The American Government wished to see the international character of the institutes maintained.

(26) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) reminded the Committee that a substantial contribution to the institutes was made by the German Federal Republic. He doubted, however, whether the institutes could continue without a contribution from Unesco. In addition, if Unesco support were withdrawn, it would be more difficult to collect funds because it would be thought that Unesco did not think the projects deserving. The General Conference would have to decide whether it wanted the institutes to continue, whether it wanted to withdraw its support gradually or whether it thought highly enough of them to continue giving them its support.

(27) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought that the Committee would not want to make a clear-cut decision without more information from the Secretariat. He was not prepared to ask questions because he was not in a position to make an evaluation at the moment.

(28) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat had already made such an evaluation and, on that basis, had drawn up a proposal which it considered just and reasonable. The Director-General had proposed allotting $32,000 a year to each of the Institutes because he thought they deserved it. The previous September, he had sent a member of the Secretariat to see on the spot how the Youth Institute, which was the one that had aroused most doubt, was working. The Director-General himself had also been to Germany, where he had visited the three institutes and obtained additional information from the German

authorities. From those enquiries, he had concluded that the Institutes deserved support to the extent of $32,000 a year each - representing about a third of their total budget. The Secretariat was at the disposal of the Committee if fuller information were needed about any special points relating to the work of the Institutes.

(29) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) stressed that the Unesco Institutes in Germany were not German institutes. The German Federal Republic had also doubts about the institutes, especially in regard to personnel, but had decided that, as they were research institutes, it would be necessary to give them five or six years to show whether they were to be really worth while. There was a real need for the work done by the Youth Institute on a world basis and not only in Germany. The Institute was international but not sufficiently so and required an international staff. The German Federal Republic was concerned with international development of the institutes and would require international help. There would never be overlapping between the work done by the institutes and Unesco's work.

(30) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether it would not be wise at this stage to hear what Mrs. Myrdal had to say about the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences.

(31) The CHAIRMAN agreed.

(32) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that it took time to lay a foundation for research in social sciences. The Unesco Institute in Cologne was staffed mostly by German personnel and had, up to now, made studies of German problems. In the future, it was planned to make comparative studies in the countries bordering on Germany. A seminar had been held on comparative studies in family sociology and had resulted in the setting up of a preliminary international committee on family problems under the chairmanship of Professor Burgess of Chicago. The Institute had arranged that the results of the seminar would be brought to the attention of a large international meeting to be organized by a non-governmental organization. A further seminar was planned for January 1955, in which the Institutes of Hamburg and Cologne were to collaborate.
(33) Although the activities of the Cologne Institute were limited by its modest resources, Mrs. Myrdal was convinced that it would find a place in the international picture.

(34) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that the French organizations and government circles concerned, which had followed the work of the Institute for Social Sciences in Cologne, had found that it seemed to be working in a watertight compartment and that its activities were less international than those of the other two Unesco Institutes in Germany. However, on account of its geographical position, France was called upon to take part in the work of the three Institutes, particularly in that of the Youth Institute at Gauting - the only international institution in that field. The French delegation was therefore strongly in favour of approving the proposed appropriations for the Institutes for 1955 and 1956.

(35) The CHAIRMAN indicated that there were two proposals before the Committee. The proposal by the Canadian delegate was that a lower priority should be accorded to the projects concerning the Unesco Institutes in Germany than to other projects in the Department's programme, and the proposal by the United States delegate was that Unesco continue support of the Unesco Institutes in Germany for the present, but should evaluate the usefulness of their work before the next General Conference, in order to decide whether or not Unesco should continue its support of these Institutes.

(36) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the United States proposal. He was afraid that the Canadian proposal, if adopted, might mean that the Institutes would be abandoned if the General Conference decided to cut the proposed budget.

(37) Mr. BOW (Canada) stressed that, in putting forward the proposal that the Unesco Institutes in Germany be accorded a lower priority than other projects, the Canadian Government had no intention that the projects should be completely cut off from Unesco support.

(38) There being no support for the Canadian proposal, the CHAIRMAN put the American proposal to the vote. The motion was adopted.

Paragraphs 396-398

(39) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) drew the attention of the Committee to document 8C/PRG/12, which related to this section. He did not think that it was particularly appropriate for the Committee to discuss this project at length, as it was not intended to spend any money on it. The Department of Education intended to invite those Member States which had expressed interest in the scheme, to make an analytical report on the rôle of sport in education.

(40) Mr. CABOUAT (France) mentioned that the French National Commission and the government departments concerned were greatly interested in Unesco's activities on behalf of sport in education. He was sorry that the wording of the item in the draft programme, as given in the document submitted to the Executive Board, had been changed and proposed that the earlier wording should be restored. The French National Commission was in favour of the project mentioned in paragraph 397, in which three to five Member States were to be invited to undertake a comparative study of the place of sport in the education of young people, either in school or out of school, and was quite prepared to undertake such a study. France and its overseas territories offered a wide field for experiment and had a whole network of officials responsible for organizing sports activities.
Mr. Cabouat said that the French Government was prepared to make a financial contribution to a study of the kind proposed. The French National

Commission had prepared a memorandum, suggesting that a series of activities without budgetary implications be included in the programme, such as contacts with the Olympic Committee and international sports federations which had shown interest in Unesco's studies, the exchange of detailed information among Member States about the place occupied by sport in those States, discussions on the educational value of sport, and the publicizing of basic principles. Provision might be made for the inclusion in the programme of a whole series of activities involving no additional expenditure. The Secretariat might study those suggestions and make appropriate proposals.

(41) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the references mentioned by the French delegate could be used in writing to Member States. He accepted his other suggestions in general terms.

(42) Mr. LEE (United States of America) was in favour of the French delegate's suggestion that Unesco should ask for voluntary help from National Commissions.

(43) There were no further comments on paragraphs 396-398.

Paragraphs 399-415

(44) There were no comments.

(45) The CHAIRMAN said that, subject to consideration of the section on fundamental education, the Committee had completed its study of the Chapter on Education. He thanked Mr. Elvin for the help he had given the Committee and suggested, after consultation with the Secretariat, that the Chapter on Cultural Activities should be studied next.

**CHAPTER 4: CULTURAL ACTIVITIES**

(46) The CHAIRMAN welcomed Mr. Thomas (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) and asked him to introduce the Chapter.

(47) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) introducing the draft programme of his Department, pointed out that, like those of the other Departments, it was divided into two sections, the first containing established service activities of universal interest which were necessary for the development of international cultural co-operation and, the second, an action programme of projects designed to furnish advice and assistance to Member States. He gave a rapid survey of both sections, drawing attention to changes as compared with previous years. With regard to subventions to non-governmental organizations, the only increase proposed, which was for the International Council of Museums, was a small one. On the other hand, the Secretariat had sought, whenever possible, to convert subventions into contracts, with the result that the total amount of subventions for 1955-56 was slightly lower than that for 1953-54. So far as bibliographical services were concerned, Mr. Thomas drew the Committee's attention to an amendment to paragraph 405, contained in document 8C/5 Corrigendum, relating to the Index Translationum. The part of the programme dealing with activities relating to international agreements already concluded or on which preparatory work was being done contained no new proposals. The first section ended with a number of paragraphs relating to the Unesco library.

(48) In the second section, dealing with the action programme, efforts had been made to group cultural activities under three main headings, covering ten major projects. The first heading was the preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind (artistic, historic and scientific records, monuments and collections of universal interest) and the programme provided for direct or indirect aid to Member States for the preservation of that heritage, direct aid being given by sending out expert missions. The second main division, headed 'Culture and Education', made provision for cultural activities forming a necessary development and extension of the educational programme at all levels; it covered four main projects: humanistic studies in culture and education, education through the arts and the crafts, the development of libraries for all stages of education and for research, and the development of museums and their contribution to education. A new project, which was likely to make considerable progress, aimed at providing help for Member States in preparing reading materials for people who had recently learnt to read through fundamental education programmes; that project was being planned in close co-operation with other Unesco Departments: Education, Social Sciences, Mass Communication and Natural Sciences. Finally there was a third main heading - Culture and International Understanding, under which the proposed activities were designed to develop exchanges between the cultures of East and West and, especially since 1952, relations between the Old World and the New. Provision was made for artistic exchanges through reproductions, travelling exhibitions, recordings of the music of different peoples, etc. It was an enormous programme, in full course of development, and concentrated mainly on cultural exchanges between East and West. The project for the translation of great books representative of the genius of the various peoples included a series devoted to the literatures of Asia. Mr. Thomas concluded by saying that he had drawn attention particularly to activities which marked a strengthening of the programme compared with previous years.

(49) The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Thomas for his statement and commented on the clarity with which this Chapter had been presented. He asked for comments of a general nature on the Chapter as a whole.

(50) There being no general comments, a detailed discussion was opened.

Paragraphs 23-26

(51) The CHAIRMAN, in his capacity as Australian delegate, asked for an explanation of the provision for staff travel in paragraph 26, pointing out

that each project had also a provision for staff travel.

(52) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that paragraph 26 referred to the travel of the Director and Deputy Director of the Department, whereas the provision made under the individual projects was for travel by the Department's specialists.

(53) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the delegate of Australia, expressed the opinion that the only criterion should be whether the travel was absolutely necessary for the carrying out of the projects.

(54) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that travel costs appearing under the heading of the Office of the Director of a Department were to enable the Directors to carry out missions covering a number of projects at the same time.

(55) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the sum mentioned for staff travel and hospitality in the draft budget for 1955-56 was responsible for the increase in the budget over that for 1953-54.

(56) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) replied that the increase was due rather to the increase in staff costs caused by annual increments.

(57) There were no further comments on paragraphs 23-26.

Paragraphs 27-71 - Project 4.11

(58) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked the meaning of the first sentence in paragraph 31. Was it intended that new organizations would not receive subventions?

(59) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that, for 1955 and 1956, it was not proposed to grant subventions to any organizations other than those on the list of subventions for 1953 and 1954.

(60) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) asked whether, if new organizations were affiliated to already established organizations, they would also come under this provision.

(61) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked for a closer definition, as the present one did not make it clear whether reference was only being made to the period 1955-56 or whether it applied also to the future.

(62) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew attention to an error in translation which might be responsible for Mr. Cowell's remarks; further organizations should be substituted for new organizations.

(63) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that he would be satisfied with the substitution of the word further.

(64) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the International Society for Education through Art was already in existence in 1953-54; it was included in paragraph 31 among the organizations to which a starting subvention had been granted in 1953-54; it was now proposed that contracts be concluded with those organizations for 1955 and 1956, and information about them was given in the appropriate paragraphs of the programme.

(65) In answer to a question from Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) whether all the organizations included in document 8C/ADM/20 would be discussed by the Administrative Commission, the CHAIRMAN said that the Administrative Commission would only review them in connexion with their past performance. The Committee could discuss them from the point of view of granting subventions.

(66) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought that there would be some contradiction if the Committee recommended subventions for the period 1955-56 and then the Administrative Commission decided that a project should be discontinued on the basis of its past record.

(67) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) mentioned that the Committee had received documents 8C/ADM/20 and 8C/ADM/21 and considered them from a different point of view from that of the Administrative Commission, which had to take decisions on Unesco's general policy with regard to such organizations, in the light of the last four years' experience, whereas the Committee had to satisfy itself that the Secretariat had duly observed the existing directives and criteria.

(68) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) presumed that the Administrative Commission discussed the principles of continuing or undertaking a specific project and wondered how the Committee could possibly discuss the amounts of subventions before the principles had been agreed upon.

(69) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that Mr. Avidor's remark would be justified if the programme were entirely new, but, in point of fact, there were scarcely any changes in the new programme from previous years, and those were generally in the nature of reductions.

(70) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) proposed that the Committee in its report should suggest that the proposed subvention for the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies was insufficient. The Council was still growing and its affiliated associations were not all included in the list contained in paragraph 32.

(71) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) associated himself with the remarks made by Mr. Sommerfelt.

(72) It was agreed to make a recommendation to the effect that the subvention proposed for the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies was insufficient.

(73) Mr. BOW (Canada) indicated that on the whole, Canada supported the cultural programme.
(74) There were no further comments on paragraphs 27-71.

Paragraphs 72-83 - Project 4.12

(75) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) mentioned that project 4.12 (co-ordination of bibliographical services and exchanges of information) marked a natural continuation and extension of activities whose usefulness had already been proved. The Co-ordinating Committee was going to assess the value of Unesco's bibliographical activities and give its views on the Organization's work in that field; it was also concerned with the co-ordination of national and international services, and many States had already made considerable progress in that respect.
(76) Mr. Thomas also drew the Committee's attention to the corrigendum (paragraph 83) relating to the Index Translationum published before the war by the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation and revived by Unesco, which had undertaken its annual publication with the co-operation of Member States. At the outset, the Secretariat had been doubtful, not about the value or form of the Index, but about the cost of production; publishing this work placed a considerable burden upon the Secretariat and no more than 700 copies were sold annually. Questions about the need for continuing the publication had been asked in the Executive Board, and it had been decided to discontinue it. The Committee on Bibliography had discussed the question and had unanimously requested the Director-General to reconsider that decision.
(77) The Director-General had investigated the matter, with encouraging results: experts had pointed out that the sales level could be considered satisfactory and that it would be a pity to discontinue the publication now that an increased number of countries figured in it. The Director-General left it to the General Conference to decide whether the Index Translationum should continue as a regular feature of the programme or should be discontinued at the end of 1955.

(78) The CHAIRMAN, referring to paragraph 14 of document 8C/5 Add.1, (submission of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 by the Executive Board) asked whether the work connected with the Index Translationum was done under contract or whether it was done by the Secretariat of Unesco.

(79) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that the work was done mainly by the Secretariat, which consulted the National Commissions and specialized services of Member States. For certain countries, the information obtained was inadequate and had to be supplemented or revised by specialists, especially as concerned languages which were not widely spoken.

(80) The CHAIRMAN asked for comments on project 4.13

Paragraphs 84-117, Project 4.13

(81) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the corrigendum entailed no material change or budgetary implications; the work plans relating to copyright were simply presented in a more satisfactory form, in accordance with the recommendations of the Provisional Committee.
(82) There were no further comments on paragraphs 84-117.

Paragraphs 118-121 - Project 4.14

(83) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) asked why the amount proposed for travel in paragraph 121 was so high.

(84) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the provision for travel was to enable the Unesco librarian to attend meetings of the co-ordinating committee of librarians of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies.

(85) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the delegate of Australia, said that the Australian Government had always doubted whether the amounts spent on travel were justified and he asked whether business could not be carried out just as satisfactorily by correspondence.

(86) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) answered that the bulk of the work was done by correspondence; the librarians of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies met once a year and, if the budget item in question were deleted, the Unesco librarian would be the only one absent from the meeting. The meetings were extremely useful and provided an opportunity of making detailed arrangements for the exchange of documents.

(87) The CHAIRMAN replied that the contacts made by travel were obviously useful but he considered that travel was a luxury when the budget was restricted. He suggested that meetings could be held perhaps once every two years instead of annually or, alternatively, that only half the amount be spent on travel for annual meetings.

(88) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that the figures were based on actual expenditure in past years.

(89) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether it was logical to include the Unesco library in the programme for the Department of Cultural Activities. The library provided an administrative service for the whole of Unesco and not only for this Department.

(90) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought Miss Laise's point a good one. Though there were arguments for showing the appropriations for the library under the Department dealing with libraries, there were also arguments for showing

them under the administrative services. It was a question of the administrative organization of the Secretariat, which might, it seemed, be left to the Director-General.

Paragraphs 122-147 - Project 4.2

(91) The CHAIRMAN asked for comments.

(92) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) mentioned that the project for an international centre for the preservation and restoration of monuments and museum objects, with which the Conference was already familiar, was now being put into effect. The centre, which would be at the service of all Member States, would come into being in the near future. The Director-General had taken the view that it would be well to begin with organizations which were already in existence and had proved their worth, and he had received offers from the Governments of Belgium and Italy.

(93) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) drew attention to paragraph 131, which included an amount of $900 for contracts; he asked for information concerning this sum.

(94) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) reminded the meeting that the Executive Board would have to give its views on the location of the proposed centre. Legal regulations would have to be drawn up to establish its international status, and the Secretariat had felt that, for that purpose, the advice of experts would be needed. In reply to a query from the delegate of the United Kingdom, Mr. Thomas explained that the budget estimates were based on the remuneration of an expert, for six weeks, at $150 a week, which was the usual rate for an expert of that category.

(95) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the sum of $900 represented the cost of the preparation of draft agreements.

(96) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) remarked that the centre would be an important international institution, comparable in its own field with the International Laboratory for Nuclear Research in Geneva, an international organization in whose work all countries wishing to do so could take part.

(97) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the document could not be prepared by the Bureau of Legal Affairs.

(98) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that, in the case of the European Council for Nuclear Research, the work had been done by the Bureau of Legal Affairs. He pointed out, however, that the Bureau was too small to include specialists in every field. In the case in point, the services of an expert with technical as well as legal knowledge were required.

(99) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that, as a matter of principle, the cost was too high.

(100) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) repeated that the Bureau of Legal Affairs played a part in all the Organization's legal work; but its staff of officials numbered only four and could not have specialized knowledge in every field, whence the need for calling in an outside expert. With regard to the estimated cost, the Secretariat was, of course, quite prepared to use the services of a British expert if one could be secured at a lower rate.

(101) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 132, asked whether use would be made of the experience gained by members of the Egyptian Excavation Fund.

(102) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that it would. The Secretariat had taken advice and, by a decision of the Executive Board, a mission had been sent to Egypt to make a detailed study in preparation for the missions that were to be organized in 1955 and 1956. The project would not be begun until a very careful preparatory investigation had been completed.

Paragraphs 148-171 - Project 4.31

(103) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), referring to paragraph 151, asked whether it was the intention of Unesco to consult oriental countries as to which orientalists were to undertake this work. The normal procedure would be to confide in the Member States of areas in which it was proposed to work.

(104) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the project was still at a very early stage. Unesco had begun by asking ICPHS for advice; the Council had set up a working party consisting of representatives of the International Union of Orientalists and the International Federation of Societies for Classical Studies, which had drawn up a questionnaire to be sent out to all the countries concerned.

(105) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that projects A, B and C in paragraphs 153-164 should be given a very low priority. He was of the opinion that they were not of sufficient importance at the present time.

(106) Mr. BOW (Canada) supported the United Kingdom proposal. He did not mean that the projects were not good in themselves, but supported the allocation of a low priority.

(107) Mr. CABOUAT (France) could not support the proposals made by the United Kingdom delegation. The projects in question were a central part of cultural activities and the French delegation proposed to submit a draft resolution requesting the Director-General to encourage experiments in educational television, which, like broadcasting, was proving a most effective means of spreading ideas and techniques, especially in rural areas. He was therefore in favour of giving a high priority to the project mentioned in paragraph 161 of the programme.

(108) Mr. LEE (United States of America) was in favour of projects A, B and C having a low priority especially in relation to project D, which, he felt, should be given a high priority.

(109) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom proposal that the Committee should recommend that projects A, B and C be allocated a low priority in relation to the other projects in the programme of the Department of Cultural Activities.

(110) The motion was adopted by 6 votes in favour, 4 against and 1 abstention.

(111) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that, in view of the differences in priority recommended for projects A, B and C, on the one hand, and project D, on the other, it would be necessary to amend resolution 4.31.

(112) The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Maheu to draw the attention of the Committee to this point later, when the question of overall priorities was being discussed.

Paragraphs 172-184 - Project 4.32

(113) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) mentioned that he had already said in his general statement that project 4.32 was continuing. Seminars had been organized, including a recent one in Japan, at which the problem of crafts, which was of great importance in many countries of the Far East, had been raised. It was probable that the technical aid to Member States, for which provision was made in paragraphs 182, 183 and 184, would be concerned with the crafts.

(114) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 172, expressed the opinion that the staff costs were too high. In his opinion, a great deal could be done at a lower cost.

(115) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) remarked that two questions had been raised: (1) cost and (2) staff. With regard to the cost, it was proposed, in paragraphs 177 and 178, that contracts be concluded with two international associations - the International Society for Education through Art and the International Society for Music Education - which had recently been established as a sequel to conferences organized by Unesco. Those contracts would take the place of the starting subventions granted in the past. Much of the expenditure provided for under paragraphs 182, 183 and 184 was to be devoted to technical aid in the form of missions sent out in response to specific requests.

(116) The staff had not been increased, and consisted of a specialist in the teaching of the visual arts, with an assistant who was an expert on the questions involved in the teaching of music. Probably, increasing demands would have to be met in that field. It was a minimum programme with the smallest possible staff. Mr. Thomas concluded by saying that, if he had known the results of the Tokyo Seminar in time, he would probably have put forward a broader, and therefore more costly, programme.

(117) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the United States Government regarded project C (paragraphs 182-184) as having considerable significance and proposed that it should be given a higher priority than projects A and B (paragraphs 177-181). In submitting this proposal, he understood that the higher budgetary level was not being taken into account.

(118) Mr. CABOUAT (France) observed that the proposal of the United States delegation raised a question of principle, since requests for higher priorities for projects classed as special services might entail cuts in projects classed among the established service activities.

(119) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) did not think that the proposal of the United States delegation would mean dropping anything else. It was indeed a pleasant innovation to accord positive rather than negative priorities.

(120) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked again whether the proposal of the United States delegation could be accepted without its having automatic repercussions on the established service activities.

(121) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) left it to Mr. Thomas to answer that particular case, but thought that, generally speaking, Mr. Cabouat's fears arose from pushing logic rather too far. The established service activities formed a sound enough foundation to support such increase of technical aid without there being a need for increased appropriations therefor.

(122) Mr. CABOUAT (France), while acknowledging that some flexibility was necessary, drew attention to the need for preserving a balance between the two sections of the programme.

(123) Mr. LEE (United States of America) explained that, in making his proposal, he had only wanted to emphasize one part of the programme. He had not intended to suggest that the other two projects should be abandoned.

(124) As the United States proposal was not seconded, the CHAIRMAN ruled that the projects up to paragraph 184 were to be considered as having equal priority.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

# SIXTH MEETING

*4 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION** (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the meeting to document 0809 4784, setting out the technical aid projects throughout the programme, and opened the debate on fundamental education, on the basis of document 8C/DIV/30, upon the production of which he congratulated the Secretariat.

(2) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that document 8C/DIV/30, 'Fundamental Education: Reference to various chapters of the draft programme and budget for 1955-1956, represented a first experiment to control interdepartmental co-ordination in a specific field of work. The principle of selection, which had inspired the drafting of the document had led to the elimination of a large number of related activities and to the retention only of those most directly connected with fundamental education. It had not seemed desirable to draw up a list of activities merely by juxtaposition, following the same order as the chapters of the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-1956. On the contrary, effort was directed towards setting out in their sequence the questions relating to the problem of fundamental education and to show for each of them the action taken or to be undertaken by Unesco.

(3) The Assistant Director-General said that such action was envisaged in the first place from the angle of a scientific study of the social problems of fundamental education; thus it came under the Department of Social Sciences (Section I).

(4) Section II was concerned with the techniques to be used for improving methods. It mentioned, in particular, projects of the Department of Education.

(5) Section III represented direct action by Unesco for the training of specialists. The production of reading material for the newly literate was a new departure and should be inserted, as Section IV, after Section III.

(6) The former Section IV of the document (now Section V) was general aid to fundamental education projects. It represented a limited activity by Unesco, depending essentially upon Member States. With the exception of the Gift Coupon Scheme, it was the concern of the Department of Education.

(7) The final section, now renumbered VI, was a new item: the Secretariat felt that in future any action taken by Unesco should be completed by a phase of evaluation.

(8) The Assistant Director-General added that the total budget for the projects relating to fundamental education set out in document 8C/DIV/30 amounted for the two years 1955 and 1956 to $2,000,000, half of which came under the Education chapter, and the other half was spread over the remaining Department concerned. The total figure represented approximately 15% of the sums budgeted for the execution of the programme, excluding the Documents and Publications Service. (Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-1956, Part II).

(9) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) expressed his delegation's approval of the work on fundamental education, but feared there was a tendency on the part of Unesco to go beyond the original conception in its relations with the Associated Projects.

(10) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) commended the projects, with special reference to the production of reading material for new literates.

(11) Mr. LEE (United States of America) felt that a high priority should be accorded to the projects on fundamental education. It was important to evaluate these, with a view to remodelling the programme. He approved the stress laid on education for international understanding. Another pleasing aspect of the programme was the participation of women and the effort to do away with all racial and other forms of discrimination.

Statistical data (Social Sciences, paragraphs 98 and 99)

(12) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) informed the meeting that the Statistics Division provided regular data on illiteracy as part of its routine activities. An historical survey of the dramatic changes in the field of literacy (paragraph 98) would prove more interesting. It was hoped to have this document ready by 1955.

(13) Paragraphs 98 and 99 were adopted.

Social Studies (Social Sciences, paragraphs 201 and 211-13)

(14) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that community development was the term which covered all local self-help projects. Knowledge of the basic conditions of local community structure had been

found to be lacking and it had therefore been proposed, in close co-operation with the United Nations, to make a world-wide survey of types.

(15) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) questioned why, if that work was to be printed in 1956, a sum should be allocated to staff travel during that year.

(16) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that details of travel would depend on the countries most interested in co-operating. As it could not be planned in advance, the allocation had been made in that approximate form for budget reasons.

(17) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether it would be possible at that stage to indicate what professional scientific organizations would receive the contracts mentioned in paragraph 211.

(18) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the International Political Science Association was interested, and that Unesco would probably have the co-operation of the International Union of Local Authorities.

(19) Mr. LEE (*United States of America*) reaffirmed his delegation's view that such surveys should be strictly limited to facts bearing a real relationship to programmes, and should rely for research largely on the National Commissions, non-governmental organizations, etc.

(20) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate for Australia, supported Mr. Lee's suggestions.

(21) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the budget envisaged did not suffice for obtaining all the information needed, and Unesco was relying on the co-operation of Member States and non-governmental organizations. She added that the study was of great value to the programme of fundamental education, as well as to the whole United Nations Community Development programme.

(22) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) said that the Mexican National Commission had asked Unesco to undertake a study of the social repercussions of agrarian reform in his country.

(23) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that the work on community development in Mexico had been connected with land reform.

II. Improvement of Methods and Techniques of Fundamental Education

1. *Diffusion of Technical Information on Fundamental Education* (Education, paragraphs 76 and 107 and 108)

(24) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that this was one of the most important aspects of the work. Unesco relied on it for briefing its field workers, supplying them with preparatory information, and assisting Member States in reaching conclusions on fundamental education problems. He added that the word complete in the first line of the English text (paragraph 76) was misleading. It would be more appropriate to say full. The quarterly bulletin (paragraph 107) was a useful link between workers in the field and officials in ministries. Six thousand copies appeared in English, 3,000 in French, apart from the regional versions now undertaken.

(25) Adopted.

2. Methods of teaching how to read and write (Education, paragraph 268)

(26) Mr. BOW (Canada) highly commended the kind of practical activity proposed in this paragraph.

(27) Adopted.

3. The use of a language of wide communication in relation to the use of vernacular languages in fundamental education (Education, paragraphs 274-279)

(28) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that these paragraphs dealt with a difficulty that arose in many parts of the world. On principle it was best to teach people to read and write the language they spoke, but where their vernacular was not widely spread or had only recently acquired an alphabet, they might prefer to learn a language in world use. Two phases had therefore been planned.

(29) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) expressed approval of the project.

(30) Agreed.

4. Rôle of libraries in fundamental education Seminar on public library development in Asia (1955) (Cultural Activities, paragraphs 212-215)

(31) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) drew attention to the role of public libraries in the development of fundamental education; their effectiveness was indisputable. The experiment they made at the Delhi Public Library would be completed in the current year. For 1955, the intention was to extend this experiment to 30 librarians from 12 other Asian countries so that the good results already obtained might be repeated throughout the region.

(32) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the idea.

(33) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) commended it highly. The project in Delhi had done very good work for the last five years.

Pilot project for library development in Africa (Cultural Activities, paragraphs 219-222)

(34) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of

Cultural Activities) described the main features of the pilot project for the development of public libraries in Africa. A seminar had been held in Nigeria the previous year and librarians and educators had attended it. A member of the Secretariat had gone to the region during 1954 and should soon be handing in his report on public libraries in Africa and on the recommendations made at the Ibadan seminar, especially as concerned the planning of the pilot project. The General Conference would be asked to decide on the choice of country and on the desirability of organizing a centre for servicing the mobile libraries.

(35) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) favoured a high priority for this project.

Education for librarianship in Arab States (Cultural Activities, paragraphs 244-251)

(36) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the difficulty arose from the complete absence in these States of librarians acquainted with modern methods. What they now had to do was to tackle the problem methodically from 1955 onwards with the co-operation of the Sirs-el-Layyan Fundamental Education Centre.

(37) Approved.

Technical aid to Member States (Cultural Activities, paragraphs 257-263)

(38) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) had little to say about technical aid in the development of libraries in rural areas. The task would be principally one of advising and aiding Member States at their request and giving them the advantage of the experience gained by the Organization in other regions.

(39) Paragraphs 257-263 were approved.

5. Rôle of museums in fundamental education (paragraphs 296-298)

(40) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) compared this pilot project for an educational museum in the Patzcuaro Fundamental Education Centre with the project for training qualified librarians at the Sirs-el-Layyan Centre. Its object was to adapt to fundamental education the technical methods used in museums, by establishing a small educational museum in the Centre itself and organizing a number of travelling exhibitions. The scheme would also provide an opportunity for training specialists.

(41) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) said that his Government was not opposed to the pilot project's being conducted at Patzcuaro by the museums expert but suggested that it be given a lower priority. The expert was dealing with Tarascan art, with which he was possibly insufficiently acquainted. Mr. Siller therefore thought that these efforts might be more effectively directed towards other projects.

(42) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the suggestion by the delegate of Mexico.

(43) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said it was not clear to him why the delegates of Mexico and Israel were asking for a lower priority. He explained that there was not the slightest intention of opening yet another museum at Patzcuaro - there were already two which were functioning very well and the Centre could rely on their co-operation. What they were trying to do was to use, for the development of fundamental education, the visual methods employed in museums and to disseminate these methods by training a certain number of specialists for the other countries.

(44) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) in support of the proposal made in the document, said that the existing museum at Patzcuaro did not fulfil the function for which the museum expert was provided, i.e. to use museum techniques in order to improve the basic education of a community.

(45) Mr. BOW (Canada) supported the suggestion of the delegate of Mexico.

(46) The motion for reducing the priority of this activity was carried by 8 in favour, 2 against.

Regional seminar on the use of museum techniques in fundamental education (1956) (Cultural Activities, paragraphs 299-301).

(47) Approved.

Paragraphs 304-311

(48) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) observed that the idea behind the seminar provided for in paragraphs 304-311 was the same as in the case of the project just discussed. The Brooklyn and Athens seminars had provided lessons which should be turned to account. It was particularly important to provide for the training of specialists for the travelling exhibitions (museo-buses), which might circulate in countries where there were no regular museums.

(49) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked for reconsideration of this scheme. There were other things more important than mobile museums, such as the training of museum curators, research into the preservation of museum objects under tropical conditions, etc. A considerable reduction of expenses might be effected here. If, however, the revision were not undertaken, he would like to see a mention of the International Council of Museums, whose services should be made use of.

(50) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) thought Mr. Cowell had made an important point. No mention had been made of the International Council of Museums in connexion with the project, but they were of course counting on its collaboration. It was the only body of its kind for which an increased subvention was made in the Proposed Programme and Budget for

1955-56 in the Chapter on Cultural Activities.
(51) Some misunderstanding had perhaps crept into the discussion: the purpose of the museobus was not to preserve the cultural heritage of Member States but to develop fundamental education by taking exhibitions formed for that purpose to the spots where they were needed.

(52) Mr. LEE (United States of America) supported the suggestion of the United Kingdom delegate. The activity should be given a low priority.

(53) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the use of museums as a medium of education was beginning to be appreciated in India. Travelling exhibitions were very successful in largely illiterate populations as a part of adult education programmes. He opposed giving this activity a low priority.

(54) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the delegate of India. In areas where there were no museums such work could meet a basic need.

(55) The CHAIRMAN asked the delegate of the United Kingdom whether, in the light of what had been said, he could formulate his proposal in terms of low priority only, or whether he wished for a modified project.

(56) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) could not at that stage work out a modified project. He therefore asked that the scheme be given low priority.

(57) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) explained that he was opposed to the pilot project, not on grounds of principle, but on account of the special circumstances in that case. Accordingly, if the Indian delegate thought that the project for South East Asia should be proceeded with, the Mexican delegation would support it.

(58) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that travelling exhibitions would be useful even in countries with well developed regular museums, like the countries of Western Europe. Over and above their specific purpose - the development of fundamental education - mobile museums would awaken interest in Unesco and its activities among the general public. In conclusion he wished to express his hearty support of the proposal put forward by Mr. Junankar.

(59) A vote was then taken on the motion of reducing the priority of the seminar workshop on the building of travelling exhibitions and a mobile museum for South East Asia (paragraphs 304-311) which was rejected with 4 in favour and 7 against.

6. Rôle of teaching of arts and crafts in fundamental education (Cultural Activities, paragraphs 182-4)

(60) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) observed that the Committee had already discussed the rôle of the arts and crafts in fundamental education from the standpoint of technical aid to Member States.

(61) The CHAIRMAN replied that technical aid to Member States had been examined from a vertical perspective, it would now be taken from a horizontal one.

(62) Approved.

7. Use of the means of communication for fundamental education (Education, paragraph 280 and paragraphs 165-183 of Mass Communication)

(63) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication), speaking of the use of mass media for fundamental education and particularly of the production of films for that purpose (paragraphs 165-176) observed that these projects would have to be carried out in full agreement with Member States. Nevertheless the local production of films had been mainly in the form of silent 16 mm. reels and it was not at present possible to judge the results on the spot since the countries where the films had been shot had no laboratories. A very simple type of mobile development kit would need to be made available to film units at low cost through some form of hiring.
(64) Another difficulty, both financial and linguistic, was the production of sound films in local languages. There were nevertheless grounds for hoping that the current projects would lead to the formation of independent low cost local production centres, with the aid of the standard magnetic process. In 1956, there was to be a pilot project upon which would be based a detailed report and precise conclusions on the practical possibilities.

(65) Mr. LEE (United States of America) made a criticism, which however he hoped was no longer valid, on the lack of co-ordination between education specialists and specialists in mass communication.

(66) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) assured the United States delegate that there was full co-ordination between the services of the Departments of Mass Communication and of Education in the matter of fundamental education; without such close co-operation the proposed programme could not be carried out.

(67) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) added that his Department had always received excellent co-operation from members of the Department of Mass Communication. He quoted the Messina Seminar as a particularly fruitful example.

Visual aid kits for fundamental education (Mass Communication, paragraphs 177 and 178)

(68) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that these kits had been put together as a result of the Messina Seminar; they were packed in eight strong cases which could be lent to Member States on request. Four other cases were to be made up on slightly different subjects.

(69) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the

project, but thought that the Organization of American States should be asked to co-operate.

(70) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that, on 20 October 1954, the Director-General had signed in Washington an agreement between the Organization of American States and Unesco for the development of fundamental education in Latin America. The purpose of the agreement was to continue the arrangements - due to expire in 1954 - which had enabled the Patzcuaro experiment to take place and to extend the experiment to the whole of Latin America.

(71) The project for visual aid kits was approved.

Influence of educational broadcasts (paragraphs 179 and 180)

(72) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that through lack of funds the educational influence of radio broadcasts had not been adequately exploited in the underdeveloped countries. Pilot projects, like the one already carried out in Colombia, were planned for Egypt and that should make it possible to work out the necessary techniques (paragraphs 179 and 180).

(73) The project was approved.

(74) Continuing, Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) made some explanatory remarks about the production of reading material for new literates (paragraphs 181 and 182 of the Chapter on Mass Communication and Section IV of document 8C/DIV/30). He pointed out that the Department of Mass Communication was merely carrying the work of the Department of Education a stage further (paragraph 311 of the Chapter on Education). His Department's project provided for direct action in the shape of a contract to be concluded with the Graphic Arts Foundation of the United States of America. The aim was to compensate for the complete absence of a daily press in some countries and of a press suitable for new literates in others.

(75) Paragraphs 181 and 192 were approved.

Regional Film Library for the Middle East (Mass Communication, paragraphs 184 and 185)

(76) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) reported that the Ford Foundation and the University of Syracuse (United States of America) had undertaken to collect the material for a report which was expected to reach Unesco in the near future. The scheme provided for an expert to be placed at the disposal of the Film Library to get it into working order. There would also be provision for visual aids.

(77) Paragraphs 184 and 185 were approved.

Use of television for fundamental education (Mass Communication, paragraphs 186 and 187)

(78) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained this project, quoting the experience acquired in a country where broadcasting was technically backward. The proposal was to organize group listening with the assistance of Member States and to study the results secured, paying special attention to the solution of local difficulties regarding the maintenance of equipment.

(79) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that a pilot project had been carried out in France and could be extended to Japan, where television was developing rapidly.

(80) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the idea so far, as concerned radio, but thought that the project for Asia in 1956 based on television should be postponed. It was too early to use television as a means of education in that continent.

(81) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the suggestion by the delegate of Israel.

(82) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) considered that with regard to the attitude to be adopted towards television, a new phenomenon, there arose a question of principle. Unesco could acquire an influence in that sphere not possible for it to attain in media such as press and radio, where the pattern was already set. Would it not be wise to grasp that opportunity when television was still only feeling its way? In two years' time it might be too late.

(83) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought that the point made by the Assistant Director-General would apply just as well in 1958 or later.

(84) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was also unconvinced. How many television sets were there in Japan?

(85) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) seconded the proposal by the delegate of Israel.

(86) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested that the project, instead of being suppressed, should be classed as a low priority one.

(87) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) did not accept that suggestion.

(88) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the proposal was being examined in his country by the Ministry concerned with the television experiment in Bombay.

(89) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that the use of television would develop in India following the experiment carried out in Bombay. He then read out a list of countries, including some in Asia, which had asked Unesco to co-operate in the project.

(90) The amendment of the delegate of the United States of America was not seconded. The motion put forward by the delegate of Israel, seconded by the United Kingdom and Indonesian delegates, that the Committee recommend deferment of the

project contained in paragraphs 186 and 187 was put to the vote and adopted with 8 in favour and 3 abstentions.

Development of the radio forum as a means of fundamental education (Mass Communication, paragraphs 188 and 189)

(91) Adopted.

III. The Training of Fundamental Education Specialists

1. International Fundamental Education Centres (Education, paragraphs 290-304)

(92) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that two out of the four fundamental education training and production centres decided on by the General Conference four years ago had now been under way, Patzcuaro for four years and Sirs-el-Layyan for two. It had been difficult to finance them adequately on the budget now ending, particularly owing to the uncertainties of technical assistance. As continued existence on a sound financial basis was looked upon as vital, it was proposed to rely no longer on technical assistance for the maintenance of students, but to provide out of the normal budget not only for those of the host countries but for all students. Forty thousand dollars were being contributed by the Organization of American States. The work of both institutes was in good shape. A reorganization had taken place recently at Patzcuaro.

(93) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought it opportune at that stage to propose that no conference, seminar or other activity should be organized by or with the support of Unesco in a region inaccessible for political reasons to any Member State. Israel, with her Arabic schools and educators, was interested in learning from and contributing to the Centre in Egypt, but had been discouraged from doing so, and subsequently the Director-General had stated at a press conference that Israel had not pressed for a share in the activities of that Centre.

(94) He read the following statement:

"I wish to bring to the Committee's attention the following statement on behalf of my Government: When it was proposed, at the sixth session of the General Conference in 1951, to establish a fundamental education centre in the Middle East, my delegation indicated its interest in such a centre and proposed that it be established in a place accessible to all Member States. When the centre was about to be established in Egypt we brought the matter up before the Secretariat and the Executive Board, and were assured by the Secretariat, in writing, that the Egyptian centre would be accessible to Israeli educators.

Our interest in this centre is indeed great, for we could both learn from it and contribute to it. We have in Israel an Arab-speaking population and a network of government schools conducted in Arabic, and we also have in Israel a small but important group of educators who are Arabists well versed in Arabic and also intimately familiar with the Arab way of life and Arab mentality.

We had made all necessary preparations to send a team of educators to the centre in Egypt when it was hinted to us that our request might embarrass Unesco. When the Director-General visited Israel several months ago he was asked at a press conference why Israel was not participating in the Egyptian Centre. His brief answer was that Israel had not pressed for it. The Director-General was our guest, and I, who was present at the press conference, preferred not to elaborate on the matter.

My delegation will support all efforts to improve education in the Middle East, including further support for the Egyptian Centre, but I wish, on this occasion, to request the members of the Committee to convey to their delegations our earnest request - and I want especially to impress it on the Secretariat and all its departments and sections - that no conference, seminar or any other activity of a regional nature shall be organized by or with the support of Unesco in places that are inaccessible, for political reasons, to any Member State of this Organization."

(95) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that there was little he could say about Mr. Avidor's statement. The delegate of Israel had made his Government's position clear. He (Mr. Maheu) could but confirm that all Unesco's regional or local undertakings were subject to regulations which provided in particular that they should be open to observers of all the other Member States.

(96) Currently, Mr. Maheu added, the Secretariat was tending to revise its policy on the setting up of international and regional fundamental education centres. The original idea had been to create a world network of regional centres following the success achieved in Latin America. But Unesco had, at the very beginning, come up against the problem of finance in bringing the network into being. Moreover, there were few regions linguistically and politically homogeneous enough to ensure the success of a regional centre. For all these reasons, the Secretariat was disposed in future to concentrate rather on the development of national centres of fundamental education.

(97) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the question of principle raised was an important one and should be taken note of, but that the Committee was not the appropriate place for action to be taken on it.

(98) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) merely wished that such things should not occur again in the future.

(99) The CHAIRMAN said that the statement by the delegate of Israel would appear in the records.

(100) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether there was any connexion between the reorganization mentioned and the new agreement concluded with the Organization of American States.

(101) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said he referred merely to an internal

administrative change. Training of students and production work at Patzcuaro were to be merged in order to give the studies greater unity and efficiency.

(102) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked if it would not be possible to seek further assistance from outside. Was $40,000 the last word of the Organization of American States? The Institutes had done well enough without the sums Unesco proposed to allocate to students. Were these essential?

(103) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Australia, on policy rather than on budget, wondered whether it was psychologically right to assure the maintenance of students whose costs should really be met by the participating countries.

(104) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), answering Mr. Cowell's question first, said that the figure of $40,000 was the highest the Organization of American States could give directly, but they were also contributing through a newly instituted Bureau for the Production of Materials for Fundamental Education in Latin America. Other resources might be found, but it would be most unwise to budget on hopes. In reply to Mr. Cowell's other remark, he said that the Centres had not got on well without the proposed allocation from the budget.

(105) In answer to the Chairman's point, he said that Member States already maintained the students' salaries at home, and paid for their travel. Enquiries had been made, and it was probable that in the Middle East, where fundamental education had been virtually unknown before, there would be very few students if Member States were required to pay for them, while in Latin America, where the idea was more widespread, only a few States would be willing to do so.

(106) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked if the measure might be looked upon as a temporary one, taken in order to fill a gap.

(107) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that it could concern only the next two years.

(108) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the foregoing remarks showed how important it was to make every effort to develop national centres. The United States of America would give high priority to such efforts.

(109) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that Mr. Cowell's objections were met by paragraph 300, which stated that Member States after 1957 would have to meet maintenance costs either from their own funds or from funds ear-marked in their technical assistance programmes.

(110) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) was against any change in the present system of contributions, on the grounds that it would lead to complications and delay in payments and might also bring about changes in the agreement signed with Mexico.

(111) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) agreed that such a policy would involve many complications both for the students and for the Member States concerned.

(112) The paragraphs on international fundamental education centres were adopted.

2. Aid to national fundamental education centres (Education, paragraphs 305-7)

(113) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Secretariat was strongly in favour of giving direct assistance to promote the creation and upkeep of these centres, in view of the difficulty of starting any new international ones.

3. Scholarships in fundamental education (Exchange of Persons, paragraphs 32, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60)

(114) Mr. W. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the purpose of the fellowships was to give the opportunity to highly qualified experts in Member States to make comparative observations.

(115) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board), at the request of the Chairman, said a few words on his recent visit to Patzcuaro. What had impressed him most was the spirit of the students. There was one disturbing factor: groups of students, full of enthusiasm at the end of a course, were dispersed upon their return home. That was a regrettable waste of all the resources that had been spent on their training. He suggested that a meeting of Latin American Ministers of Education should be called at Patzcuaro to find a solution to that question. He also stated that the posters produced at the Centre could be improved.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

# SEVENTH MEETING

*4 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION (document 8C/DIV/30) AND PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56 (8C/5) (continued)**

**IV. PRODUCTION OF READING MATERIAL FOR NEW LITERATES**

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited discussion on Education: paragraphs 310-312.

(2) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the paragraphs under discussion related to studies in methods of teaching adults to read and write. Such efforts would be of little use unless followed by the provision of reading material, which for many Member States was difficult. It was therefore proposed to give financial assistance, at their request, to national and regional institutions conducting experiments as a result of the Unesco study in 1953 and 1954.

(3) No comments were made and projects 310-312 were thus approved.

Cultural Activities, paragraphs 186-201

(4) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) drew attention to the grave problem met with by many Member States in making reading matter available to new literates, since vernacular literature was all too often lacking. Unesco had therefore concluded contracts on a very modest scale with certain Indian institutions with a view to the production of booklets dealing with national and social life. It was intended to help or encourage Member States to produce simple, attractive and inexpensive publications so as to keep alive the desire for reading and prevent those who had benefited by literacy campaigns from falling back into their former ignorance. Various working methods had been proposed, and, if these were to be effectively carried out, close co-operation between the different departments of Unesco was essential. During 1955 on-the-spot studies would be undertaken in various countries with the collaboration of National Commissions and local authorities. Paragraphs 191 to 200 listed modes of action, both direct and indirect, designed to solve this vast problem, which was destined, alongside that of fundamental education, to become one of Unesco's main tasks.

(5) Replying to a question by the delegate of the German Federal Republic, Mr. Thomas said that the plan was to begin with three or four countries specially interested in the problem. The National Commissions and the education authorities would give guidance to Unesco missions, whose job it would be to make an inventory of existing resources. There were two problems - that of selection and that of printing. There were likely to be considerable opportunities of obtaining assistance in choosing contemporaneous works that lent themselves to adaptation. In addition, certain publishers had expressed readiness to collaborate with Unesco in the printing and distribution of attractive and inexpensive works.

(6) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked what methods were used in the important and difficult task of judging the material provided.

(7) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the National Commissions of the countries concerned were the bodies best qualified to advise Unesco through systematic consultation. Methods of action should be worked out on the spot, in close liaison with these Commissions and the national authorities, by selecting a few countries to which the problem was of immediate concern. On the basis of the data thus assembled, Unesco would be able to put forward a working plan for one or two years. Works belonging to world literature could be selected, translated and published in cheap editions. Well-known authors could also be asked to write booklets on various subjects specially intended for this class of reader. In addition to such direct action, the programme also envisaged the offer of prizes to encourage production of this kind. Finally, there was provision for Unesco aid to enable governments and National Commissions to launch a system of distribution and production. Each country had its own problems and no hard-and-fast method could be laid down.

(8) Paragraphs 186-201 were adopted.

Mass Communication, paragraphs 181 and 182 and Social Sciences, paragraph 128

(9) No comment.

V. General Aid to Fundamental Education Projects

1. Servicing associated projects (Education, paragraphs 282-289)

(10) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the system of associated projects was

expanding, there were at present fifty in seventeen different countries. It was now proposed to link associated projects with an expert mission on fundamental education and to appoint two experts who would spend the greater part of two years visiting the regions concerned and giving constant advice and supervision in the development of the various projects. Paragraph 284 contained a new and significant proposal. It was felt that regional centres in fundamental education would not be justified unless their graduating students were subsequently given suitable work in their own countries, and it was therefore proposed to encourage co-operation by sending to a country which guaranteed to employ students graduating from the Sirs-el-Layyan Fundamental Education Centre, an expert entrusted with the setting up of a fundamental education centre.
(11) A propos an earlier question by the United Kingdom delegate in connexion with paragraph 285, Unesco did not in any way intend to direct associated projects; its function was rather to advise and act as a catalyst. Unesco was, however interested in the status of women and in seeing remedied the inequalities which existed in the field of education.

(12) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thanked the Director of the Education Department for his reassurance; the speaker had perhaps misunderstood the term urged. He had been concerned because there were fourteen associated projects in territories connected with the United Kingdom.

2. Fundamental education within the framework of the educational programme for Palestine refugees (Education, paragraphs 232-235)

(13) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) drew attention to the fact that the students at the Sirs-el-Layyan Centre would include a team of five from the project on education of Palestinian refugees.
(14) There was no comment.

3. Emergency Educational Assistance to Korea (Education, paragraphs 241 and 242)

(15) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, following a recommendation made by UNKRA, it was proposed to send a fundamental education expert to start a centre in Korea.

(16) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the provision for staff travel was really necessary.

(17) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that it was difficult to keep in touch with work in Korea. Some contact had been made by staff members who had managed to visit Korea from Tokyo, but it would be wise to make provision for staff travel.

4. Gift Coupon Programme (Mass Communication, paragraphs 211-221)

(18) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), pointing out the reference made to the Unesco Gift Programme, suggested that the discussion on coupons should be opened when they came to examine the chapter on Mass Communication

(19) The CHAIRMAN approved this suggestion.

VI.1. Evaluation of Literacy Campaigns (Education, paragraphs 271 and 272)

(20) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that these paragraphs reflected the general feeling that Unesco should review its efforts and help Member States to assess the methods used. The criterion of success in the literacy campaign was not how many people were still attending classes after three months but how many were reading worth-while literature after one year. It was proposed that an evaluation should be carried out by two experts: one an expert in teaching adults how to read and write, and the other an educationalist with a sociological background, who would work in a selected region. At Headquarters close collaboration would be maintained between the Departments of Social Sciences and Education.

VI. 2. Evaluation of the results of fundamenta education projects (Social Sciences, paragraphs 232-235)

(21) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that an initial survey was being conducted in 1954 by the Department of Cultural Activities in collaboration with the Department of Social Sciences, on the value of a public library set up in Delhi. It was hoped that the evaluation would be carried out in 1955 by local research teams in India, with foreign assistance, if requested.
(22) The second project, outlined in paragraph 235, represented a combined attempt by the Departments of Education and Social Sciences to evaluate fundamental education. A survey was being made to ascertain the best techniques, after which the major responsibility would fall on the operating department. For that reason the cost came in the budget for the Department of Education.

(23) The CHAIRMAN said that the consideration of fundamental education was now completed. The discussion had been very valuable and a clear idea had emerged of how the different projects were knit together. He thanked the Directors of the Departments concerned for their statements.

(24) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the remarks of the Chairman and proposed that they should be included in the Rapporteur's report.

**CHAPTER 4. CULTURAL ACTIVITIES** (continued)

Project 4.34: Development of libraries

Paragraphs 202-215

(25) No comment.

Paragraphs 216-218

(26) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural

Activities) gave a few details about the experiment currently proceeding, in association with the Colombian authorities, in organizing a public library in the industrial town of Medellin. The Director-General had just returned from taking part in the inauguration of the scheme. The library was not specially designed for fundamental education but the Colombian authorities were about to undertake a fundamental education drive in Medellin, and it was Unesco's intention to use the library as additional leverage. The drive was being conducted on the same lines as that in New Delhi, where the contracts had expired.

Paragraphs 224-229

(27) Turning to project D Mr. Thomas stated that one of Unesco's aims was the inter-library exchange of publications. In many countries exchange centres were already functioning and relaying Unesco activities, and it was felt that the Latin American countries should be invited to a conference in order to consider an extension of exchanges between themselves and the rest of the world.

(28) Mr. LEE (United States of America) pointed out that there was no mention of the Organization of American States, which was interested in the subject. He assumed that that Organization would not be associated with the project.

(29) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that, although the Organization of American States was not expressly mentioned, the Secretariat proposed to inform it of the project and obtain from it the same support received at the Sao Paulo Conference, in which the Organization of American States had taken an active part.

Project E (paragraphs 230-243)

(30) Mr. Thomas said that this project was a continuation of what had already been done for several years under the heading of Associated Projects. The list of publications in preparation or now appearing was given in paragraphs 233-243; all of them were designed to assist in the development of popular libraries in Latin America and South East Asia.

Paragraphs 264-267

(31) Mr. Thomas observed that paragraphs 252-267 indicated various fields in which it was proposed to give direct aid to Member States. Project H related to requests from the countries of southern Asia and dealt with the creation or development of national or university libraries.

(32) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Australia, said that his Government considered the project of the greatest importance and had arranged for the Deputy National Librarian to accompany the Asian tour and to assist in co-ordinating results in Paris.

(33) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) added that this mission was functioning at the moment. Mr. E.J. Carter, Head of the Libraries Division, was on his way to South Asia, accompanied by the Australian librarian to whom the Chairman had referred. He wished to express the Secretariat's appreciation of the Chairman's co-operation which would help to strengthen Unesco's action in the field of libraries.

Paragraphs 268-277

(34) Mr. Thomas said that project I was another example of direct aid to Member States by setting up a small microfilm library, under the direction of a qualified expert, which would visit regions where, judging by requests received, the need appeared to exist. The unit was to begin work in 1955 and might be installed in Latin America in 1956, where it could be attached to the Havana office.

(35) The microfilming of all documents preserved in libraries, archives and so forth seemed to be an urgent necessity, and Unesco would like to make available to interested Member States an apparatus and an operator, thus enabling the most pressing needs to be met. This was a new form of direct assistance but one which was often asked for.

(36) In reply to a question by the representative of Israel, Mr. Thomas indicated that the appropriation of $7,000 represented the purchase of equipment.

(37) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested that the project should be awarded a low priority, as being a little premature, but would not press the point.

(38) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked what countries were involved.

(39) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) did not have before him the official requests by Member States, but emphasized that, wherever contacts were made with libraries and documentation centres, the problem arose of obtaining the means for microfilming. Hitherto, Unesco had done no more than give advice by indicating the most effective technical methods, whereas this item in the programme made provision for more extensive direct assistance by making equipment and materials available to any States which might request them.

(40) The delegates of the United Kingdom, Israel and Canada thought that the priority of the project should be raised. A formal proposal to that effect was made by Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) and seconded by Mr. JUNANKAR (India).

(41) In reply to Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway), the CHAIRMAN explained that, if the motion were lost, the activity would remain equal in priority to other projects.

(42) The proposal of the delegate of Israel was rejected by 7 votes against, 3 in favour, with 1 abstention.

Project 4.35: Development of museums

Paragraphs 278-295

(43) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) drew attention to a textual amendment to the French version: the Executive Board thought that the title of project A "La croisade des musées" would be better worded "Campagne en faveur des musées". The idea of this campaign had been launched by the International Council of Museums and several articles had appeared in Museum, in order to bring home to local authorities and teachers the potential value to the community of a museum in its present-day concept. It was proposed that an international museum day (or week) should be organized - he himself preferred the idea of a week; the preparations would be made in 1955 and the day or week held in 1956. This was rather like what had been done for public libraries some years previously by means of a manifesto which had led to important results.

(44) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Australia, said that his Government would give a lower priority to a campaign of the kind described than to action for direct aid.

Paragraphs 296-301

(45) No comment.

Paragraphs 302 and 303

(46) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that these paragraphs referred to continuous action by Unesco under a resolution adopted at the sixth session of the General Conference to encourage Member States to exchange exhibitions. An exhibition organized by the Australian National Commission was at present on tour in the United States of America and Canada, and the latter country was prepared to organize another one. Unesco would act as an intermediary or clearing house between Member States, and its budget would not be affected.

(47) Mr. LEE (United States of America) hoped that the Secretariat would continue to examine and appraise the value of techniques used for international understanding. It was possible to exchange exhibitions without increasing such understanding.

(48) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the United States delegate's views would be taken into account.

Paragraphs 304-311

(49) No comment.

Paragraphs 312-317

(50) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that several States had approached the Secretariat with requests, in some cases of a very detailed nature. Burma, for instance, wanted to start a museum and a national library, while India and Pakistan had also approached Unesco, which was planning to send combined missions to give advice to these Governments over a lengthy period.

(51) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom National Commission thought that aid to Burma, India and Pakistan could be increased, and he had earlier proposed reducing the allocation for a travelling exhibition to that end. He thought that a higher priority should be given to aid to Member States than to mobile museums.

(52) Mr. LEE (United States of America) supported the views of the United Kingdom delegate.

(53) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that a motion to increase project E did not necessarily imply a reduction in project D, a reduction which in any case had been rejected by an earlier vote.

(54) The CHAIRMAN thanked the Assistant Director-General for his explanation but said that a formal proposal would have to be made.

(55) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) proposed that a higher priority be given to the whole project. The proposal was seconded by the delegates of the United States of America and France.

(56) The proposal of the delegate of India was adopted by 8 votes to 1 with no abstentions.

(57) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked that the Rapporteur should relate his remarks on Section E to his earlier statement on Section D.

(58) After discussion, it was agreed that it was not appropriate to include views in the report and the United Kingdom delegate said that he would be satisfied if the minutes of the previous meeting reported his views sufficiently fully.

(59) In reply to a question by Mr. CABOUAT (France) whether the Committee should give priority to project E in exchange for withholding it from other projects, the CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was examining projects individually without taking account of the relations between them.

Project 4.41: History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind

Paragraphs 318-325

(60) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document 8C/PRG/7.

(61) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the project for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, which had been exhaustively discussed at previous sessions of the General Conference, was well known to the Committee and he would confine himself to reporting the most recent progress made. The Commission had continued its work and had published five Cahiers; it had held an important meeting

last February and its Bureau had met still more recently. From its decisions it was clear that the manuscript of the six volumes of the History was to be ready at the end of 1956, but that the final revision of the English text - the first to appear - would take up part of 1957; the History would be published in 1958. The contract concluded with the firm of Little, Brown and Co. specified that the latter also undertook to publish two abridged editions, the first in one volume, designed for the general public, and the second in two volumes, designed for students. The Unesco Legal Affairs Bureau considered this contract to be very satisfactory. The problem of replacing two of the general editors who had died had caused some delay, but the editing was nevertheless making satisfactory progress. As regards the budget, it had been decided at the seventh session of the General Conference that $53,000 should be allotted to this project in 1953 - a figure which had been reduced to $30,000 for 1954 - in the hope of obtaining support from the Rockefeller Foundation; the Foundation however had rejected the request, as it felt that the scheme was a matter for Unesco. At its extraordinary session in July 1953 the Conference authorized the grant of additional funds, which the Executive Board had fixed at $27,000 for 1954; the same sum, to be exact, $57,500, was requested for the years 1955 and 1956, the Executive Board having unanimously expressed the opinion that the project should be completed. Document 8C/PRG/7 gave all the details of the draft project for 1955 and 1956.

(62) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that the project had originally been opposed by Norway and other countries, who thought it would be better carried out by national bodies. Unesco's success, however, was now acknowledged. But he would like to have a more detailed account of how the funds had been spent.

(63) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked what circulation the Cahiers had had, what part Unesco had played in their distribution and whether it would be advisable for Unesco to assist in popularizing these publications. Through the intermediary of Unesco it might be possible to awaken interest in them in certain circles which were otherwise difficult to reach.

(64) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Cahiers were published by a firm which distributed them under contract with the Commission. The latter considered the distribution to be insufficient and fresh talks had been held between the Secretary-General of the Commission, the publisher and a Unesco representative in order to plan a more energetic distribution campaign.

(65) In reply to a question by Mr. SILLER (Mexico), Mr. THOMAS said that Unesco had taken no action yet but thought that its Publications Service might help in distributing the Cahiers.

(66) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) associated himself with the views of the delegate of Norway. With regard to the point raised by the Mexican delegate, he wondered whether there was any possibility of the price of the Cahiers being reduced, since their cost had been the chief obstacle to their distribution.

(67) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) welcomed this statement, which bore out the remarks of the Mexican delegate. A preliminary report had been drawn up as a result of discussions between the Commission, the publisher and Unesco; the Secretariat hoped that a serious effort would be made to distribute the Cahiers and was ready to lend its help.

(68) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that there should be more publicity; the project was unknown in Scandinavian countries.

(69) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether funds would be required after 1957-58.

(70) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) remarked that the needs of the Commission would be fewer in 1957, since there would be no more contracts to conclude nor meetings to be provided for. Nineteen fifty-seven would be devoted to the essential revision required to give uniformity to the six volumes and it could be assumed that the requisite estimate would be very much below that asked for 1955 and 1956; in 1958, in the normal course of events, no further budget should be needed for the History, as the manuscript was to be delivered by the end of 1957.

Project 4.42 - Study of cultural relations (paragraphs 326-340)

(71) Mr. Thomas said that the title should be changed to read: Study of relations between cultures. Section A dealt with the publication of reports on the international discussions, organized in 1954, at Sao Paulo and Geneva, on the cultural relations between Europe and America; it was proposed to publish the results of these discussions and a selection of the communications.

(72) Section B comprised two parts, the first of which was the continuing collaboration established between Unesco and the Rencontres internationales de Genève. The latter had been held for eight years past. Since 1952 the Rencontres had concluded a contract with Unesco and in 1954 agreed to organize round-table discussions; the organizers had made great efforts to adapt themselves to Unesco methods and the Secretariat hoped that the successful collaboration secured would be maintained. The second part concerned the countries of Asia and America, and Unesco would like to organize these discussions in collaboration with the United States National Commission.

(73) Mr. LEE (United States of America) considered the section of great importance. With regard to the discussion referred to in paragraph 335, the idea of international discussions between representatives of Asian and American cultures was favourably received by the American National

Commission, which welcomed the opportunity for participation. He hoped that there would be adequate preparatory work so that the representatives from the two areas would have some prior knowledge and understanding of each other's culture and traditions.

(74) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked how the figures in paragraph 336 were related to the proposals in paragraphs 334 and 335.

(75) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the sums mentioned in paragraph 336 were divided between the two projects, the appropriation for 1955 being allotted to project (i) and that for 1956 to project (ii).

(76) Mr. CABOUAT (France) supported the remarks of the United States representative on the importance of the part which might be played by Section B in the development of international understanding.

(77) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) then gave an outline of Section C (paragraphs 337-339), which was the reply to a request presented to Unesco some considerable time ago. The Pan-American Institute of Geography and History and the National Archives of Mexico had undertaken to make an inventory of these documents so as to begin a study of them. Unesco had been requested to facilitate access to the archives concerned, and to help the missions which came to carry out the investigation. Mr. Thomas stressed the importance of this project both for the history of Latin America and for that of the development of relations between America and Europe; it was the natural sequel to the Geneva discussions, which was why it had been included in the programme.

(78) The CHAIRMAN asked how many research workers would be provided under the $8,000 allowed for 1955 and 1956 and for what period.

(79) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) asked whether the contracts included publication and, if so, how research was provided for.

(80) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that there was only one contract with a qualified organization - to enable it to organize a mission, there was no question of publications.

(81) The CHAIRMAN asked on what basis the preliminary figure of $8,000 had been calculated.

(82) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that it was difficult to make precise calculations, but it had been assumed that there would be one expert in each year for approximately eight months.

(83) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) questioned the urgency of the project on the history of Latin America in paragraph 338 and the priority accorded to it.

(84) Mr. SILLER (Mexico), in reply to the representative of the United Kingdom, said that at one time some doubts were felt in Mexico as to the direction which these investigations should take, and who should carry them out, since some sectors of public opinion thought it was purely a domestic matter. However, as certain Latin American countries had no connexions with the European countries where the enquiries would be conducted, and Unesco offered better opportunities for disseminating the results, he approved the project. (85) The sum allotted to this work should be maintained until States were in a position to carry it out themselves.

(86) Project adopted.

Project 4.43: Dissemination of the visual arts and music

Paragraphs 341-350

(87) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the credits included in paragraph 350 were intended for the publication of revised editions of the two catalogues which had already appeared; the catalogues were having a large sale.

Paragraphs 351-353

(88) This series in which two volumes had already appeared, would be continued with the publication of an album on aboriginal Australian art. The credits provided would permit the publication of three volumes a year; in 1955 they would be devoted to Norway, Yugoslavia and Iran.

(89) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) strongly supported the preparation of albums of reproductions of works of art but questioned the high figure for staff travel.

(90) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that Unesco's function was to provide the negatives. The practice was to send a specialist to the place in question, accompanied by a photographer of the firm of Pizzi, who would take the pictures. The appropriations mentioned in paragraph 353 were intended to cover the costs of three missions in three countries each year. As the emphasis was to be on little known works of art, mostly situated in Asia and Latin America, the travelling expenses would be relatively high. The publisher was responsible for publishing and distributing the albums at his own expense; he refunded a percentage of the selling price to Unesco.

(91) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) was also strongly in favour of the project, which was an important method of promoting cultural understanding. He would like to see more spent on the project and suggested that the Secretariat might prepare a more comprehensive plan on a five or ten year basis. It was important, however, that such publications should be within the reach of ordinary people. Their price was at present prohibitive.

He asked whether Unesco could consider itself financing a project for providing lower priced publications.

(92) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked for information on receipts from the sales of publications. Although the price was high, he wondered if it covered all overheads, including such items as staff travel. While appreciating the views of the Indian delegate, it was difficult to maintain quality with low costs, and the public must recognize that, if it wished for culture, it might have to sacrifice other things.

(93) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Australia, asked whether National Commissions could help the project in kind, for instance by contributing coloured photos (Ektachromes) for the albums. It was not unreasonable to expect the Commissions to participate in disseminating culture.

(94) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) referring to the remark by the Indian representative on the high selling price of the albums, stated that at $15 they were still very much cheaper than other publications with such a high class content. Unesco supplied the publisher with the Ektachromes and the commentaries. The number of copies printed (10,000) was considerable for works of this kind, and the albums were widely distributed owing to the fact that they were issued in several languages. The publisher remitted 1% of the selling price to Unesco; for three albums this represented about $2,250 per annum. Although this sum did not reimburse Unesco for all its expenses, it enabled systematic surveys to be carried out in all those countries whose paintings were little known. Despite this, Mr. Thomas agreed with the Indian representative in considering that Unesco should prepare a systematic plan, for five years or more, which could be submitted to the next session of the General Conference. It should be noted, on the other hand, that the possibilities of distributing such works were not unlimited, and he wondered whether Unesco could not get the publisher to agree to publishing 6 albums each year. He mentioned that the Australian National Commission had arranged to take a number of photographs at its own expense, but it would be difficult to ask other National Commissions to do the same.
(95) The Secretariat was ready to study the suggestion, but Mr. Thomas observed that, if Unesco undertook to bear the essential cost, it could visit the various places itself and form its own opinion whether the works were of world-wide interest. The Secretariat would, however, welcome a recommendation by the Conference suggesting that Member States should bear part of the cost.

Project C (paragraphs 354-356)

(96) Mr. Thomas recalled that this activity already had quite a history, the first exhibition had been shown in 34 countries, the second in 36, the third in 47, and the fourth, which was of Japanese prints, was currently circulating; it had already visited 20 countries and in equal number were still expecting it. Mr. Thomas stressed that these exhibitions were warmly welcomed everywhere, and he stated that the next would be devoted to Chinese art. A selection of works already exhibitied would be shown in Montevideo during the current session of the General Conference. Mr. Thomas concluded by saying that, in accordance with a recommendation of the General Conference, the last two exhibitions had dealt with oriental art and that the Secretariat intended to continue the series.

(97) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the cost of supplies included the cost of sending and insuring exhibitions as far as the first benefiting country.

(98) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) said that the Mexican National Commission had much pleasure in supporting the project. The exhibition of reproductions of Japanese art had had considerable success in in Mexico. It had been shown in three galleries, one of them a State institution. In connexion with the exhibition three lectures had been given by the Japanese cultural attaché, by Señor Octavio Paz, and another expert respectively. The welcome given to this art exhibition had led to its being extended for a further three months.

(99) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that he had already mentioned the importance attached by the French National Commission to these travelling exhibitions. His own impression confirmed the remarks of the Mexican delegate and led him to suggest that the Secretariat, while continuing to place sample exhibitions at the disposal of Member States, should also sponsor the sale of the reproductions exhibited; the money thus collected could be used to set up a fund which would enable fresh exhibitions to be held with no additional cost to Unesco. The execution of the project would undoubtedly be facilitated by collaboration with the International Association of Plastic Arts, the Association of Art Critics and the International Council of Museums .

(100) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) referred the Committee to the Appropriation Resolution. Any receipts by Unesco from sales were credited to miscellaneous income and shown as a reduction in the Appropriation Resolution.

(101) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), returning to the question of sales, felt that the time had come to draw up a balance sheet of commercial activities. It would be useful in discussions at the General Conference.

(102) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that, if it was a question of obtaining information on the cost of, and possible revenue from, the project, the Secretariat was at the Committee's disposal to provide further details. If, on the other hand, the question at issue was the principle of placing the programme on a commercial basis, the Director-General, he feared, might voice some surprise and regret at such a principle

being raised in their discussions, especially in a cultural context.

(103) The CHAIRMAN interpreted the United Kingdom delegate's intention as being to show that, if revenue were taken into account, the cost of some projects might be less than appeared from the budget.

(104) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) suggested that discussion of revenue bringing items might better be left until the Appropriation Resolution was discussed. He realized that it would be useful to have the facts: for example, the Catalogue of Colour Reproductions (paragraph 347) had already more than covered its cost, and such a fact was good propaganda for Unesco in securing approval for other projects. He promised that full information would be supplied by the time the Appropriation Resolution came up for discussion.

(105) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) associated himself with the views of the Mexican delegate. While he agreed with the United Kingdom delegate that it was worth knowing how far some activities paid their way, it was important not to become obsessed with economies: there were dangers in commercial balance sheeting.

Paragraphs 357-359

(106) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that these three paragraphs concerning project D, had been transferred from the programme of the Department of Cultural Activities to that of Mass Communication.

Paragraphs 360-362

(107) Mr. Thomas said that these recordings were made under the auspices of the International Music Council with the help of a Unesco subsidy. All that the Secretariat did was to receive some copies of the recordings for distribution to Member States. The appropriation of $800 provided for under paragraph 359 for 1955 and 1956 was to cover the purchase of special containers for transporting the records.

(108) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the records referred to in paragraph 361 were distributed free of charge or sold.

(109) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that, in the case of folk music recordings, an agreement had been made with the Museum of Ethnography in Geneva, which produced the records selected by a committee of experts and sold them to learned societies. The International Music Council received no percentage of these sales. In the case of contemporary music, IMC acted as adviser to the publishing houses; in both cases a number of records were sent to Unesco for information of Member States.

Paragraphs 363-368

(110) Mr. Thomas referred to the agreements concluded with the boards of adjudicators at the Biennales of Venice and Sao Paulo, which enabled certain works to be reproduced and so become better known. In the case of music IMC had undertaken to have recordings made and musical scores printed. He drew attention to paragraph 367, concerning travel grants awarded to artists and writers, to a total of 5 for the years 1953 and 1954; the Secretariat hoped to raise this figure to 7 for the years 1955 and 1956.

Paragraphs 369-371

(111) Mr. Thomas said that the aim of this project was to request National Commissions to conduct an experiment in using all the modern methods of reproduction to encourage wider and more systematic public interest in artistic matters. The locality selected for the experiment should be a town of medium size, and the results would indicate what could be done to improve public taste.

(112) He added that there were two reasons why a reduction had been made in the budget for 1955. First, they were anxious that the reintroduction of the Index Translationum should not lead to an increase in the budget ceiling, and they had looked to see where savings could be made. Second, in 1955 a survey only would be made in the Member States, in which the Secretariat would collaborate; the project would not be put in hand until 1956.

(113) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that, after studying all the art projects, he believed that the one under discussion was the least important and proposed its postponement.

(114) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal.

(115) The proposal of the United States delegate was adopted by 6 votes to 3 with 2 abstentions.

Project 4.44: Translations (paragraphs 375-391)

(116) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) emphasized the great importance of this project, which was beginning to show results. He referred members of the Committee to the draft programme, where all the necessary explanations would be found. The project was progressing in a succession of series, the order of priority being Arabic, Ibero-American, Italian and Persian, in which 9, 6, 3 and 1 volumes respectively had been published. The General Conference had decided to extend this activity to the literature of Asia, and the Secretariat had turned its attention to India, Japan, Pakistan and Thailand; 25 works were in process of translation or printing, and negotiations were proceeding on 20 others, but no contracts had yet been concluded.

(117) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) strongly supported the project and said that he would welcome an extension of activity for both periods.

(118) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the delegate of India on the importance of the work.

He regretted that there had been such a small output and thought that staff costs were too high in proportion to achievement.

(119) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) noted the Indian representative's wish for an increase in the number of volumes published; as already stated, 25 volumes were in course of production and 20 were being negotiated. The difficulties attaching to this translation programme were that it dealt with little known languages for which only an extremely limited number of competent translators were available and, in addition, revision of the texts entailed considerable delay. The practice was to ask publishing firms to take over publication on the basis of contracts concluded with Unesco, which undertook to buy a certain number of copies of each work. Remarking that it was not easy to find publishers, Mr. Thomas said that later on Unesco itself might possibly assume the cost of printing and commercial distribution. A professional publisher, however, would seem to have greater opportunities of reaching the public; another difficulty was bound up with the question of copyright, which also implied negotiations. Finally, he said he could assure the Committee that 25 volumes would shortly be appearing.

(120) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) hoped that the output would eventually justify the initial outlay. He asked for more information on how costs in paragraph 375 were calculated, and how the staff costs were apportioned.

(121) Mr. RAO (Acting Head, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that other costs included contracts and meetings. In distributing staff costs, however, it was difficult to assess what percentage should be applied to each project. The amounts of $32,375 for 1955 and $33,195 for 1956 were based on the assumption that approximately 25% of the budget of the Division of Arts and Letters would be assigned to the project, including salaries and other staff costs under the Staff Regulations.

Paragraphs 398-414

(122) Miss LAISE (United States of America) noted that the staff of the Office of the Director followed the same pattern throughout the Organization, regardless of the number of staff employed. She also questioned the need for an additional clerk-stenographer (paragraph 403) in connexion with the implementation of the International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property.

(123) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought, in view of the United States delegate's first remark, that it would be better to discuss this problem of the staffing of the Director's office in relation to all Departments; to treat one Department separately from others might lead to unfair conclusions.

(124) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that paragraph 403, as at present worded, called for a single post of clerk-stenographer E; in the corrigendum, provision was made, in addition, for a clerk-archivist F. He would mention that, since the Convention was signed, the work of the Secretariat had considerably increased; the Convention might come into operation shortly and it would then be essential to create this second post because of the specific tasks devolving upon the Secretariat, which it could not carry out with its present staff.

(125) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked Mr. Thomas whether the explanation he had just given referred to one or both of the posts in question.

(126) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said it referred to both posts.

(127) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked whether in 1954 any posts had been created for the work of preparing the Convention.

(128) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that a temporary post of secretary-stenographer had been created in order to deal with the large amount of correspondence. There would, however, be further tasks for the Secretariat once the Convention came into force - such as keeping a register of the works in each country which would be protected under the Convention, a list of which was to be communicated by the Secretariat to all Member States; the two posts for which permission was sought represented the minimum establishment necessary.

(129) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed the retention of only one of the two posts requested in the amended paragraph 403.

(130) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that the French delegation felt somewhat reluctant to accept the proposals of the Secretariat. Every country had a central department with similar functions in such cases; in France, the fact of being the depository for a convention or agreement did not mean that new posts had to be created.

(131) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that he was not proposing to evaluate the amount of work which this new situation would entail, but wanted to refer to the arguments adduced by the representative of the United States of America against creating these two posts. It was because Unesco hoped that the Convention would shortly be ratified that the Secretariat had estimated the amount of work which would result. He also pointed out to the representative of France that the responsibilities devolving upon Unesco in this connexion could not be compared with those of a country with which a diplomatic instrument was deposited, for example, the obligations of the United Kingdom in regard to the Unesco Constitution; it was not simply a question of depositing a text in the archives, but of keeping a register, with all the complicated work which this involved.

(132) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) proposed that the posts should not be filled immediately, but only when the need arose, i.e. when the Convention had been ratified.

(133) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that only five ratifications were needed for the Convention to come into force. He emphasized that, apart from keeping a register, Unesco would then have many other responsibilities.

(134) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether these posts could not be provided when the need arose, or had they to be approved immediately because they would otherwise be suppressed?
(135) He pointed out that the United States delegation's proposal differed from his own. What his delegation proposed was that the posts should be created when the need for them arose.

(136) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said it was merely a matter of making provision in the budget for a situation that was expected to arise. The Director-General would only decide to create the post if it were found necessary after the Convention had come into force - a contingency which it was expected would arise during the 1955-56 financial year; these posts would be of a rather permanent value, whereas temporary posts were for some ten or twelve months only.

(137) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether any ratification had yet been received.

(138) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied in the negative.

(139) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that, if the Department of Cultural Activities needed staff to administer the Convention, there was no reason why that staff should not be in the permanent category. He therefore supported the proposal by the delegate of Israel.

(140) The proposal of the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegate of France, was put to the vote and adopted unanimously.

(141) The CHAIRMAN announced that Natural Sciences would be discussed at the next meeting.

(142) Miss LAISE (United States of America) reserved the right to comment on the section of the programme dealing with copyright (Cultural Activities, project 4.13).

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

# EIGHTH MEETING

*5 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

**CULTURAL ACTIVITIES (continued)**

Project 4.13: Paragraphs 84-100

(1) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested that, in order that the resolution contained in paragraph 86 should authorize the studies proposed in paragraph 93, it would be advisable to insert, after the words "Armed Conflict", in line 3, the words: "for the study c certain special copyright problems".

(2) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) agreed with Mr. Lee and proposed to join with him in working out a clearer wording of the resolution.

(3) Mr. LEE (United States of America) was of the opinion that the study of the rights of scientists should be referred to another Department, and although he considered the kind of activities mentioned in (c) and (d) useful, he would propose that these paragraphs be deleted from the programme for the present, in view of the general principle of concentration which his Government advocated.

(4) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked Mr. Lee if he was alluding to the studies of special copyright problems dealt with in paragraphs 93-97, or if he had in mind other studies on the question. In the latter case close co-operation should be established with the interested organizations. In Europe the Berne Union should be consulted; copyright questions were also dealt with in the Council of Europe.

(5) The CHAIRMAN understood that the change suggested by the delegate of the United States of America was intended to cover the proposed studies only.

(6) Mr. LEE (United States of America) had no other study in mind. He agreed with the delegate of France in his desire that full use should be made of research carried out elsewhere.

(7) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) took the opportunity of expressing his country's gratification on learning that the United States of America had ratified the International Copyright Convention. It was a major event in publishing history, and he found it very satisfactory that it should have been achieved under the auspices of Unesco. If such a thing had happened 150 years ago, Sir Walter Scott would have died a rich man.

(8) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed that it had been an admirable function for Unesco to perform.

(9) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked the United Kingdom delegate if his country had already ratified the International Copyright Convention.

(10) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) replied that his country had long been a member of the Berne Copyright Convention. The differences between the two agreements were small, and were in process of adjustment.

(11) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) drew the attention of the United States delegate to the amended version of paragraphs 91-98(8C/5 Corr.), which had been prepared after the first meeting of the Provisional Copyright Committee and was based on its recommendations.

(12) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed that the changes introduced by the corrigendum were a considerable improvement.

**CHAPTER 2: NATURAL SCIENCES**

(13) The CHAIRMAN welcomed Mr. Auger, Director of the Department of Natural Sciences, and asked him to introduce the programme proposed under this chapter.

(14) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) drew attention to the two sections of his Department's programme and budget. Section I was mainly concerned with permanent activities. For 1955-56 provision had been made for only one new activity - the International Geophysical Year - which would have to be continued in 1957-58. In 1955 Unesco was to contribute towards the establishment of a permanent Secretariat for that project. It had been put forward in 1951 by the Bureau of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), which had set up a Preparatory Committee; National Committees had been established in 13 countries. That activity afforded a fine instance of world-wide co-operation in the field of science.

(15) Section II consisted of planned activities in the field of scientific research and the teaching and dissemination of science. Mr. Auger drew special attention to research on the arid zone, physical

oceanography (the project on that subject was to be amended in the light of developments since the document was drafted), the expanded programme for science teaching, and the science co-operation offices, which were decentralized units for carrying out the natural sciences programme.

(16) The CHAIRMAN asked for general remarks on the chapter as a whole.

(17) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that, on principle, available resources should be applied to existing organizations before new developments were envisaged. He therefore proposed that more emphasis should be laid on international co-operation in scientific research at the expense of regional science co-operation offices and the programme for the dissemination of science. The existing organizations were doing a good deal of work in this last field. He also considered that, at the higher budgetary level, a disproportionate amount had been earmarked for the teaching of science, at the expense of other sections.

(18) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) set a high value on the work in natural sciences in general. However, the National Commission of Israel had grave misgivings as to the advisability of keeping regional science co-operation offices. Regional activities could be performed just as well and often better by headquarters in Paris. Moreover, the regional office system tended to become contagious. It had already spread to the Department of Social Sciences.
(19) He agreed with the United Kingdom delegate that the development of international co-operation was highly important, as was also assistance to scientific research, and he thought that these projects should be strengthened at the expense of the regional offices. The dissemination programme could be transferred to the Department of Mass Communication, retaining the funds for earmarking to research.

(20) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) disagreed with the foregoing remarks. The programme of research and international collaboration was important, but the popularization of science should be considered as a high priority activity.
(21) His Government intended to put forward a separate resolution on nuclear energy. Unesco's efforts in Europe in this field were not enough.

(22) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) said that, while the remarks made by the delegate of Israel on regional offices might apply to countries relatively near to Unesco headquarters, they were not true of distant regions such as Asia. He suggested that the project for science co-operation offices should be maintained for distant countries.

(23) Mr. LEE (United States of America) reminded the meeting of its present purpose of concentrating the programme. This chapter could perhaps be taken a little further in that direction. He would like to have some indication whether or not projects were set up with an eye on the possibility of their being brought to an end at some definite stage.
(24) He also reminded the meeting that Unesco's true function was to stimulate activity, and that it should not become involved in work that Member States ought to be carrying out.

(25) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the new proposals would be considered later. With regard to the science co-operation offices, he could advance general arguments of wider relevance than scientific co-operation and raising the general problem of decentralization of Unesco's activities. The Committee might wish to arrange for a general discussion of the problem of decentralization when it had finished discussing the programme and budget. He recommended the Committee to confine itself for the time being to a consideration of the operation and budget of those offices.
(26) The whole of the science chapter was designed to secure a balanced treatment of the varying needs of Member States.
(27) Mr. Maheu wished to mention that in the course of recent months he had had an opportunity of attending various co-ordination meetings of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies and he had been struck by the great efforts being made for the dissemination of science in their respective fields by the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization. Much had been achieved, but the results would not be lasting unless the general public in the countries concerned had a general understanding of science. Unesco had the task of encouraging such understanding.
(28) Frankly, he did not think that projects for the dissemination of science could be transferred to the Mass Communication Department; it was essentially a specialized activity.

(29) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) assured the meeting that the Director-General of Unesco was specially anxious to use existing organizations for scientific co-operation rather than set up new ones. For the arid zone there was an Advisory Committee of nine members and no bureaucratic machinery. The same method was being considered for oceanographic research. Whenever it was possible to do without setting up new intergovernmental bodies, the opportunity should be taken. It had not been possible to adopt that procedure for nuclear research, but that subject was an exception.
(30) Unesco had one difficulty as regards the dissemination of science. There were groups such as associations for the advancement of science, but most of them existed only at the national level and Unesco was endeavouring to bring them together in international federations.
(31) Obviously Unesco could not stand aloof from so important a subject as nuclear research, but the Organization's work in that field could not be effective until specialized scientists were able to work for peaceful ends, unhampered by governmental restrictions. Great hopes could be placed on the projects under consideration in the United Nations; Unesco could intervene when the proper time came.

(32) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) enquired the purpose of the sums for consultants mentioned in paragraph 16.

(33) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the expenses listed in

paragraph 16 included an annual sum of $1,196 to pay consultants whose advice was sought on the preparation of regional or international projects. The consultations covered practical, clearly defined subjects which could not always be foreseen. Those consultations had always been useful in the past and, if the appropriation were cut, it would greatly hamper the Department's activities.

(34) The CHAIRMAN asked on what basis the consultants had been budgeted for.

(35) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that sums had been provided for one consultant at $10 per diem for two weeks, and another at $20 per diem for 4 weeks, with journeys based on a medium distance from Paris.

(36) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) wondered whether similar arguments for the use of experts might not be urged by other departments. He asked for a careful consideration of the question, which had a wide implication. Paid experts should not be engaged for work that might be provided free by non-governmental organizations.

(37) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that his Department had always been able to secure the services of consultants. If other Unesco services had not followed that example and requested similar funds, it was perhaps because they did not need consultants. An overall picture or general information could be obtained from non-governmental organizations but the personal advice of highly specialized consultants always seemed preferable before starting discussions with international scientific organizations, as the Department of Natural Sciences very often had to do.

(38) As there were no further comments, paragraphs 14-16 were approved.

Section I: 2.1 Development of International Co-operation

Project 2.11: Co-operation with international scientific organizations (paragraphs 17-38)

(39) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) referred to the origin of the Geophysical Year and the efforts made to inaugurate that project. It was the only new subvention his Department was requesting for the development of international scientific co-operation; the others merely renewed the assistance already granted in 1953-54.

Paragraphs 18-31: Subventions

(40) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the National Commission of the United Kingdom was in favour of the subventions, but he suggested that some bodies, particularly in the fields of medical science and engineering, might be able to finance more and more of their own work. He wished to stress the principle that all subventions should gradually decrease with the passing of years.

(41) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that comparatively small amounts were proposed for the two organizations mentioned by the United Kingdom delegate. For each budgetary year the subvention requested for the Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS) amounted to $18,000 and for the Union of International Engineering Associations (UATI) to $12,000. The same amounts had been granted in 1954 and were intended to promote the international work of those two organizations. The subvention proposed for the Union of International Engineering Associations was intended for the publication of multilingual dictionaries.

(42) Mr. BOW (Canada) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate that subventions should taper off.

Paragraphs 32-38

(43) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought that assistance to the International Geophysical Year was a very appropriate type of Unesco activity. He would like to see more money go into that item, if available, in order to ensure its full implementation.

(44) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the suggestion. That, and the three fellowships mentioned in paragraph 40, Exchange of Persons, should receive high priority.

(45) With reference to paragraph 33, he enquired whether the International Union of Biochemistry was likely to join the International Council of Scientific Unions.

(46) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that, at its meeting in Naples, the Bureau of the International Council of Scientific Unions had already been in favour of admitting to membership the future International Union of Biochemistry, once established.

(47) The proposal of the United States delegate to give that project a high priority was put to the vote.

(48) It was adopted by 10 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

Project 2.12: Improvement of scientific documentation (paragraphs 39-58)

(49) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stressed the success achieved by the ICSU Abstracting Board for scientific literature. For physics, the Board issued abstracts in three journals, each in a different language. That arrangement had been extended in 1954 to chemistry and it was hoped to do the same shortly for the biological sciences. The results of the study of reference methods which was being made by the Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences under a contract with Unesco had not come up to expectation. That activity had accordingly been deleted for 1955-56 (8C/5 Corr., Natural Sciences, paragraph 47 deleted and paragraph 48 amended).

(50) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed to delete the contracts mentioned in paragraph 42. His

National Commission also thought very little of the translation of medical abstracts, which it considered a source of misinformation.

(51) Mr. LOW (Canada) supported the delegate of the United Kingdom on the two points he had mentioned, adding a query about paragraph 54: was the contract referred to necessary, in view of the subvention granted to that organization?

(52) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia), speaking on paragraph 57, informed the meeting that his Government appreciated the aid given by Unesco in the field of terminology. Indonesia was faced with many problems of this order in replacing the Dutch language by Indonesian in schools.

(53) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the Canadian delegate in the matter of paragraph 54. He also opposed paragraph 57, and would propose that it be given a low priority.

(54) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom in wishing to reduce the priority of paragraph 57.

(55) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that the Advisory Committee could not meet unless Unesco paid the travel expenses of its members. The Committee had met every year since its establishment in 1949.

(56) The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it a proposal to eliminate the contracts mentioned in paragraph 42, estimated to cost $700.

(57) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that the meeting was a permanent service and that only Unesco could defray its expenses. He was against Mr. Cowell's proposal to cut down that activity.

(58) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegate, seconded by the delegate of Canada, was put to the vote.

(59) It was rejected by 2 votes in favour, 6 against, and 3 abstentions.

(60) With regard to paragraph 45 concerning contracts to be concluded by Unesco with the Council of International Organizations of Medical sciences, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences), replying to Mr. Cowell, said that the deletion of translations of medical abstracts would result in a saving of $3,000.

(61) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) accordingly proposed that the budget for the activities covered by paragraph 45 should be thus reduced.

(62) The motion was put to the vote and adopted by 7 in favour, none against and 2 abstentions.

(63) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences), referring to paragraph 54, explained that the International Committee on Anatomical Nomenclature, set up by the Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences, had just completed its work of preparing an international agreement on anatomical terminology. That project was quite in keeping with Unesco's aims and would surely enhance the Organization's prestige.

(64) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was not hostile to the activity, but thought that the work would be better done if results were published in the learned journals of each country, and would stand a better chance of reaching the people interested than if they came out in a special publication.

(65) Mr. BOW (Canada) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(66) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that, if that contract were deleted, the report could not be published in book form. It would be a less handy working tool if published in a periodical.

(67) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought the publication of that report entirely in keeping with Unesco's general programme. The World Health Organization was doing the same kind of work for pharmaceutical nomenclature. As for the possibility of publishing the report in a specialized periodical, he preferred to abide by the Secretariat's views on that subject.

(68) The CHAIRMAN said that, as the question of publishing in the reviews of different countries had not been investigated by the Secretariat, it was perhaps better not to decide on it at that stage.

(69) Mr. CABOUAT (France) proposed deferring the Committee's decision until information was available on the possibility of publishing the report in a specialized periodical, if necessary as a supplement.

(70) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) was afraid that, if the appropriation were deleted, the activity itself would have to be dropped, as no one could foresee the result of the commercial negotiations which would have to be undertaken.

(71) Mr. LEE (United States of America) considered that the general question raised was an interesting and complex one. It was true that, where the results of Unesco investigations could be published in private journals, they would be more likely to reach the audience that could profit from them than if distributed in Unesco pamphlets. On the other hand, there were parts of the world where that medium was not available. He would favour leaving a decision to the Secretariat, on the understanding that they explored both the less and the more developed areas.

(72) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) added that any attempt at a standard nomenclature in a branch of science could in the beginning be no more than tentative, so that its appearance in a learned journal, where it would receive the comments of scientists, would be preferable in the first place.

(73) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee include that point in its Report to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(74) Mr. CABOUAT (France), as Rapporteur, agreed with the Chairman.

(75) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat had considered that question. The reason why commercial publication of the report had not been envisaged was because, in the Director-General's opinion, it was better for Unesco itself to publish the report. In book form the report would provide tangible proof of the effectiveness of Unesco's action. Also, it would be more useful to readers in a single volume than if issued as a series of articles. It would be difficult for scientific journals to publish the report itself, whereas they would be glad to open their columns to discussion of the document.

(76) The proposal of the Canadian delegate, seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, was put to the vote and rejected by 5 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

(77) The CHAIRMAN then opened the discussion on the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom to delete paragraph 57.

(78) Mr. LEE (United States of America) seconded the proposal.

(79) Mr. CABOUAT (France) suggested giving the project a lower priority, instead of deleting it, as proposed by Mr. Cowell.

(80) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the delegate of France.

(81) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that the project was an extension of the efforts of Unesco in the domain of scientific terminology. A cut would limit this work to the field of European languages. He suggested that the project be maintained, and assistance to it, if possible, increased.

(82) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported the Egyptian proposal. The project was important in Asia, owing to the difficulties involved in the changeover from one language to another. It deserved a high priority.

(83) Mr. BOW (Canada) wished to make it quite clear that his support of the proposal to suppress the activity was based on his desire to concentrate the programme, not to reduce the field of operation of the activity.

(84) The CHAIRMAN explained that the Committee had three distinct proposals before it. He would first put to the vote the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom, then that of France, and lastly that of Egypt.

(85) The proposal put forward by the delegate of the United Kingdom and seconded by the delegate of the United States of America to suppress the activity was put to the vote and rejected by 4 in favour, 6 against and 2 abstentions.

(86) The proposal made by the delegate of France and seconded by the delegate of Israel to attribute a lower priority to the activity was put to the vote and adopted by 8 in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention.

Section II: 2.2 Contribution to research particularly for the improvement of the economic and social conditions of mankind

Project 2.21: International Advisory Committee on Research in the natural sciences programme (paragraphs 64-73) (see 8C/5 Corr., paragraphs 72 and 73)

(87) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the saving made by dropping the study of referencing methods which was being carried out under contract by CIOMS (paragraphs 47 and 48) had been transferred to project 2.21 (paragraph 64 of the Corrigendum).

(88) No comments

Project 2.22: Assistance to scientific research

(89) Mr. Auger stated that the various projects mentioned (paragraphs 76-102), particularly research into the nature of cancer, would not in any way duplicate the work of the World Health Organization, which dealt with clinical medicine. Those projects were concerned with scientific research in basic fields, as was clear from the new wording of resolution 2.22 paragraph 75 of the Corrigendum).

(90) Mr. BOW (Canada) proposed that the arid zone research programme should be given the highest priority, while other activities in this section could be reduced.

(91) Mr. LEE (United States of America) seconded the proposal. The programme was well organized and had been achieving useful results.

(92) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) agreed with the delegates of the United States of America and Canada, and said that the Government of Mexico had followed the arid zone activities with the greatest interest and was applying in its territory some of the results obtained. He was in favour of granting the highest priority to that project, but not of deleting other projects for the purpose.

(93) Mr. CABOUAT (France) supported the proposal of the Canadian delegate to give a higher priority to the programme of arid zone research. He thought it a pity that the Proceedings of the Symposium on Wind and Solar Energy were to be published in English only and not in a bilingual English-French edition, like the Proceedings of the Symposium on the Formation and Erosion of Soils as affected by Climatic Factors, scheduled for 1956 (paragraph 79).

(94) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Publications Committee, of which he was Chairman, had decided that the articles in the edition would be printed in their original languages and followed by a summary in the other language.

(95) The proposal of the delegate of Canada, supported by the delegates of the United States

of America, France and Mexico, was adopted by 10 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions.

(96) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) proposed the postponement, for a year, of practical work on the humid tropical zone project (paragraphs 85-88) and to use the money thus saved in 1955 for the physical oceanography and marine biology projects (paragraphs 89-91), as their preparation was farther advanced.

(97) The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Auger's remarks could be regarded as a verbal corrigendum to the sub-project on the humid tropical zone.

(98) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) wanted Mr. Auger's amendment carried farther, and wondered if one of the two meetings in 1956 could not be eliminated, since results could not be achieved so quickly.

(99) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked how far, if priority were granted to the arid zone research project, it would be advanced towards completion. It should be as far on the way as possible before another project was begun.

(100) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought that Mr. Cowell would be pleased to know that the one-year postponement would not be a waste of time, as the preliminary surveys could be continued. A further saving of $5,000 could be made on the 1956 estimates for the humid tropical zone if only one meeting instead of two were organized. It was difficult to say exactly when the cycle of work on the arid zone could be completed. The study of five or six main projects should first be completed in the next few years. Moreover, if the funds requested were granted, the pilot projects proposed in paragraphs 92-100 would provide an opportunity of reviewing the knowlecge acquired.

(101) Mr. BOW (Canada) was satisfied by Mr. Auger's explanation.

(102) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Mr. Auger's proposal could be voted upon, only if it were presented by a member of the Committee.

(103) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) formally proposed the reduction Mr. Auger had suggested.

(104) Mr. BOW (Canada) seconded the proposal.

(105) A vote was taken and it was adopted by 10 in favour, none against and 1 abstention.

Paragraphs 89-91

(106) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) had not yet circulated the document setting forth the new programme proposed for physical oceanography and marine biology. It provided for the experience gained in the Indo-Pacific region and Latin America to be applied throughout the world, with the co-operation of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the competent scientific councils. A World Advisory Committee would be responsible for guiding and co-ordinating the work of several scientific councils for such areas as the North Atlantic and the Mediterranean. The Advisory Committee of Marine Sciences would have the same structure as the Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research. The project was supported by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

(107) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) enquired what proportion of the funds would be contributed to that project by the Food and Agriculture Organization.

(108) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) could make no promises for the Food and Agriculture Organization, but added that it had collaborated in 1953 in the Eighth Pacific Science Congress in Manila and could be relied on to support the project if it were in line with its own aims.

(109) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), on paragraph 90, asked whether the expenses of the intergovernmental conference should not be met entirely by the governments concerned.

(110) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked for the budgetary implications of the remarks just made by Mr. Auger. He thought they implied an improvement in the working plans.

(111) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought it better to drop the idea of convening an intergovernmental conference for Latin America in 1955 (paragraph 90) than to give up practical work. The budget proposed at that stage, together with the sum saved on humid tropical zone research, should be sufficient for all regional and international activities in connexion with oceanography.

(112) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought the suggestion was excellent. He advocated caution, however, in going too far with a major project. Existing organizations should bear as much of the expense as possible.

(113) Approved.

Paragraphs 101 and 102

(114) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the research on cancer (paragraphs 101 and 102) had been planned at the request of the Executive Board of Unesco. It involved contracts with experts who were to meet once in 1955. Several meetings were proposed for 1956 and might lead to the establishment of an intergovernmental or non-governmental body. The results obtained in 1955 could guide the Secretariat's work in 1956, but they could hardly be foreseen at that stage.

(115) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) felt concerned at the expenses entailed in a continuation of activity after 1956. Could not the World Health Organization cover some of them?

(116) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) could not foresee whether the project could be completed in 1956. If the work made rapid headway,

an international body with its own budget would be established. He personally thought that body could not be set up for three years. No promise could be given in that connexion on behalf of the World Health Organization, which would probably seek to define the extent of its functions in the matter, but would not consider collaborating in Unesco's project.

(117) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) shared the uncertainty expressed by the delegate of Norway. The lead in this matter should more properly be taken by the World Health Organization. He recommended deferment of the activity.

(118) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether the Executive Board had recommended this activity before or after it had adopted its report on the remodelling of the future programme.

(119) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that it had been discussed by the Executive Board before and commented on (8C/5 Add. 1, paragraph 12) with interest.

(120) Mr. LEE (United States of America) did not consider the comment made by the Executive Board in 8C/5 Add. 1 a very convincing expression of support. That argued for deferment. He suggested that the Department of Natural Sciences should find out what organizations were interested, and make a fuller statement of the situation to the next General Conference in two years time.

(121) The discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

# NINTH MEETING

*5 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

**NATURAL SCIENCES (continued)**

Project 2.22: Assistance to scientific research

Paragraphs 101 and 102 (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the Chairman of the Executive Board to state the Board's views on the proposed campaign.

(2) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had given careful consideration to the subject and had agreed, first, that the World Health Organization should be consulted before a decision was taken and, second, that the views of the Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences programme should be ascertained. As a result of WHO's agreement to participate and the Advisory Committee's strong support, the Executive Board had unanimously approved the project. It was clear, from conversations with experts in the United States of America and the United Kingdom, that there was a lack of contact between the medical and the scientific sides of the problem, and that the results of scientific research were not transmitted to doctors rapidly enough. The Executive Board favoured the project in the hope of ameliorating the situation and helping to remove one of the serious causes of misery in the world. There was a strong dividing line between scientists' research on cell growth and the work of doctors, and it was essential that Unesco and WHO should be closely linked in the project.

(3) The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting the United Kingdom delegate, supported by the delegates of Norway and the United States of America, had proposed that the project be postponed.

(4) In reply to a question by the delegate of Israel, Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the project would be a joint one between Unesco and WHO, since the closest collaboration between the scientific and medical sides was needed.

(5) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) questioned the use of the word "campaign".

(6) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Australia, also considered the title of the project misleading. The dividing line was clear: cancer, being a health problem, concerned WHO, while research on cell growth was a scientific matter and therefore concerned Unesco. He proposed amending the title to "Basic research on cell growth and related problems".

(7) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) favoured the wording "Study of normal and abnormal cell growth", which he thought would satisfy WHO. The Committee should, however, note that this new title implied a change of attitude and that it would be well to make quite sure that the

project still fitted in with the Executive Board's intentions.

(8) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) remarked that the title had arisen out of a press conference at Unesco House. Since Unesco's work alone did not represent a campaign, he proposed amending the title to "Unesco's part in the Campaign against Cancer".

(9) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that WHO had so far not committed itself; that body's chief concern was to make sure that Unesco was not undertaking projects which came within its own sphere.

(10) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked for an assurance that cancer was not one of the subjects already being investigated by bodies affiliated to the International Council of Scientific Unions.

(11) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that cell growth was a subject dealt with by the International Union of Biological Sciences, a body affiliated to ICSU, and also by the newly-founded International Union of Physiology, which was shortly to be admitted to ICSU. But in either case it was only one of their respective interests and Unesco could perfectly well undertake an investigation of this phenomenon in its relation to cancer, in agreement with the two unions. Research into cell growth was also of the utmost interest to the International Union against Cancer. Under the new arrangements which it was proposed to set up, contacts should be established with all these unions with a view to studying a specific problem not directly dealt with by any of them.

(12) Mr. LEE (United States of America) recognized the desirability of further investigation, but said that it was necessary to study what had already been done by other bodies. He proposed that the project should be struck out and the next two years be devoted to investigation by the Secretariat with a view to providing a better basis on which to formulate an approach to the problem.

(13) Asked by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that he would accept the United States delegate's proposal as meeting his own wishes.

(14) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences programme had been strongly in support of the project. That Committee was aware of the problems, and the strength of its support indicated the possibility of effective work starting at once.

(15) The CHAIRMAN asked whether a document existed on the Advisory Committee's discussions.

(16) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the views of the Advisory Committee were embodied in a document which had not yet been reproduced but could be read to the Committee.

(17) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) wanted to make it clear that, if project B were struck out and the Secretariat were simply instructed to continue what it was doing, it could hardly make any headway in the matter without a budget appropriation for consultation with experts. He suggested that, rather than simply strike out paragraphs 101 and 102 from the programme, they should, if the idea of holding the constituent meeting proposed for 1956 were dropped, make provision at least for a meeting of experts.

(18) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) expressed his support for the views of the Chairman of the Executive Board. The project would provide an opportunity for scientists to collaborate in solving an important problem; moreover it had been approved by a body which, knowing the problems involved, considered that research could be undertaken at the present stage.

(19) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) read out the Advisory Committee's recommendation and pointed out that its second paragraph reflected what he had said about the responsibilities of each of the two organizations.

(20) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) asked if any information was available on what WHO had been doing in the field of cancer.

(21) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) did not think WHO had taken any major action in the matter.

(22) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that the project be deferred for one year to allow time for negotiation with WHO, that the conference be held in 1956 with the collaboration of WHO and the budget allocation for 1955 be transferred to 1956, the 1956 provision being deleted.

(23) Mr. BOW (Canada) recalled that it had been originally proposed to defer the project in the interests of concentrating the programme, and could not reconcile the Executive Board's recommendation on concentration with its approval of a new project. In any case he considered that such a project should be inspired by the World Health Organization. Without wishing to detract from its importance, the Canadian delegation supported the proposal to defer the project.

(24) There being no seconder for the delegate of Israel's proposal, the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate was put to the vote and adopted by 6 votes to 4 with no abstentions.

Project 2.31: Dissemination of science

(25) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the proposed activities might give an impression of greater dispersion than those in the section on scientific research. The fact was that there were many ways of disseminating science, hence a whole range of projects as varied as: project A, concerned with general scientific information the object of which was to secure the publication of information on scientific subjects, project B on travelling

science exhibitions, another channel of dissemination, etc. Project 2.31 comprised a wide variety of activities, each of which required to be judged separately. For 1955-56 the programme was primarily one of research; a well thought out programme of action could not be presented until 1957-58.

(26) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) regretted that sales of the periodical Impact of Science on Society were not very satisfactory, in spite of favourable opinion on its quality. He asked whether there was any additional information on its financial success since the preparation of the budget.

(27) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that, though Impact was not, strictly speaking, a financial success, it had been repeatedly referred to in terms of warm appreciation in such important publications as the British periodical Nature, a well-known science publication of high standard, The Scientific American and Discovery. The non-specialized press also took it seriously, particularly in the United States of America. That seemed to prove that Impact was dealing successfully with subjects of vital interest.

(28) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that, since the object of the publication was to secure wide circulation of views, it would be better to include the articles of Impact in the periodical publications of the Department of Mass Communication.

(29) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the success of any publication had to be considered from two angles, quantitative and qualitative. Obviously, the articles appearing in Impact could be distributed much more widely by the Department of Mass Communication, but Impact was aimed at a special public, not very large in numbers but influential in political, business and administrative circles. An example of what he meant was the publication in Impact of an article on the organization of the "Parliamentary and Scientific Committee" of the United Kingdom, which article had led to the formation of a similar parliamentary committee in France. The latter committee had had a great deal to do with the recent establishment of an Under-Secretaryship of State for Scientific Research. That might properly be considered a success for Impact.

(30) Answering a question by the delegate of Israel, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences, said that there were 200 subscribers to the English edition of Impact and 120 to the French edition, total sales per issue being 560 copies in English and 200 in French. In addition, 761 copies of the English edition and 422 copies of the French edition were sent free of charge by the Secretariat to addresses on a special distribution list.

Paragraphs 123-139

(31) Mr. AUGER read paragraph 129 and outlined the origin of the project. A few years back Unesco had published a compendium of plans for the low-cost production of simple apparatus for the teaching of science. This publication had been an immense success, especially in India and it was in response to an explicit request that Unesco had planned to publish a second compendium on the construction, furnishing and equipment of laboratories, which the Secretariat felt was a needed sequel to the first collection.

(32) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported Mr. Auger's statement. The designs were most useful, and his country had already started an experimental scheme for manufacturing equipment based on the drawings.

(33) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked which were the three countries mentioned in paragraph 136 as wishing to develop education in nuclear physics and cosmic rays, and whether it was an essential project.

(34) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that paragraphs 135-139 dealt with a programme of technical aid to Member States in the domain of science teaching. As some States had requested technical aid for teaching about nuclear physics and cosmic rays - which could not be shewn to have any direct impact on their economic development - the project had been included in the natural science programme. Ecuador and Pakistan should be added to the list of States seeking such aid.

Project 2.41: Science co-operation offices (paragraphs 140-154)

(35) The CHAIRMAN suggested postponing a general discussion of the policy aspects of decentralization until the whole programme had been studied. It might, however, be useful to examine specific details at the present stage.

(36) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that the science co-operation offices, which had originally been bodies for the exchange of information, had evolved into organs for executing the Unesco programme in distant countries. The activities set out in project 2.41 had a direct connexion with the programme work of the Department.

(37) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) asked what were the activities of the regional centres and whether they could not be carried out by headquarters in co-operation with National Commissions.

(38) The CHAIRMAN said that questions of that nature should be considered under decentralization of the programme as a whole.

(39) Following an exchange of views on the advantages of this kind of procedure, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that, to overcome the difficulty, they agree that, for the examination of the proposals submitted in the project, the Committee proceed as though it accepted the principle of regionalization and that they hold over consideration of the actual principle of maintaining regional offices for the general discussion of the programme.

(40) The CHAIRMAN said that it would not be possible for members who had doubts on decentralization to join in the discussion at the present stage, but there could be an exchange of views on

specific details by those who approved the Director-General's approach.

(41) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) suggested that a working party be set up during the Conference to study the decentralization of Unesco's activities and report at the end of the Conference. The science co-operation offices could then be considered in relation to the general problem of decentralization and its organizational aspects.

(42) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that it was important to consider the overall use of funds for natural sciences. He would prefer a lower priority for the science co-operation offices and suggested that any savings might be applied elsewhere, for example to the section on the teaching of science.

(43) The CHAIRMAN said that it would be quite proper to discuss priorities within the chapter on Natural Sciences without prejudging the general discussion of decentralization.

(44) Mr. BOW (Canada) agreed with the delegate of the United States' point concerning budgetary considerations, but did not approve of relating a decision on priority to the release of funds for another project.

(45) The CHAIRMAN explained that the United States delegate had only been concerned with priorities within the natural sciences programme.

(46) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) was against the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America. He felt that, if the science co-operation offices were continued, they should be provided with the requisite means to do their work. Until such time as the Conference decided to abolish them or to diminish their functions, they must retain the priority they were previously given.

(47) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) considered that the question of priorities should be studied within the general problem of decentralization, of which it was only one aspect.

(48) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) agreed with the delegate of India. It was surely logical to discuss general policy before making decisions on details.

(49) Mr. LEE (United States of America) withdrew his proposal and the CHAIRMAN deferred to the view that discussion should be postponed.

(50) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) saw the science co-operation offices, not as a project proper but rather as part of Unesco's administrative machinery for effective implementation of the programme, and considered that they should be discussed not as part of the natural sciences programme but as an aspect of the implementation of Unesco's task as a whole.

(51) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) agreed with the delegate of Mexico and felt that the same views were held by all the countries of the Americas. This was the only service which Unesco maintained in that region and strong arguments for its retention were its accessibility and the fact that there was a common language over most of the region and that problems were similar throughout. He asked the Committee to maintain the present priority.

(52) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished to defer discussion until the end of the programme and budget document.

(53) It was so agreed, Mr. BOW (Canada) requesting that budgetary considerations should be included.

Summary Tables (paragraphs 185-198)

(54) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it had been agreed to defer discussion of the Director's office to the comparative examination at the end of the document.

(55) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that in that case it would be better to defer discussion of the Staff Tables as a whole.

(56) The CHAIRMAN replied that it would be appropriate to discuss the staff in connexion with the programmes already approved.

(57) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked why, under International Co-operation in Scientific Research, there were two P-5 posts in 1954 but only one for 1955-56.

(58) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the Division of International Co-operation on Scientific Research had the same number of posts in 1955 as in 1954, the abolition of a P-5 post having been offset by the establishment of a post at a lower grade. What had happened was that a post of Head of Division had become redundant as a result of subventions being passed in a lump sum to ICSU, which undertook to distribute those funds. As a result of this simplification one Head of Division was enough and it had been possible to establish a post at a lower grade for the work involved in developing the programme.

(59) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested that any decision to make changes in the science co-operation offices (paragraph 196) might result in increasing headquarters staff.

(60) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the staff listed in that paragraph included those at headquarters dealing with regional affairs.

(61) The CHAIRMAN explained that the delegate of Israel foresaw that, if the science co-operation offices were suppressed, it might be necessary to strengthen headquarters staff to maintain the work.

**CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL SCIENCES**

(62) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the development of Social Sciences in the international field had been initiated by

Unesco. It was hoped that they could be used in solving some of the difficult problems of the day.
(63) For the years 1955-56 the Department of Social Sciences was organized in the same way as other departments, namely in two main sections: permanent and general services and special projects. An outline was given in paragraph 10. In Section I the main theme was stabilization, the only major addition being the Unesco Institute in Cologne. In Section II the main theme was concentration. There were five major projects listed. Unesco's work in the social sciences field was closely related to the interests of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies.
(64) With regard to the discussion of field and regional offices, there were two offices in existence, in the Middle East and Asia, as indicated in paragraphs 16-24. With a view to meeting the expressed requirements of Member States, it was envisaged that the Asian office might in 1956 be integrated in the proposed International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization.

(65) The CHAIRMAN asked for general discussion before the programme was considered in detail.

(66) Mr. BOW (Canada) was concerned at the large budgetary increase for 1955-56 and did not think it was the right time for expanding activities. The proposed projects were all valuable, but it was necessary to select and evaluate. He questioned the subventions in Section I, involving an increase of about $50,000; and with regard to Section II suggested selecting the two most important of the five major projects and deferring the others until sufficient progress had been made to demonstrate the value of the activities and perhaps obtain support and funds by a public appeal. He did not approve of the proposed expansion of activities under Section II and would prefer to see concentration on more important activities in other chapters: for example, transfers might be made to the Exchange of Persons Service.
(67) Finally, a high priority should be given to requests from Member States, since they were the judges of what assistance was needed and of how it would be best administered.

(68) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) favoured more emphasis on work in Section II, for example projects 3.5 and 3.6, and less on documentation and terminology.

(69) The CHAIRMAN, in reply to the delegate of Canada, said that changes in the budgetary balance and priorities between departments could only be discussed when the whole programme and budget had been dealt with.

Project 3.11: Co-operation with international social science organizations and institutions (paragraphs 25-54)

(70) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the increase in subventions mentioned by the Canadian delegate was mainly due to the annual grant of $32,000 to the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences, Cologne.

(71) Mr. BOW (Canada) said that, with the exception of the International Union of Scientific Psychology, all subventions showed an increase. After studying the explanation and document 8C/ADM/20, he was not convinced that there had been adequate evaluation of activities to support the increases or that the criteria for subventions were correctly applied. He proposed that the subventions be stabilized at the 1953-54 level.

(72) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the list of subventions and comparative table for 1953-54 and 1955-56 in Annex I on page 233.

(73) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) believed that the remarks of the delegate of Canada did not apply to the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences, for which a figure of $32,000 was shown in the list of organizations which received subventions through the Department of Social Sciences. He had already explained why the Secretariat had made provision for a subvention for this Institute and the other two Unesco Institutes in Germany; the Cologne Institute, therefore, should be omitted in any comparison between the financial years 1953-54 and 1955-56.

(74) In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. BOW (Canada) said that he was proposing that, with the exception of the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences, Cologne, subventions should be retained at the 1953-54 level.

(75) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) pointed out that the social sciences were less developed than other Unesco activities, and the Secretariat had been urged to encourage development. It was not reasonable, therefore, to compare the Department of Social Sciences with other departments.

(76) In reply to a question from the delegate of Israel on the reasons for the increase in subventions, Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that they were due to items formerly represented as contracts, which were now considered as subventions. In the majority of cases the increase in subventions was offset by the reduction in contracts, and the only real increase was in the case of the International Science Council, whose subvention had been raised from $15,000 to $18,000, because it was a young organization showing good progress and needing additional funds on account of wider geographical coverage. Unesco had given contracts to the organizations concerned for specific subjects to be discussed at their congresses; such special projects, however, were precluded by the concentration approach, and it had been decided to replace contracts by an increase in subventions, which in many cases resulted in an ultimate saving.

(77) The CHAIRMAN said that he would welcome more clarification and asked if the Acting Head, Bureau of Programme and Budget, could give comparative figures of conventions and contracts for the periods 1953-54 and 1955-56.

(78) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that it would be difficult to supply complete information at the

present stage, since it was not yet known what contracts would be given and to which organizations.

(79) The CHAIRMAN said that it was important for the Canadian delegate to have some comparison between the two periods, in view of his proposal to stabilize subventions at the 1953-54 level.

(80) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed that, as Mr. Rao had explained, it was difficult at that stage to foresee what contracts would be concluded and with whom. Would Mr. Rao say, however, whether, leaving the other organizations aside, he could not make the comparison suggested between the two financial periods for the two organizations which had had a very substantial increase - the International Statistical Institute, where the figure had risen from $5,000 to $14,000 and the International Committee on Social Science Documentation, which showed an increase from $3,000 to $9,000?

(81) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether the International Statistical Centre at Beirut would become self-supporting or whether Unesco would continue to provide assistance.

(82) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the International Statistical Institute, which was provided with $9,000 annually to set up training institutions in different areas, followed a policy of encouraging the host country to contribute on an increasing scale. For example, an institution set up in Calcutta in 1950 was now supported by the Indian Government and received no more funds from the International Institute. In the case of the regional training centre set up at Beirut in 1952-53, contributions from the Lebanese Government and private foundations would enable the International Institute to withdraw gradually from its financial responsibility.

(83) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that the $9,000 contract with the International Statistical Institute in 1953-54, added to the subvention of $5,000, accounted for the sum of $14,000 for the years 1955-56. With regard to the International Committee on Social Science Documentation, the contract amounts of $8,150 for 1953 and $4,950 for 1954 gave a total of $13,100, which, if offset against the increase of $12,000 in the subvention for 1955-56, gave a net reduction of $1,100.

(84) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that, in the case of the two associations whose subventions, on paper, had had a spectacular rise, there was in fact no increase in the total sum supplied by Unesco.

(85) Mr. BOW (Canada) said that one of his objections to subventions was the loss of control over funds. He could not understand the reason for the change from contracts to subventions.

(86) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that the definition had been made to prevent any overlap between the purposes for which the subventions were given and the purposes for which Unesco should receive services. As to the question of control, all proposals for subventions were submitted to the Executive Board for examination.

(87) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) assumed that subventions were not earmarked for special activities.

(88) The CHAIRMAN asked why the subvention to the International Statistical Institute was directed to a specific rather than a general purpose, namely the maintenance of centres.

(89) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the description of the activities for which the subvention was given was to encourage the improvement of statistical training in various regions of the world. Developments were watched closely and there was constant consultation between the Executive Committee of the International Institute and the Secretariat over any new steps. Tasks to be undertaken were set out in the annual requests for subventions submitted to the Executive Board.

(90) The CHAIRMAN asked whether Unesco had any guarantee that the funds would in fact be used for the purpose for which they were intended. If so, a contract would be the normal procedure, under the criterion explained by Mr. Rao.

(91) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), referring to paragraphs 84-87 of the Technical Explanation, recognized the validity of the Chairman's comment. The Secretariat had had to give much consideration to the question of clarifying the difference between contracts and subventions. The change had been made because in a contract the main responsibility fell on the contractor.

(92) Mr. BOW (Canada) still saw some loss of control of funds under the subvention system as opposed to the contract system. If organizations undertook specific assignments for Unesco, then a contract should be given in accordance with the policy described by the Acting Head, Bureau of Programme and Budget. If not, subventions should be stabilized as he had already proposed.

(93) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that, while it was quite true that Unesco's control over funds was less stringent in the case of subventions than in that of contracts, such control nevertheless existed. The Committee was dealing with a marginal case and, if the delegate of Canada wanted the subvention to the International Statistical Institute to take the form of a contract, the Secretariat would not object.

(94) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Programme and Budget Commission at the seventh session of the General Conference had recommended the use of contracts wherever possible.

(95) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that it would be possible to reconsider the interpretation in the case of the International Statistical Institute and give a contract, in accordance with the views of the Canadian delegate.

(96) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) understood that the International Statistical Institute had given a written assurance to Unesco that the $14 000 would be used for establishing centres. As, however, the Unesco contribution was only a proportion of the budget of each centre, it was surely a subvention.

(97) Mr. CABOUAT (France), speaking as Rapporteur, asked whether the Committee was going to stand by the interpretation in figures given in the programme or whether the question of the category in which these appropriations would appear was still undecided, he had to insert a note to that effect in his report.

(98) The CHAIRMAN asked for a formal proposal from the Canadian delegate.

(99) Mr. BOW (Canada) proposed that the first six subventions in Annex I (p.233) be stabilized at the 1953-54 level and that the next two (see paragraphs 44 and 45, and 46-50) be reduced by a comparable amount.

(100) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Canadian delegate's proposal was tantamount to asking that the subventions which had been increased be brought back to the 1954 level - a perfectly legitimate request - but the delegate was also asking that the subventions which had not been increased should be reduced in the same proportions. In his (the speaker's) view, if that proposal was to make sense, it should apply only to the first five organizations in the list whose subventions had been increased, without the justification being offered that subventions had replaced contracts.

(101) The CHAIRMAN said that the stabilization of the proposed subventions would apply only to the first five organizations concerned.

(102) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested as an alternative wording that the organizations should receive in 1955-56 not more than they had received in 1953-54 through subventions and contracts.

(103) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that the delegate of Israel had spoken of what the organizations "received". Where a contract was concerned, no one was "given" anything; the funds passed in return for services rendered. There was therefore no gift by Unesco. He asked the Israeli delegate not to press his proposal.

(104) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) withdrew his proposal.

(105) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether the Canadian delegate's proposal affected five only of the six organizations under discussion; in other words, whether the International Statistical Institute was not covered by the proposal.

(106) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that the Canadian delegate's proposal was to keep the first five organizations at the previous level.

(107) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that, as far as the five organizations were concerned for which a reduction had been proposed, it was not a case of contracts having been converted into subventions. He would like to know on what grounds the Secretariat had proposed the increases in question.

(108) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the increases had been suggested for two reasons: firstly, some of the bodies in question were newly-established and were still in the growing stage; secondly, all of them were expanding their networks throughout the world, thus becoming more international; the numbers of their national branches were rising, which entailed larger expenditure.

(109) The CHAIRMAN thought that the Assistant Director-General's view did not allow for the eventual independence of organizations receiving subventions.
(110) He asked whether there was any support for the Canadian delegate's proposal.

(111) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that the Department of Social Sciences, more than any other department in Unesco, needed, for the pursuit of its activities, the certainty of progressively increasing financial support. The French delegation would vote in favour of the proposed budget.

(112) Mr. BOW (Canada) agreed with the views expressed by the delegate of France.

(113) There being no seconder for the Canadian proposal, the CHAIRMAN asked for comments on paragraphs 43-45.

(114) No comments.

Project 3.12: Clearing house for information and advisory service (paragraphs 55-70)

(115) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the two major items concerned were the International Social Science Bulletin and the Clearing House. The Bulletin was the only multidisciplinary international bulletin being published for the social sciences; it appeared in two languages and was receiving ever-increasing recognition. The Clearing House was small, but its work was now extended to cover also what had in earlier years been the subject of a separate project on "promotion of research".

(116) No comment.

Project 3.13: Improvement of social science documentation and terminology (paragraphs 71-90)

(117) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether the International Bibliography of Anthropology referred to in paragraph 82 was an essential project for 1955-56. It would need a large outlay and he considered it an item on which savings could be made.

(118) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway), referring to the same paragraph, pointed out that the sum of $23,170 covered five bibliographies. He considered bibliographies most important and welcomed particularly the one on anthropology, which would fill a long-standing

gap. He wondered, however, why the cost was so high, amounting to between $4,000 and $5,000 for each one, and said that similar work had been done in his country at a cost of $2,000.

(119) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that Unesco, in collaboration with associations representing the various disciplines, had been investigating the need for international bibliographies and had decided to cover the main fields by bibliographies but leave abstracts to the responsibility of voluntary organizations. The anthropological bibliography was of great interest for technical assistance and other missions abroad. There was also a big demand from anthropologists themselves.
(120) With regard to the costs, the International Political Science and International Economic bibliographies had contracts of $2,000 each and those for Sociology and Anthropology $3,000 each, since anthropology covered a very wide field and the publication on Current Sociology contained trend reports in addition to an annual bibliography.

Project 3.2: Statistics relating to education, science and culture (paragraphs 91-112)

(121) Mr. CABOUAT (France) was prepared to agree to the Unesco Statistical Service being administered by the Department of Social Sciences. As, however, this was a division serving several departments, he would like to have an analysis showing the proportions of the appropriation allocated for servicing each individual department involved.

(122) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that Mr. Cabouat's point would be borne in mind when they discussed the final percentages of the departmental budgets.

Project 3.3: Development of social science teaching (paragraphs 113-139)

(123) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that a fact-finding survey had been conducted in eight countries and published in an important series, now containing 8 volumes. It was proposed to supplement it by smaller surveys on subjects of great practical importance but not constituting independent disciplines recognized by universities. In 1954 action in the regions had included three highly successful seminars, in Delhi, Costa Rica and Damascus, and the proposals in paragraphs 124-129 were the results of definite recommendations from those regions. A seminar in the southern part of Latin America was planned for countries which had not been able to attend the one in Costa Rica.
(124) With regard to technical aid to Member States, twenty-two requests for missions had been received, of which four had been met. Missions were planned for 1955-56 to help countries needing assistance in building up social science teaching at university and secondary school levels. It was hoped at a later stage to concentrate more on teaching aids.

Project 3.4. Social science and problems of international understanding and tensions (paragraphs 140-163)
(125) Mrs. Myrdal said that the project represented the continuation of studies in which Unesco had been interested since its inception. It was hoped to pursue investigations in 1955-56 with a view to finding positive means of reaching agreement and averting conflicts. It was also hoped to make use of public opinion polls to ascertain public opinion about Unesco, the United Nations and their ideals.

(126) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom National Commission doubted the advisability of the use of public opinion polls proposed in paragraph 152 and of the guides on "How to read the news" referred to in paragraph 156. He proposed that paragraphs 152-156 inclusive be given a lower priority.

(127) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the National Commission in his country appreciated the importance of international understanding but were not entirely satisfied with Unesco's programme in that field. The Advisory Committee on Education for Living in a World Community was at present meeting in Paris and he proposed that discussion be deferred so that the programme could be modified in the light of the Committee's recommendations.

(128) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) enquired whether the report for publication in 1957 mentioned in paragraph 150 would be issued in Spanish.

(129) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences), in reply to the delegate of Uruguay, said that no decision had yet been made on the question of languages. With regard to paragraphs 152-157, Unesco had been promised valuable assistance by public opinion institutes in various countries. It was the first opportunity Unesco had of including questions in the public opinion polls and it would be an indirect means of encouraging public interest in the Organization and its work. It was, moreover, of great financial value to have these services free, since it was extremely costly to conduct a public opinion poll.

(130) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the delegate of Uruguay had referred to the report to be published in 1955, mentioned in paragraph 148, or to the publication of material referred to in paragraph 150.

(131) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) said that the report he meant was the one mentioned in paragraph 150, arising out of paragraph 149, on the development of international law since the end of the nineteenth century.

(132) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that the French National Commission regarded projects 3.5 (the social sciences and problems of human rights and minorities) and 3.6 (social sciences and problems of social development) as important and would like them to have priority over the project on public acceptance or rejection of the principles of Unesco and the United Nations which - though it would not go quite as far as the delegate of the United Kingdom - his own Commission regarded as a much less important project.

(133) The CHAIRMAN asked for a seconder to the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate that the priority of paragraphs 152-156 be reduced.

(134) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegate, seconded by the Norwegian delegate, was adopted by 7 votes to nil with 4 abstentions.

Project 3.5: The social sciences and problems of human rights and minorities (paragraphs 164-190)

(135) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that there were three main headings under human rights and minority groups: racial prejudice and discrimination; women; migrants. Much work had been done under the first heading and 220,000 copies of pamphlets with informational material had been distributed. She drew attention to a corrigendum relating to paragraphs 178 and 179, which had been written in the expectation that the International Conference on Race Relations meeting in Honolulu would recommend that Unesco take on a continuing responsibility for co-ordination of research in that field: in fact, it had set up an International Society for further studies. Unesco's contribution would be most valuable in the form of clearing house activities.

(136) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) expressed the Mexican National Commission's satisfaction with the quality of the booklets so far published on human rights, questions of racial discrimination and the protection of minorities. These excellent publications deserved to be treated as of the highest importance and to be given top priority.

(137) Mr. BOW (Canada) seconded the proposal of the Mexican delegate. The Canadian authorities considered the pamphlets on racial relations among the best of Unesco's publications.

(138) Mr. CABOUAT (France) endorsed the remarks of the delegate of Canada and supported the motion of the delegate of Mexico.

(139) The proposal of the delegate of Mexico that a higher priority should be given to the project on human rights and minorities was put to the vote and adopted unanimously.

(140) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraphs 178 and 179 as amended, asked for an assurance that similar activities were not performed by the Carnegie Foundation.

(141) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that there were no such clearing house activities within the Carnegie Foundation.

(142) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked that the Secretariat should take account, in its future programmes on women's political rights and political education, of a project in the Near East being undertaken by the Ford Foundation.

Project 3.6: Social sciences and problems of social development (paragraphs 191-215)

(143) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the project was a major one in the field of applied social sciences. Contributions from both theoretical and applied social science were made to the work of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies, particularly in relation to technical assistance. Paragraphs 207, 208 and 209 related to regional action in the form of symposia in three different parts of the world. A new feature was that regional seminars were to be undertaken, in co-operation with international professional organizations such as the International Sociological Association, the International Economic Association and with intergovernmental agencies, i.e., the Food and Agriculture Organization and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East as well as for Latin America.

(144) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that the French National Commission attached great importance to Unesco's studies of the impact of technological change and industrialization on countries in process of development. On behalf of his National Commission, he supported the majority of the projects under this head and asked for the reinstatement in the present programme of a project on the development of democratic institutions in evolving countries which had appeared in the initial draft programme submitted to the thirty-seventh session of the Executive Board. Such a study would be of definite topical interest and he therefore asked for restoration of the appropriation of $4,000 originally earmarked for the International Political Science Association for production of a report on this most interesting problem.

(145) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that the subject was a vast one, and it was important to secure continuation of the projects if they were to be of scientific value.

(146) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) wondered if more would be achieved by supporting existing organizations. It was an important subject and needed careful study, which might perhaps be given more satisfactorily by the Programme and Budget Commission with its wider membership.

(147) As a secondary consideration, he asked how deeply the Director-General was committed to the project. With regard to paragraphs 205 and 209, he assumed that Unesco would finance the whole project despite the co-operation of other Specialized Agencies. He would be interested to know whether technical assistance funds would be forthcoming for such a project.

(148) The CHAIRMAN did not agree with the United Kingdom delegate that the project should be referred direct to the Programme and Budget Commission: it was for the Advisory Committee to give all possible assistance by preliminary consideration.

International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization in South Asia (paragraphs 216-222)

(149) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Executive Board's comments in document 8C/5 Add.1 and asked if the Chairman of the Executive Board wished to comment.

(150) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the problem was continually arising in all countries and there was a need for research. The Executive Board considered it of the highest importance.

(151) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences), replying to the delegate of the United Kingdom, said that, with regard to paragraph 205, the contribution of the International Labour Organization would be in the form of studies to complement Unesco's work. There might possibly be some indirect financial support through the European Productivity Agency. As far as paragraph 209 was concerned, there were definite promises of co-operation from both ECAFE and FAO, involving financial consequences for those organizations, which would not, however, necessarily reduce Unesco's contribution.

(152) Turning to paragraphs 216-222, a combined activity was envisaged, of which one part was to have a permanent character, and another part to be more temporary and flexible. The first concerned a documentation centre on problems of industrialization and economic development, which would be set up so as to be of permanent benefit to the host country, while the second, the research centre proper, would have a nucleus staff acting as a task force at the disposal of member governments, which need not involve commitment for any long future. The whole project presupposed a host country sufficiently interested to contribute to the costs. It was further proposed that the Social Science Officer in Delhi should become an integral part of the research centre, if established in that region. A detailed memorandum on structure and staff, as well as needs for premises and equipment, had been prepared and was being discussed with the Indian Government.

(153) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thanked the Director of the Department of Social Sciences for her statement. With regard to paragraph 216, he wondered whether, since it was undertaking part of the project, the Indian Government might not be persuaded to undertake the whole.

(154) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the National Commission of his country was strongly in favour of the project contained in paragraphs 216-222. It was sponsored by a National Commission and would therefore have that Commission's active interest, and it was well planned. He proposed that it be given a higher priority.

(155) The proposal of the delegate of the United States of America, seconded by the delegates of the German Federal Republic, France and Mexico, was adopted by 5 votes to nil with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

# TENTH MEETING

*6 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

**CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL SCIENCES (continued)**

Project 3.7: The social sciences and evaluation techniques (paragraphs 226-246)

(1) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the resolution contained in this part was one of the additions made after the Executive Board's discussion with the Director-General on the first draft. The Board had felt that it was necessary for the Secretariat to find out how new projects were getting on, and this had led to the idea of promoting the techniques of evaluation.

(2) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) informed the meeting about the experiment in evaluation at present being carried out in Montevideo. The new institute for research on public opinion in Uruguay was collaborating, as well as the French Public Opinion Research Institute, in an attempt to measure the impact of the Conference.

(3) A corrigendum made to paragraph 238 was submitted in order to incorporate adjustments of the work plans after a meeting in Geneva, in July, with technical assistance representatives and social scientists. The Department had been asked to hold another small meeting in Geneva in the summer of 1955, together with TAB representatives, in order to check on the progress made in regard to evaluation of technical assistance. The Economic and Social Council (paragraph 239) had set up a committee of eleven government representatives to make a general evaluation of technical assistance programmes. Unesco would place at their disposal a consultant in scientific evaluation techniques.

(4) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked for details of the budget implications of the Montevideo enquiry.

(5) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that $4,000, saved in 1954 out of projects in the same chapter, would cover the required expenses.

(6) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom, questioned the value of the activities described in paragraphs 243-246.

(7) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that these activities were closely linked with those of the United Nations in this field. Some countries (notably Ceylon) had already been requesting help in evaluation of development schemes.

(8) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that, since the technique was a new one, it should be deferred until 1956. The budgetary provision for 1955 could be suppressed.

(9) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) and Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the motion. It was then put to the vote and adopted by 10 in favour, none against and 1 abstention.

Summary Tables I and II (paragraphs 247-261)

(10) Mr. BOW (Canada) wished to raise the budgetary implications of the project on the Unesco Institute in Cologne, on which he had commented earlier. He suggested that the subvention allocated to this activity should receive a low priority.

(11) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the proposal of the delegate of Canada.

(12) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked the delegate of Canada whether he regarded the Cologne Institute for Social Sciences as less important than the Hamburg and the Gauting Institutes which were included in the Education chapter. If it was a question of an abstract evaluation, that was one thing. If, however, the considerations were exclusively budgetary, the Secretariat was prepared to put up a case for the $32,000 appropriation requested. The abstract evaluation, it was understood, would be made by the 1956 and not by the present General Conference.

(13) Mr. BOW (Canada) had intended to refer only to the budgetary implications of the project. His Government's attitude, however, was the same towards other institutes as it was towards this one.

(14) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) thought the Institute in Germany had not had time to prove its worth. A reduction in the subvention at this stage might curtail its activity or force it to close down. It should be given another two years.

(15) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the delegate of Norway. He understood that the Secretariat was to evaluate the project. This should include a discussion of the relationship between the Department of Social Sciences and the Institute, which might be able to carry out some of the work done in Unesco.

(16) Count Von HARDENBERG (German Federal Republic) proposed that the suggestion by the delegate of the United States of America on achieving a closer relation between the Institute and the Department of Social Sciences, should figure in the Committee's report.

(17) A vote was taken on the proposal made by the delegate of Canada, and seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, to lower the priority of the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences in Cologne. It was rejected by 3 in favour, 6 against and 4 abstentions.

**CHAPTER 6: EXCHANGE OF PERSONS SERVICE**

(18) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the chapter was divided into three parts. I: clearing house and advisory services; II: administration of Unesco fellowships; III: more general promotional activity.

(19) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) expressed dissatisfaction with the method of sending expert missions. The "expert mission" had come into prominence in the last few years with the launching of technical assistance programmes, not always proving to be a successful method of action. Even if familiar with the language of the country he was assigned to, the expert did not always penetrate its mentality. Or he might leave behind him a good plan but no one qualified to put it into practice. Mr. Avidor noticed and approved a tendency to shift the stress towards the training of local talent. That was more in line with Unesco's task, although the policy was a long-term one. Fellowships should be awarded before an expert was invited, so that, when the work of the expert ended, the students could be made better use of.

(20) The delegate of Israel accordingly proposed that a high priority should be given to fellowships, provided (1) they had received some endowment; (2) the holders were very carefully selected; (3) their work was well planned and executed.

(21) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that the remarks of the delegate of Israel showed that fellowship activities required careful planning. The more money there was, the more fellowships there would be. He feared there was not enough money to go too far in that direction.

(22) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom. He asked what was the basis used in calculating the proposed budget figures.

(23) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said there was a standard budget of $2,900 per fellowship. That included maintenance allowance, two-way travel, a sum for travel within the various countries, books or small equipment, miscellaneous expenses and insurance. In many cases governments agreed to pay part or the whole of a fellow's salary while he was away. The figure was a flexible one, allowing for differences in cost of travel.

(24) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) seconded the proposal by the delegate of Israel that a high priority should be given to fellowships.

(25) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) endorsed one aspect of the statement by the delegate of Israel, that of an exchange of fellowships between the underdeveloped countries themselves. That could form a second part

of the fellowships programme. He also recommended that the Secretariat prepare a comprehensive, systematic and expanding programme of fellowships to meet the requirements of the various countries, taking into account and co-operating with national schemes already in existence.

(26) Mr. Junankar wondered whether the fellowships could not be attached to certain fixed basic institutions. That would make it possible to check up on progress more carefully.

(27) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with both the delegate of India and the delegate of the United Kingdom. He strongly endorsed the remarks by Mr. Junankar on the possible uses of Unesco's facilities as a clearing house in this field. But the Organization should not get involved in a large programme of administering fellowships. He suggested in the interest of concentration that those at the higher level should receive a lower priority.

(28) Mr. CABOUAT (France) stressed the importance which the French National Commission attached to the Unesco system of fellowships. He agreed that Unesco fellowships should be supplementary to national programmes and, in his view, the first to benefit from the Unesco programme should be those countries least favourably placed as regards bilateral exchanges. Fellowships were most necessary in the most neglected domains of science and technology. He differed, however, from the delegate of Israel on the question of experts. In his view, the two systems, far from being opposed, were complementary. The best fellowship holders who had come to France had been recruited on the spot by experts from Unesco; that was the best method of selection even if it occasionally entailed administrative difficulties. He further felt that there should be no special priorities for the various items in the Exchange of Persons chapter, and the priority for each should be decided in the light of the priority given to the programme activity with which it was connected.

(29) The CHAIRMAN thought it wiser to defer a decision on Mr. Avidor's proposal until the details of the chapter had been debated. When the relative priority of the different chapters was being discussed, it would be possible to see what part Exchange of Persons should play in relation to the others.

(30) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) reminded the Chairman that his recommendation was not stated in terms of the budget, but with a view to future planning.

(31) Mr. BOW (Canada) was torn between two points of view: the programme was an important one and the country to which a fellow was sent benefited as much as he himself. But, from the point of view of the budget, his delegation's position had already been made clear.

(32) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained, in answer to a remark by Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), that the Unesco programme of fellowships did not overlap national programmes; it had certain distinctive characteristics. These were based on the following criteria:

1. The fellowships always related to a specific Unesco project.

2. The number proposed was on a sufficient scale to ensure an impact in one year. Only in new fields or for specific cases were one or two new fellowships proposed in a particular year.

3. They gave an opportunity to visit a variety of countries where there was a specific activity going on (e.g. fundamental education).

(33) Direct contact with Unesco and its work was a part of the programme of every fellowship.

(34) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) pointed out that the criteria outlined by Mr. Carter were different from those on which his own idea was based. He wished for a programme linked in large measure with the efforts of the countries concerned, within the framework of the Exchange of Persons programme.

(35) The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal by the delegate of India was an important one. The meeting should examine it again when the Executive Board's document on remodelling the programme was being discussed.

Project 6.1: Clearing house and advisory services (paragraphs 9-26)

(36) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service), on paragraph 17, referred to Mrs. Myrdal's earlier remarks on the plans of her Department for 1956. The work described in this paragraph was the direct result of the advice of a social science consultant.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported this section. He paid tribute to the value of the publication Study Abroad. Incidentally, the work illustrated the complexity of the sphere Unesco was entering in attempting to give scholarships. Mr. Cowell wondered if the material contained in Teaching Abroad might not be more effectively disseminated by the International Association of Universities.

(38) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that the publication was distributed as a supplement to the International Universities Bulletin. If it were not printed under Unesco's budget, the expense of obtaining extra copies for universities that did not take the bulletin would come to almost the same as that incurred under the existing arrangement.

(39) Mr. CABOUAT (France) produced a new suggestion regarding paragraph 21: the Secretariat might perhaps get in touch with the International Union of Official Travel Organizations and secure the insertion of items about Travel Abroad in that body's journal.

(40) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said there was a possibility of merging the two publications. Its technical aspects were being examined. This would spread interest in Unesco very widely and would have an important effect on the travel agencies. It might require a slight increase in the budget, but the impact would be well worth it, as a totally new market would be opened up.

Project 6.2: Fellowship administration (paragraphs 27-67)

(41) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service), in answer to earlier remarks on this project by the delegate of the United States of America, said that higher budgetary level fellowships were tied up with technical aid projects in other parts of the programme.

(42) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that separate itemizing might be helpful in this project.

(43) Mr. LEE (United States of America) wondered if it would not have been better for the figures in this programme to be shown under the different projects to which the fellowships were related.
(44) He referred to the remark he had made during the general discussion of the chapter, with reference to paragraphs 37 and 38, 44-46, 49-51, 55-63, and proposed that fellowships listed under the higher budgetary level be awarded a lower priority. He asked what the figures in paragraph 67 applied to.

(45) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) opposed the suggestion by the delegate of the United States of America. All fellowships under the higher budgetary level should be considered as having the same relative importance as those of the normal budget.

(46) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) felt apprehensive about the repercussions of the United States delegate's proposal. Fellowships were part and parcel of the projects of the departments. None of the projects with which the study grants mentioned by the United States delegate were connected had had its priority reduced; in some cases it had even been raised. Such a budgetary cut, therefore, could mean only one thing, namely, that the Committee disapproved of the whole system of fellowships, and this he refused to believe.

(47) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that the fellowships connected with programme projects should be shown in the relevant chapters with an indication of the proposed expenditure.

(48) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), in reply, said that cross-references could be inserted in the relevant chapters of the programmes but that a budgetary transfer could not be considered, for the administrative responsibility rested essentially with the Exchange of Persons Service.

(49) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked on what criterion the study grants mentioned in paragraph 52 were awarded.

(50) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that this activity was not in the category of specific technical aid. It was of a broader promotional nature. The ten fellowships offered for the last two-year period had aroused great interest. Thirty-seven out of the sixty Member States to which a circular had been sent had already replied.

(51) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) shared the view of the United States delegate over this question. He was not impressed by the number of Member States which had accepted the offer. He was in fact surprised that they had not all done so. He did not think the advantage to Unesco of the scheme was clear, and he proposed that it be awarded a low priority.

(52) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that the activity described in paragraph 52 was not under the higher budgetary level.

(53) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that the fellowships for artists and writers were very serious propositions, contrary to what the delegate of the United Kingdom inferred. National Commissions and governments had accepted the idea and sent highly qualified candidates. There had been a tendency to neglect artists and writers in favour of scientific and technical workers. This was a small step in the other direction.

(54) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the proposal by the delegate of the United States of America that the fellowships referred to in paragraphs 37 and 38, 44-46, 49-51 and 55-63 should be awarded a lower priority, had not been seconded and he called for support for it.

(55) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded that proposal.

(56) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) disagreed with what the United Kingdom delegate had said about paragraph 52. The Chief of the Exchange of Persons Service had stressed the importance of maintaining these particular fellowships and the delegation of Mexico supported that view, at any rate until the Universal Copyright Convention had been ratified.

(57) Mr. BOW(Canada)deplored the fact that the question of higher budgetary level had come up again. Had the meeting not agreed that decisions were not to be taken on that basis? He suggested that the project be taken section by section, with a reference to the projects with which the different sections were connected.

(58) Agreed.

(59) The CHAIRMAN asked the meeting to defer accordingly the discussion of paragraph 52 and to take up Section A, paragraphs 32-38.

(60) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked the Committee to bear in mind the priorities given to the projects with which the fellowships were connected.

(61) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that none of the projects to which the fellowships mentioned by the United States delegate related had had its priority reduced.

Section B, paragraphs 39-43

(62) No comments.

Section C

(63) Approved without comment.

Section D

(64) The proposal made earlier by the delegate of the United States of America on paragraph 52 was seconded by the delegate of Norway.

(65) Mr. LEE (United States of America) pointed out that the fellowships for artists and writers seemed to be exceptions to the standard rates. The grants of $3,500 were higher than the average.

(66) The CHAIRMAN remarked that also they did not relate to any specific project.

(67) Mr. CABOUAT (France) entirely agreed with the view previously expressed by the delegate of Mexico: it was a good thing for Unesco to encourage international exchanges of artists and writers.

(68) A vote was taken on the question of reducing the priority of the fellowships for artists and writers (paragraph 52). The motion was rejected by 3 in favour, 7 against and 1 abstention.

Section E, paragraphs 62 and 63

(69) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought the sum allocated to fellowships in mass communication was too high, and proposed a low priority for this item.

(70) Mr. CABOUAT (France) formally moved that the discussion of the fellowships attaching to mass communication be held over until the Committee came to examine that Department's programme and budget.

(71) Agreed.

Section F, paragraphs 64-67

(72) On paragraph 67, Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained, at the request of the delegate of the United States of America, that three types of fellowships were administered by the Exchange of Persons Service: normal programme; technical assistance; and fellowships sponsored by Unesco (about 20 to 25 a year since 1948), apart from those administered on behalf of governments for their own nationals. Five thousand dollars was a rough estimate of the possible budget under this heading. It would not cover the costs of the staff concerned; it was intended to meet the additional expenses incurred when there was a large request for administration.

Project 6.3: Promotion of Exchange of Persons for international understanding
Project 6.31: General promotion (paragraphs 69-76)

(73) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the meetings of experts referred to in these paragraphs, particularly that held in Bangkok, had had a considerable impact on the development of the programme of Unesco in the region concerned. The solution of many problems had been easier to find through direct contacts on the spot.

Project 6.32: Exchange of workers (paragraphs 77-91)
(74) The CHAIRMAN referred the meeting to document 8C/PRG/20 giving comments by the Director of the International Labour Organization on this project.

(75) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) considered that the leading part in promoting these activities should be taken by the International Labour Organization. He did not find quite satisfactory the reference to that Organization in paragraph 90, where it was stated that its co-operation would be sought".

(76) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that co-operation with the International Labour Organization was a constant factor of the programme ever since it had first been mooted. That Organization, however, considered that study tours concerned with adult education were a function of Unesco rather than one of its own.

(77) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was grateful for Mr. Carter's partial reassurance. But did the ILO supply any cash?

(78) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that in spite of their efforts they had not secured much help on the budget side. This would no doubt eventually be forthcoming if delegations at meetings of the ILO shared the opinion expressed by Mr. Cowell.

(79) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom. He had himself taken part in the discussions with the Specialized Agencies at Geneva. The Secretariat would redouble its efforts to secure the International Labour Organization's participation in the project financially as well as otherwise.

(80) There being no other speakers, project 6.32 (paragraphs 77-91) was approved.

Project 6.33: Exchange of young people (paragraphs 92-97)

(81) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that the criteria for the award of grants under this project had been made more strict. Youth organizations were asked to finance an additional period of 3 to 5 months for studies for any candidate they proposed, to be devoted to youth work. That might reduce expense, as far fewer organizations would qualify.

Project 6.34: Exchange of teachers (paragraphs 98-106)

(82) Mr. Carter said that the publication Teaching Abroad was becoming increasingly useful in this connexion (paragraph 103).
(83) Paragraphs 104 and 105, grants for regional cultural studies, were another activity which ventured a little way out of the usual technical field.

(84) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) remarked that young people did not know enough about their own culture to profit from the study of cultures abroad. He hoped this activity was not included at the expense of the exchange of young scientists.

(85) Mr. W.CARTER(Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) did not recall an actual project on the exchange of young scientists. He felt however that scientists had a great many opportunities of travel, particularly in the field of research. The university grants for the regional cultural studies project were one way of broadening the interests of young teachers and advanced students.

Summary Tables I and II (paragraphs 107-111)

(86) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) welcomed the strengthening of the staff. It would make it easier to maintain the essential contact with National Commissions.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

# ELEVENTH MEETING

*8 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56 BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

**DEPARTMENT OF MASS COMMUNICATION**

(1) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) submitted the proposed programme for his Department. To forestall any potential ambiguity arising from the dual or even tripartite character of the activities of the Department of Mass Communication, the Director-General had endeavoured to draw a clear distinction between its different functions. First, there was publicity, designed to reach the "enlightened" sectors and the masses. Its tasks were (a) to explain why Unesco existed, what it was, what it did and what it would do in future; (b) to foster international understanding by devoting a considerable part of its activities to propaganda for the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies and ensuring that the press, radio and visual means of communication gave support to the constitutional aims of Unesco, namely human rights, fundamental education, the struggle against illiteracy and against racial discrimination, and so forth. That work demanded close co-operation with the other Unesco departments and could be developed effectively only with the help of Member States and their National Commissions. Projects under this heading had been placed under general activities, Section I, items 5.1 and 5.2, "A. Public information and the promotion of international understanding". For the first time, large sums had been provided to help certain Member States and their National Commissions translate and adapt Unesco publications and documents, organize meetings designed to further international understanding, etc. That propaganda work, which everyone agreed was needed, absorbed by itself 53% of the staff and 50% of the proposed budget for the Department, not including the sums set aside for the latter's direction. The service was one which had to be made available to the entire Organization, as well as to the United Nations and Specialized Agencies. It was a function to which the Director-General attached the greatest importance and which was not peculiar to Unesco, since all the other Specialized Agencies of the United Nations devoted large sums to their publicity work - although less than Unesco in proportion to their budgets.

(2) Mr. Desjardins went on to the programme activities proper which Unesco was constitutionally obliged to undertake. These were found under Section I, B, Assistance in development of mass communication, reduction of obstacles to the free flow of information (by causing Member States to adhere to international conventions and administrative arrangements), mass communication clearing house, exchange and stimulation of educational, scientific and cultural programmes. Some of those activities would also be found under Section I, items 5.3 and 5.4. On the other hand, projects under item 5.5 (organization of pilot projects and research in the new techniques to facilitate development of mass communication in Member States and enable full use to be made of them for educational, scientific and cultural aims) had been placed, together with technical aid to Member States in the development of their mass communication services (item 5.6) under Section II, Special Activities, consisting, on the one hand, of pilot projects (item 5.5) and, on the other hand, of projects for technical aid (item 5.6). This part of the programme absorbed about 28% of the staff of the Department, and 28% of the total appropriations requested, plus 8% for technical assistance missions to Member States. It had to be emphasized that 70% of the proposed budget for these forms of assistance towards developing means of communication concerned almost exclusively the underdeveloped regions, while the remaining 30% was devoted to activities of interest to all Member States. In addition, all the projects envisaged under items 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 closely corresponded to requests which Unesco had been receiving for several years past from the Economic and Social Council (especially the seventeenth session, held in April last) and from the General Assembly of the United Nations. Mr. Desjardins stated that some of the projects were carried out jointly, or in close co-operation with the Departments of Education,

Social Sciences and Cultural Activities, and his Department naturally worked in constant liaison with Technical Assistance and the Exchange of Persons Service. The activities of the Department were, in other words, very largely linked with the activities of other Unesco departments. In conclusion, Mr. Desjardins mentioned project 5.7 of Section II: Voluntary international assistance, which covered activities that were also very valuable and had been approved by many Member States: these were activities of a somewhat special technical nature and some of them (e.g. item 5.71 - Unesco Coupon Scheme) were designed to facilitate the flow of educational, scientific and cultural materials, as well as the exchange of persons. Another item, 5.72, concerned the Gift Coupon programme, which, he pointed out, had an undeniable propaganda and publicity value. Twenty per cent of the staff and 14% of the budget of the whole Department were absorbed by this last function. Mr. Desjardins said he had merely described the various objectives of the Department; he proposed to give the Committee, as discussion of the programme proceeded, any additional explanations which might clarify certain parts of the projects submitted to it.

(3) The CHAIRMAN asked for discussion of the chapter as a whole before the projects were examined in detail.

(4) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) wished to pay tribute to the Director of the Department of Mass Communication for his work in preparing the programme; his absence was to be regretted. The scope of the activities of the Department of Mass Communication was so wide that that Department alone could easily use up the whole of Unesco's budget. It was, moreover, a Department which provided Member States with good opportunities for collaboration, and he considered that the Organization should call upon them to participate more closely. It had been underlined that Unesco acted as a publicity agent not only for itself but also for the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies. He was uneasy on the matter of coordination, since the other agencies had their own budgets for propaganda. Unesco might well look to the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies for financial assistance. Mr. Cowell proposed that, owing to the varied nature of the objectives pursued by the Mass Communication Department, the Programme Commission should establish a working party to study the structure of that Department.

(5) Mr. LEE (United States of America) emphasized the primary need at this stage of Unesco's programme for a dynamic and imaginative programme of public information on its work rather than for clearing house activities, studies, agreements and elimination of obstacles. He did not consider that new resolutions were necessary for that purpose, but hoped that it would be achieved by the proposed administrative changes.

(6) Mr. CHAYET (France) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate and considered that the problem of the structure of the Department of Mass Communication should be thoroughly examined. The United Kingdom delegate had rightly recommended to the Programme and Budget Commission that it should lay particular stress on this problem. Mr. Chayet was also in favour of setting up a working party to study the division of functions in the Mass Communication Department. On the other point raised by the United Kingdom delegate, Mr. Chayet felt too that close attention should be paid to the assistance given by Unesco towards developing the mass communication services of countries badly equipped in that respect; that was, indeed, one of the essential tasks of the Organization.

(7) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee would agree to the proposal that the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission should be drawn to the need to examine the organization and structure of the Department.

(8) Agreed.

(9) The Chairman then invited discussion of the programme in detail.

Project 5.1: Public information and promotion of international understanding by Member States (paragraphs 15-28)

(10) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) stated that this project dealt with direct assistance to Member States and National Commissions - assistance which had repeatedly been requested and was now being extended for the first time. He had nothing to add to the text of the programme, which was sufficiently explicit.

(11) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway), referring to paragraph 19, recalled the doubts expressed by his and other delegations at the previous Conference. He asked the Secretariat whether it was satisfied with the results of its initiative.

(12) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the work done so far was only a beginning, based on requests received. Whether the experiment would be developed or not would depend on results.

(13) The CHAIRMAN said that the project had been included in the programme on the recommendation of a meeting of National Commissions at the time of the seventh session of the General Conference, and that it had been understood that Unesco and the National Commissions should contribute to it jointly. He wondered how far that policy had been kept to during the past year.

(14) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked how far Member States had contributed to the project.

(15) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the idea had been mooted at the last session of the General Conference by several delegations, the Swedish delegation in particular, in connexion with assistance to National Commissions. The experiment made in 1953-54 had had most encouraging results, many requests having been submitted to the Secretariat. With a very small amount of money - a few hundred dollars -

the National Commissions had been able to carry out a programme of translations which would have cost Unesco several thousand dollars; the total sum proposed, $15,000 for the two years, was small when it was remembered that Unesco now had 72 Member States. The appropriations so far granted ranged from $300 to $1,075. He could show the Committee the list of countries with which contracts had been concluded.

(16) In answer to a question by the CHAIRMAN, the Assistant Director-General indicated that the contributions of Member States had always exceeded that of Unesco, sometimes by as much as fifteen or twenty times.

(17) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether the contracts for 1955-56 included printing or whether they covered only translation.

(18) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that only adaptation and translation were envisaged for the present.

(19) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the programme was a very important one. At present the majority of Unesco's publications were in English, French and Spanish, which were not understood in large areas of the world; if they were to reach a wider public, it was essential to increase the number of languages. He proposed that the programme should be given a higher priority.

(20) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that, since the work was of a scope wider than the programme of the Department of Mass Communication, discussion be deferred until the question of regionalization came up.

(21) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat endorsed the suggestion that there should be a special enquiry by a working party into the administrative structure of the Department. The working party might also consider the scope to be given to paragraph 19.

(22) The CHAIRMAN interpreted the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate to mean that the activity in question was a case which the proposed working party might discuss.

(23) The proposal of the delegate of India, seconded by the delegate of the German Federal Republic, to raise the priority of sub-project (A) (paragraph 19), was adopted by 9 votes to nil with 2 abstentions. It was agreed that the report of the Committee should include a combined reference to the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom and that of the delegate of India.

(24) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 25, expressed surprise that a project entitled Direct Action by Member States should entail a cost to Unesco of $10,000 for the years 1955-56. He proposed the reduction of the budgetary provision in paragraph 28 to $100,000 spread over 1955 and 1956.

(25) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Australia, questioned the use of Unesco funds for such activities. He considered the first example given in paragraph 26 ill chosen, since the Australian authorities, in producing the documentary film on Unesco in action in that country, had done without financial help from Unesco.

(26) Mr. LEE (United States of America) supported the views of the Australian delegate and said that he would like to see more emphasis put on activity and financial support by Member States. He, for his part, did not like the idea of Unesco financing the organization of "Unesco weeks" in Member States (paragraph 26, item 2).

(27) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) agreed with the preceding speakers and was in favour of reducing the budgetary provision.

(28) Mr. BOW (Canada), while supporting the view of the United Kingdom delegate, pointed out that the Committee had not previously made recommendations on the specific allocation of funds. He asked whether the United Kingdom delegate would agree to limit his proposal to lowering the priority of the project, provided that his suggestion regarding the budget appeared in the summary records.

(29) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed to modify his proposal accordingly.

(30) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) was in favour of the budgetary reduction proposed by the delegate of the United Kingdom, and would further assign to the $10,000 a lower priority. The proposal was supported by the United Kingdom delegate, and adopted by 9 votes to nil with one abstention.

(31) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that it would be as well to make it clear that the lower priority accorded to this activity by the Committee referred only to the budget allocation and not to the substance of the project.

Project 5.2: Public information and promotion of international understanding by Unesco

Paragraphs 29-42

(32) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that this project covered the whole of the activities of the Press Division. In reply to the delegate of Norway, he stated that the amounts set aside for travel in paragraph 42 applied to all the preceding paragraphs. Journeys had been made to many countries, for instance, to organize press conferences in countries visited by the Director-General, to produce topical articles and to collect on-the-spot information. All these were activities which had resulted in the publication of articles in the Courier or in the preparation of booklets which had been distributed.

(33) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), recalling the statement of the United States delegate, considered that the information programme should be less concerned with

publicizing Unesco, the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies. A co..structive approach to the problem was needed.

(34) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the delegate of India. Information should be concentrated on constructive Unesco work in progress, for example, seminars, technical assistance missions, experimental studies and other such activities, with a view to informing a public which was unaware of what was being done.

(35) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the view of the United States delegate. He felt also that there was insufficient reference to co-operation with Member States and National Commissions, especially in paragraphs 31, 32 and 35.
(36) He regretted that limited time often made it possible only to raise points of criticism, but he wished to pay a tribute to the Director-General for his many achievements. The United Kingdom delegation had in the past criticized the Unesco Courier, and he was pleased to see that it had now greatly improved.
(37) Turning to paragraph 42, he asked whether staff travel, which accounted for a large sum, could be accommodated under paragraph 24, which provided for staff travel in connexion with activities in Member States.
(38) Finally, he proposed that resolution 5.2 should be expanded by the insertion of the following words after "authorized" in the first line: "with the co-operation of National Commissions and Member States".

(39) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) supported the proposal by the United Kingdom delegate in regard to resolution 5.2.

(40) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) endorsed the remarks of the United Kingdom delegate on co-operation with National Commissions and co-ordination with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies; the Secretariat always kept both those matters in mind.

(41) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegate was adopted.

(42) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Australian delegate, referred to the press clippings service. The Australian authorities considered the cost of this service excessive and he would like some information on results.

(43) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that only one staff member was employed on the work. The press clippings service was of great importance in giving information on world reaction to Unesco; unfortunately, owing to insufficient funds, it was only possible to subscribe to services in a limited number of countries.

(44) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) admitted that the total cost of making this world press survey was rather high, but it was essential for the Secretariat to know the attitude of the press in the different countries towards Unesco. Some of the unfavourable comments rested upon misunderstandings or were due to inadequate information which it was important to dispel or supplement by promptly issuing a corrective.

(45) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), while sympathizing with the Australian point of view, was impressed by the explanations of the value of the service. However, the service was an internal one for the whole of Unesco, and its use was not limited to the Department of Mass Communication. It might therefore be shifted to another part of the Organization, more centrally placed, and he proposed that it should be included among the items to be considered within the framework of the administrative study.

(46) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) considered that the task of compiling a press review could be carried out by the National Commissions and the regional offices of Unesco, which could send monthly or periodic reports as convenient. In that way the work could be done at lower cost and with great efficiency.

(47) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Unesco regional offices were already doing this, but they also had to subscribe to press clipping agencies. The Secretariat would be happy to see the work done by the National Commissions, but he doubted whether this was possible. The delegate of Mexico had advocated reports every month, but that would be far too long an interval. If Unesco's reactions were to be effective, it would have to get the information promptly.

(48) In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that his Department received every week nearly a thousand press cuttings in over twenty languages.

(49) Mr. BOW (Canada) recognized the importance of the service and asked whether the contracts in paragraph 42 applied to this service only or to the whole of project (A).

(50) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the figures applied to the project as a whole, $3,000 being in respect of the press clipping service.

(51) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked how helpful the analysis of the reactions of the public through press cuttings had been in planning the programme of the Organization.

(52) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat took those reactions into account, while continuing to use its own judgment in deciding on the general lines of the programme - and still more on how to carry it out.

(53) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the United Kingdom delegate's proposal that the press cuttings service should be discussed in connexion with reorganization of the activities of the Department of Mass Communication. There being no objection, the Rapporteur was asked to take note accordingly.

Paragraphs 43-50

(54) The Chairman drew attention to document 8C/PRG/18 concerning the Unesco Courier.

(55) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the situation of the Courier was clearly set forth in document 8C/PRG/18. Since the format of the publication had been changed, it had made some progress and sales were much better. Detailed figures of the number of copies printed, as well as of sales, with individual sales figures for those countries where the propaganda campaign was proceeding, were given in the document mentioned. He added that the annual income from subscriptions amounted to over $15,000.

(56) The CHAIRMAN asked whether paragraph 46 contained the whole appropriation for the Unesco Courier, or whether there were additional estimates in other parts of the programme.

(57) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) replied that the figures did not cover all the costs; the remainder came from the Publications Fund.

(58) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), while reading and appreciating the Courier, did not understand its purpose. Paragraph 43 indicated that it was focused at school-teacher and university undergraduate level, but the number of teachers alone exceeded the circulation figures which had been given.

(59) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the intention in mentioning students and teachers was to give some indication of the cultural level of the public at which the Secretariat was aiming, without, however, suggesting that this would be the only public affected. While sales were still lower than the number of copies printed, a rapid increase in sales could nevertheless be observed, and for the first time it appeared that the future could be regarded optimistically.

(60) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked for figures on the cost of the Courier for the period 1953-54.

(61) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) replied that he would provide the answer a little later.

(62) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), supported by Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), suggested that the following question be studied: whether the Unesco Courier was necessary, and whether its function might not be fulfilled by other publications.

(63) It was agreed that the point should be included in the Committee's report.

(64) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked whether the work of the joint information mission proposed in paragraph 49 was not already being performed by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies themselves.

(65) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) stated that the reference was to joint missions the costs of which were shared equally by four Specialized Agencies - UNICEF, WHO, FAO and Unesco, each paying 25%; the missions deal with both press and radio.

(66) In reply to the United Kingdom delegate, Mr. Desjardins said that members of the Secretariat sometimes took part in these missions, but that it was preferable for them to be led by well-known journalists, whose articles would be sure to have a better reception in the press. In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. Desjardins explained that the travel expenses of members of the Secretariat who formed part of such missions were included in the staff travel costs mentioned in paragraph 42.

(67) The CHAIRMAN expressed surprise at this explanation; he had always understood that the budgetary provisions shown with each project were directly related to it. Such flexibility in the application of resources was a new factor, which would have to be considered seriously.

(68) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) added that the inclusion in these joint missions of journalists from outside the Secretariat had the twofold advantage of securing the services of journalists with world-wide reputation and of allowing them a freedom of expression that was not permissible to international officials. The missions were sometimes organized so as to fit in with staff travel; that was in conformity with a recommendation by the General Conference, which invited the Director-General to ensure, whenever possible, that members of the Secretariat who were travelling were used for several purposes, so far as their competence permitted. Thus the travel provided for in paragraph 42 might assist the missions envisaged in paragraph 50, the budget for which, however, covered only contracts with persons outside Unesco.

(69) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether a document could be produced isolating staff travel activities, with a view to ascertaining whether there was any overlapping.

(70) Turning to paragraph 49, he asked what evidence there was to justify the word "successful". He proposed, and Mr. JUNANKAR (India) seconded, that the project be given a lower priority.

(71) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that no travelling expenses were provided for in connexion with paragraphs 49 and 50, but journeys intended for other purposes might very well be used to implement these two paragraphs.

(72) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegate, seconded by the delegate of India, was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraphs 51-64: Co-operation with radio organizations and production of recorded radio programmes

(73) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication), in presenting this part of the programme, recalled that activities in this field comprised, inter alia, the preparation of weekly scripts designed for broadcasting stations and known as the Unesco World

Review, which contained two five-minute talks and a radio newsreel. It served broadcasting organizations in 115 countries with an audience of about 100 million listeners every week. Another activity consisted of recordings of interviews, and the preparation of recorded programmes for organizations which asked for them. Finally, in order to encourage national organizations to broadcast certain programmes, producers belonging to broadcasting organizations in Member States whose language was not one of the Unesco working languages were invited to take courses at the Secretariat, where they prepared the basic essentials for a series of broadcasts intended for their own country. That system had produced excellent results and the Secretariat proposed to extend it.

(74) In reply to an earlier question from the Chairman, Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that the printing costs of the Courier in 1953 were $40,000. The increase for 1955-56 was due to the new format and an increased circulation.

(75) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), reverting to paragraphs 51-64, considered the Radio Division among the most successful activities of the Department of Mass Communication. He asked whether there had been an increase in the number of receiving countries.

(76) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) replied that the broadcast had expanded and requests had steadily increased during the past two years.

(77) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether any action had been taken to ensure the broadcasting of Unesco announcements over commercial radio networks. In some cases it was difficult to induce such companies to take part in this publicity, but in others it was often possible to obtain collaboration.

(78) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the Secretariat had established contact with commercial broadcasting organizations in many countries. These organizations warmly welcomed scripts with an educational, scientific or cultural value, which they had themselves no means of preparing and which were transmitted outside their commercial programmes; numerous contacts of this kind had been made, in particular with South American countries.

(79) The CHAIRMAN, referring to paragraph 64, project (F), asked why the cost of equipment was $4,500 in 1955 but increased to $15,000 in 1956.

(80) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that the 1956 figure included the cost of new equipment for studios in the new headquarters building.

(81) The CHAIRMAN wondered if such equipment should be included in the estimates for the new building.

(82) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) confirmed that the entire studio installation, sound-proofing, etc. was covered by the funds provided for the construction of the new Unesco building, but there were some expenses, such as the adaptation of existing apparatus to the new premises, which would be borne by the Department of Mass Communication.

(83) The CHAIRMAN said that he was not entirely satisfied by that explanation and asked to what exact use the additional appropriation of $10,000 would be put.

(84) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked that the Secretariat be given time to refer to the detailed estimates for the construction of the new building.

(85) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked for an assurance that there were no hidden costs for the new headquarters in the 1955-56 budget in the present document.

(86) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) gave that assurance; he repeated, as Mr. Desjardins had already stated, that the studio installation was included in the plans for the new building. All that was referred to here was the adaptation of existing apparatus to the new building and it was that point which he had asked for time to check upon.

(87) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) compared the allocations for the Unesco World Review in paragraph 53 with those for the production of recorded radio programmes in paragraph 64. The World Review, with its comparatively small cost, was obtaining excellent results; did the $70,000 in paragraph 64 produce proportionately greater results?

(88) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the method of inviting "guest-producers" would bring in five or six countries, whereas that of sending programmes to broadcasting organizations would extend to about 115 countries, with consequent reduced expenditure and the certainty of obtaining much greater results. He considered that both methods were valuable and that both were necessary.

Paragraphs 65-71

(89) Mr. LEE (United States of America), referring to the proposed exhibitions in paragraph 65, suggested that the exhibitions programme be reviewed by a working party of the Programme Commission.

(90) With regard to the use of certain terms in the chapter, the United States National Commission had emphasized the desirability of "on-the-spot" reporting as opposed to "exclusive or semi-exclusive" stories referred to in paragraph 70.

(91) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), referring to paragraph 66, asked if it would be necessary to produce an exhibition if the next Conference were held elsewhere than in Unesco House.

(92) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that all the budget estimates had been drawn up on the assumption that the next session of the General Conference would take place in Paris, but obviously, if the session were to be held elsewhere,

the words "in Unesco House" would have to be deleted from paragraph 66.

(93) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether the cost of the exhibition in question would be higher if the Conference were not held in Paris.

(94) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Director-General was placing before the Conference a document about an invitation for the ninth session, which would come up for discussion by the Conference. At the moment it was difficult to give any exact details of the possible effects which acceptance of this invitation would have on the cost of the exhibition; transport charges would obviously have to be added to the proposed budget, but money might be saved by constructing certain parts of the exhibition on the spot.

Paragraphs 72-77

(95) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) considered that the cinema made a powerful contribution to international understanding; many people obtained much clearer ideas about other countries as a result of its influence. Unesco was carrying out effective and well-defined work in that direction. However, the production of educational films should be based on three conditions: (a) use should always be made of technicians who were nationals of the country where the film was to be made, so as to save costs and to avoid overdoing the folklore aspect; (b) approval of the script should be sought of the National Commission in the country where the film was to be made; and (c) permission to show the film should be obtained from the government concerned.

(96) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) assured the Mexican delegate that the Secretariat would duly note his observations; it was obviously desirable to ensure co-operation by governments and National Commissions and, so far as they existed, by local producers, when making films in collaboration with Member States.

(97) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) considered that efforts should be made to find film subjects which reflected regional points of view, rather than such as might be of interest to the world as a whole; it would be useful if a committee of experts were instructed to study the scenarios of films approved for production and see that regional points of view were respected.

(98) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 73, asked for a more detailed justification of the allocation for a film, which he considered high.
(99) With regard to project (K), he proposed that paragraphs 76 and 77 be deleted. Priority could not be given to small prizes of that nature, and the United Kingdom Commission doubted whether they were the best kind of stimulus in the field.

(100) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) referred to the success achieved by the film "World Without End".

(101) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed a lower priority for paragraphs 72-75.

(102) In reply to Mr. JUNANKAR (India, Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) regretted that Africa had been omitted in error from the regions mentioned in paragraph 74.

(103) The proposal of the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, was adopted by 8 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

(104) Mr. CABOUAT (France) recalled that the project mentioned in paragraphs 76 and 77 was the outcome of the work of a Committee set up by the Executive Board. He would like to know the conclusions reached by that Committee, which must have been of a positive nature, seeing that the project had been included in the programme.

(105) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) confirmed that the project was the outcome of a proposal submitted to the Executive Board; the special committee had met during the Board's thirty-seventh session last March, and had made certain proposals which the Director-General had translated into a work and appropriations programme. The document prepared by the Executive Board, he added, had been addressed to all Member States.

(106) Mr. LEE (United States of America) seconded the motion to omit paragraphs 76 and 77.

(107) Mr. CABOUAT (France) stated that in the French delegation's view the method of international competitions was likely to give good results for smaller expenditure, and it also had the advantage of awakening public interest in Unesco and its aims. He formally moved that no vote be taken on the motion by the delegate of the United Kingdom until the representative of the Executive Board had given his views.

(108) Agreed.

(109) Mr. CHAYET (France) noticed that in discussing the means of publicity used by the Secretariat no reference had been made to topical newsreels. Were there any difficulties which militated against the use of such means of information?

(110) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said he would revert to the point in connexion with paragraphs 158 and 159.

Assistance in development of mass communication (paragraphs 78-180) and Project 5.3: Free flow of information (paragraphs 81-126)

(111) Mr. Desjardins briefly reviewed the activities of the Division for the Free Flow of Information and of the Mass Communication Clearing House. Their tasks consisted mainly in reducing obstacles to the flow of information and in assembling, for redistribution, information capable of contributing towards the development of national information centres in Member States.

(112) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that Unesco's

initiative in this field involved certain diplomatic difficulties, and it was essential that staff in the section be maintained at an adequate level to deal with the various programmes involved and to carry out the necessary negotiations in a diplomatic manner. He was opposed to the extension of international conventions and did not consider the international instrument proposed in paragraph 94 necessary. He would like more information on negotiations with international agencies, in particular the International Labour Organization.

(113) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document 8C/PRG/8.

(114) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the draft international instrument to reduce obstacles to the free movement of persons engaged in educational, scientific and cultural activities and wishing to travel for purposes connected with those activities (document 8C/PRG/8) was an extremely technical one and he thought it would be necessary to set up a special working party to examine the proposal in detail.

(115) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the matter be left to this special working party.

(116) Mr. LEE (United States of America) associated himself with the remarks of the United Kingdom delegate. He was concerned with the free flow of information and wished to see no lessening of Unesco's interest in reducing barriers; at the same time success must not be jeopardized by over-emphasis of the legal approach. He supported the Chairman's proposal.

(117) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the sixth and seventh sessions of the Conference had already decided it was advisable to take that action; it would be a good thing if a small working party elaborated the details before the question was discussed by the Commission.

(118) Mr. CHAYET (France) said that the French delegation would like the Secretariat to examine under what conditions technical equipment used for broadcasting or television could be temporarily imported for programme exchanges; an enquiry by Unesco on that point would be valuable.

(119) The CHAIRMAN asked if the French proposal could be included in an existing resolution; otherwise the French delegation would have to submit a formal proposal for consideration by the Executive Board.

(120) It was agreed that mention would be made of the proposal of the delegate of France in the Report.

(121) Replying to the Chairman, Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said it appeared at first sight that the French delegate's proposal could be taken over by the Secretariat and incorporated in the resolution on the programme without additional cost; it might be that after further study, proposals for fresh action would prove necessary. The Secretariat would study the point and give a reply shortly.

(122) In reply to the United States delegate's question whether the Secretariat had any definite subject in mind in connexion with paragraph 125, Mr. Desjardins said that a study entitled "The Printed Word", would go to press at the beginning of 1955; it had been prepared by Mr. Barker, Assistant Secretary of the British Publishers' Society; one study which had already appeared would be revised with a view to a second edition and a new study would be prepared for 1955-56; the choice of the subject submitted to the Executive Board would depend on how mass communication problems developed. It might perhaps usefully deal with schedules of press charges; he had no formal proposal to make at the moment.

Project 5.4: Clearing house and exchange and stimulation of educational, scientific and cultural programmes (paragraphs 127-142)

(123) Mr. Desjardins pointed out that the function of the clearing house was to ensure wide dissemination of existing knowledge. He listed the resultant activities as follows: the clearing house published bulletins and booklets which were put out for sale; requests addressed to the clearing house amounted on an average to 10 a day, and some of them entailed a great deal of work, sometimes lasting several months. The number of publications had been reduced, but it was essential, now and then, to issue a publication which filled a real need; such bulletins, which were mimeographed and did not appear regularly, gave detailed information solely intended for specialists.

(124) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 127, asked what justification there was for an additional increase in costs.

(125) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) drew attention to the breakdown in paragraph 162 (a) of the Corrigendum and explained that the additional money came either from the Department of Cultural Activities or from the Department of Mass Communication.

(126) On the CHAIRMAN's proposal, it was agreed to defer discussion until paragraph 162 was reached.

Paragraphs 143-145: Press, film and radio for children

(127) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) stated, with reference to paragraph 143, that a resolution had been submitted to the seventh session of the General Conference by the Italian delegation, asking for the creation of an international organization to safeguard children from the possible adverse influences of cinema, radio and press. Document 8C/PRG/16 contained the replies received from various Member States. It was therefore proposed to hold a meeting of a small committee of experts to determine future action by Unesco in this field; later contracts would have to be concluded with an international organization in order to set up a clearing house for information of a specialized nature.

(128) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 143, said that, since the activity was of national concern, it should suffice for Unesco to draw to

it the attention of Member States. He proposed a lower priority for the item.

(129) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said, with reference to paragraph 144, that it had been proposed, as a result of the very detailed recommendations of the experts who met at Locarno, to continue the information work with a view to drawing up a list of films recommended for children and adolescents, to prepare a yearbook of producers of such films, to plan a conference to study related psychological problems and to organize an information centre on children's films. Unesco had agreed to prepare the list of films and had collected about 2,000 titles; it did not propose to finance the organization of a conference, which might be held as part of other meetings already envisaged. The World Brotherhood might lend its support for the execution of this plan. The International Centre was considered the most urgent project, with a view to encouraging the production of films for children. The Secretariat estimated a budget of $6,000, of which $2,000 would be for a meeting of experts, and $2,000 would be used annually to subsidize the centre.

(130) Mr. LEE (United States of America) supported the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate. There were important research programmes undertaken in many parts of the world, and Unesco could therefore in the interest of concentration devote its limited resources to other fields which called for its action.

(131) Mr. CHAYET (France) insisted that, on the contrary, the problems raised by paragraphs 143 and 144 were of great importance. The sums placed at the disposal of the Department for the purpose were relatively small and they should be left unchanged as exemplifying the importance of such exchanges of information in enabling each State to solve its own difficulties.

(132) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked whether any contacts had been established with the International Children's Centre and what had been the results, if any.

(133) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that he had been in communication with a representative of the Centre, but pending a decision by the General Conference negotiations had not gone any further.

(134) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the United Kingdom delegate's proposal to reduce the priority of project (B), paragraphs 143-145.

(135) The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 4 with 1 abstention.

Paragraphs 146-148: Co-operation with communication research institutes

(136) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document 8C/PRG/17.

(137) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) drew attention to the conclusions of document 8C/PRG/17. The agreement of specialists in all countries had been obtained, and a token sum included in the programme so as to ensure liaison between the existing organizations.

(138) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that project (C) was of interest to other departments (Education and Social Sciences) and asked whether full co-ordination within the Organization was assured. He asked whether the amount of $17,000 for clearing house activities (paragraph 142) was necessary.

(139) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that inter-departmental co-ordination on the lines mentioned by the United Kingdom delegate did in fact exist, particularly in the case of the Department of Social Sciences. As it was a technical question, the main responsibility had been given to the Department of Mass Communication. From the budgetary standpoint, the amount could not be absorbed by the general budget of the three Departments concerned; consultations between mass communication specialists were essential, and that was why the project appeared in the budget of the Mass Communication Department.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

# TWELFTH MEETING

*8 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

**CHAPTER 5: MASS COMMUNICATION (continued)**

(1) Discussion of paragraphs 76 and 77: Prizes for films and film scenarios, was resumed.

(2) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) explained that this proposal had been added to the programme after considerable discussion by the Executive Board. There was a good deal of doubt whether prizes were the best method of promoting this activity. However, one project had finally been agreed on as an experiment.

(3) The proposal to delete paragraphs 76 and 77 was put to the vote and adopted by 6 in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention.

(4) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat had simply given the Committee information and had taken no part in the discussion on the substance of the question. For the rest, the decision the Committee had just taken meant that all the projects relating to films had a lower priority. The only items unchanged in the programme were those relating to audio-visual aids other than films.

(5) The CHAIRMAN said that the question could be re-examined when the merits of the different chapters were being evaluated.

(6) Section D, paragraphs 149-153, was approved without comment.

Section E, paragraphs 154-156: The rôle of broadcasting in the dissemination of culture

(7) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that this activity should receive a lower priority.

(8) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) mentioned that the project of the Department of Mass Communication was to be carried out in co-operation with the Department of Cultural Activities (Cultural Activities, paragraphs 161-164) and that, in the latter chapter, it had been given a lower priority.

(9) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America.

(10) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) reported that the non-governmental organizations had strongly supported the conclusions of the meeting of experts, held in October 1953, regarding the importance of the part that radio could play in the spread of culture. Another meeting, which had taken place in London in July 1954 and had been attended by producers and directors, had laid stress on the invaluable help which scientists could give in the development of television and on the difficulties encountered in obtaining such co-operation. The advice of cultural experts should be sought in order to improve the use of broadcasting for the spread of culture. Finally, Member States and National Commissions could help to bring about a general improvement in programmes by selecting the best programmes broadcast in their countries and collecting information on their effects. In that way it would be possible to determine the best means of securing greater variety in programmes so as to give as full a reflection as possible of the great diversity of the world.

(11) As there were no other speakers, the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America, seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, that the project in question be given a lower priority, was put to the vote. It was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraphs 157-159: International exchange and stimulation of production of educational, scientific and cultural programmes

(12) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the great film festivals (Venice, Cannes, Locarno) co-operated with Unesco in stimulating, without expense to the Organization, the exchange of educational, scientific and cultural films and kinescopes - a matter which was of great economic importance to producers. Producers of scripts, films and film sequences had taken part in the television seminar in London. The technical problems to be solved were comparatively simple. The proposal was to hold a meeting of the organizers of the International Council for Educational Film and to prepare the ground for co-operation in the production of short films and television films.

(13) The organizers of the great world film festivals paid the expenses of meetings of experts, on the choice of whom Unesco was consulted, and arranged showings of educational films and art films.

(14) The following year, the Locarno Festival intended to organize a meeting of experts on the use of films in sociological research.

(15) Unesco ought to arrange, by contract, for the production of short news films and filmstrips dealing with its work. In order to secure the co-operation of

competent organizations such as the International Council for Educational Film, and to hold its place in that field, which concerned the whole world, Unesco would have to furnish supplies for newsreels to the value of $5,000.

(16) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked (1) whether educational films and television were advanced enough to justify this quite considerable expenditure and (2) whether the sums allocated to staff travel were not excessive.

(17) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication explained that an experiment had been launched in rural areas by the French broadcasting and television company, in order to estimate the influence of educational films on the general public in somewhat backward regions. He was sure that such films had a good influence and mentioned that the technical difficulties of execution were negligible.

(18) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), replying to the Canadian delegate's second question, said that the staff travel was intended for visits to national radio and television organizations and attendance at film festivals. Two long, 6 medium and 11 short journeys had been planned for 1955-56.

(19) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether there had been an increase on the figures for 1953-54.

(20) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) offered to answer a little later.

(21) The CHAIRMAN wondered why these paragraphs were not included under the press and radio divisions. That was another point to be considered by the proposed working party on the reorganization of the Department.

(22) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that, in the programmes of the press and radio divisions, Unesco itself produced material, whereas, in the case in point, the proposal was to co-operate with the appropriate organizations and to promote production outside the Organization.

(23) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), in answer to the question put by the delegate of the United Kingdom, said that the sum was the same as for the present budgetary period, i.e. $12,000 for the whole section.

(24) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked if it could not be cut by, say, $2,000.

(25) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that the project was an unusual one and that so far the Committee had not discussed any similar suggestion. He warned the Committee against making budgetary cuts in projects before they had considered what effect they might have on the successful implementation of the programme.

(26) Mr. BOW (Canada) enquired whether any revenue could be expected from the films, once they had been produced.

(27) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that about three-quarters of the appropriations were intended to promote productions that could not ordinarily be undertaken by private companies, which would not consider them financially worth while; so far, the idea of deriving revenue from the newsreels produced had not been considered.

Paragraphs 160-162: World Braille Council

(28) In connexion with the World Braille Council, Mr. Desjardins reminded the Committee that Unesco had undertaken to complete the unification of the Braille alphabet throughout the world. The alphabet itself had already been unified, but musical notation and mathematical, physical and chemical symbols still required unification. Unesco had concluded an agreement with the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind, whereby that organization undertook to provide the Secretariat of the World Braille Council by 1955. For 1955, the Director-General was asking for a sum of $5,000 for contracts in order to complete the unification of musical notation, and would like to ask for an appropriation in 1956 for that of mathematical, physical and chemical symbols.

(29) The CHAIRMAN remarked that this project, begun at the third session of the General Conference and due to be concluded in 1955, was a good example of an activity started by Unesco for which a termination date could be given in the near future. It was a highly successful project and he expressed his whole-hearted satisfaction.

(30) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) joined the Chairman in praising the project.

(31) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) understood that the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind hoped to receive a small subvention in 1956 as well. Had a formal request on the subject reached the Director-General?

(32) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out to the delegate of the United Kingdom that it would be helpful to make a supplementary appropriation which could be used to help the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind in its work. Mr. Desjardins had mentioned the need for such an appropriation, and the Assistant Director-General asked Mr. Cowell whether he could propose the insertion of that appropriation in the proposed programme and budget.

(33) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was quite ready to make the proposal, but did not know how much or in what form this aid was wanted.

(34) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind had mentioned, with gratitude, in a resolution, that Unesco intended to meet part of its expenses for 1955. In 1956, as in 1955, the best form of assistance would be a contract for a specific purpose.

(35) Mr. CABOUAT (France) seconded the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate that the World Council

be granted contracts in 1956 for the same sum as in 1955. At the request of the delegates of France and the United Kingdom, a mention of the recommendation would be included in the report of the Advisory Committee.

Paragraphs 162a-162h (document 8C/5 Corrigendum): Assistance in the production and dissemination of art films

(36) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) presented the project described in document 8C/5 Corrigendum.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that art films had made a very good impression wherever they had been seen. With reference to 162d, what exact form was the encouragement of production to take? Was Unesco paying for the production of films? A more detailed work plan would be advisable.

(38) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew the Committee's attention to the provision for assistance in film production (paragraph 162g) and added that he was anxious that the Secretariat should be allowed some latitude in carrying out the project.

(39) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) mentioned that the meeting of experts on the distribution of art films, in Venice, was intended to make production easier by improving distribution.

(40) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked the delegate of the United Kingdom whether he would be satisfied with a drafting change consisting in the deletion of the reference to the encouragement of production from paragraph 162d, leaving only the mention of encouraging dissemination.

(41) The CHAIRMAN referring to paragraph 162g, asked whether, when giving financial aid, Unesco did not propose to request a matching contribution on the part of the Member State concerned.

(42) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that the help supplied by Unesco would represent only a very small part of the production costs.

Section II: Project 5.5: Use of the means of communication for fundamental and workers' education

Paragraphs 165-173

(43) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication), referring to the proceedings of the thirty-seventh session of the Executive Board, explained that the project for the establishment of an Educational Film Institute for Latin America (paragraphs 172 and 173) included provision for an educational film project for that area.

(44) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) reported that his Government was very much interested in the establishment of the Educational Film Institute for Latin America. It would give all possible facilities for setting up the Institute and, as soon as the relevant agreements were concluded, would carry out its part in them.

(45) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the Organization of American States would be participating in the project.

(46) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that the Organization of American States was not taking part, but that it had been consulted and had given its agreement.

(47) Mr. LEE (United States of America) hoped the work would be co-ordinated with that of other agencies besides OAS.

(48) Sections (B), (C), (D) and (E) (paragraphs 174-182) were approved without comment. Discussion on Section (F) (Fellowships) was deferred until the end of the chapter.

Sections (G), (H) and (I) (paragraphs 184-189), excluding paragraph 186, which had been dealt with earlier

(49) Mr. BOW (Canada), referring to paragraph 184, asked what rôle the private foundation would play in the project. What would be the total cost? And what was expected to happen at the end of the two years covered by the budget?

(50) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) thought it was rather early to pass judgment on the project for a regional film library for the Middle East. In 1953, the Ford Foundation had asked Unesco to assist in setting up the regional film library. At the same time, the University of Syracuse (United States of America) had embarked on a study of visual aids and their use in the same region. The help provided by those two bodies might prove very useful to Unesco, which expected to receive a report from the University of Syracuse at any moment. Unesco would be required to supply a collection of films and filmstrips suitable for the region, to appoint an expert to work out the detailed operation of the film library, and would also have, at a later stage, to arrange for the production of visual aids. The Ford Foundation and the University of Syracuse would be responsible for submitting reports to the governments concerned and for transmitting their conclusions to Unesco.

(51) In the course of the discussion, it was stated that, after agreement with Unesco, which would undertake to provide assistance only on strictly limited terms and as the need arose, the Foundation and the University would ask the Organization to take part in the project and probably to secure the active co-operation of governments in the region.

(52) Project 5.5 was approved.

Project 5.6: Technical aid to Member States in development of mass communication services (paragraphs 190-199)

(53) In presenting the project, Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that it was intended solely to meet requests put forward by Member States. He quoted as examples the regional seminar held in Messina and the training seminar for television producers, etc., held in London.

(54) Mr. LEE (United States of America), in view of his country's great interest in technical aid, hesitated to question those activities, but he found the rather high sum insufficiently related to high priority areas. He suggested that the two parts together be given a low priority in such a way that countries receiving technical aid would be free to choose between fellowships or expert missions.

(55) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that half a loaf was better than no bread. Why not keep half the number of missions and lower the priority of the other half?

(56) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed.

(57) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked whether the expert missions for which provision was made in paragraph 196 were to include experts covering all the preceding sections, or whether they were to be experts in the use of mass media for fundamental education.

(58) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) mentioned that, judging by past experience, Member States often called on the funds for technical assistance for economic development and on Unesco funds alike, for the development of fundamental education. He instanced several of the missions sent out in the past, in particular to Egypt, the Arab States, Turkey (two), etc.

(59) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom with regard to paragraphs 196 and 197 (expert missions) but not with regard to 198 and 199 (fellowships).

(60) Mr. CABOUAT (France) suggested that, as a general principle, the Committee should continue to accord a high priority to expert missions, at least so far as fundamental education was concerned. He made a formal proposal that half the funds should be allotted a higher priority, the remaining half being left as it was. At the request of Mr. Cowell, however, he amended his proposal, as a compromise, to lower the priority of the second half.

(61) The proposal by the delegate of the United Kingdom to lower the priority of half the number of expert missions was put to the vote and carried by 7 in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention. The French proposal to raise the priority of the remaining half was not seconded.

(62) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that half the fellowships should receive a lower priority.

(63) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) pointed out that, as a sequel to an expert mission, Unesco often received from seven to ten requests for fellowships from the country concerned, when only one or two could be granted. Limitation of the number of expert missions therefore did not necessarily mean any appreciable reduction in the needs for fellowships.

(64) In the course of the discussion, he explained that Unesco's programme had always included provision for fellowships for the improvement of mass media.

(65) The proposal by the delegate of the United States of America to lower the priority of half the number of fellowships was not seconded.

(66) Returning to paragraph 183, Mr. W. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the fellowships described under this heading had already been discussed under paragraph 32 of the chapter on Exchange of Persons in the field of fundamental education.

Project 5.7: Voluntary international assistance

(67) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) called the attention of the Committee to the fact that the coupon scheme, while it brought in a certain income, involved losses to the National Commissions which might eventually devolve on the Organization. He referred to the case of Iran, which was to be brought up later, and to that of Israel.

(68) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that the Government of Iran had put the question of gift coupons on the agenda of the General Conference.

(69) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the subject would be discussed more appropriately within the framework of the Programme Commission.

Paragraphs 211-221: Gift coupon programme

(70) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the scheme was still too young for proper evaluation. He stressed the importance of the effort made to avoid its eleemosynary aspect and to give it an educational value. Schools in needy countries, for instance, could find something to return to schools in donor countries, in exchange for their gifts.

(71) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) endorsed the remarks of the delegate of Israel.

(72) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) agreed with those views. He added that institutes should not be included in the gift scheme without prior consultation with and the approval of the respective National Commissions.

(73) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) endorsed the remarks made by the delegate of Israel.

(74) It was agreed that this point should be included in the report.

(75) The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to resume the discussion of paragraphs 63 and 64 (work of Unesco's recording studios).

(76) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the rather large sum requested in paragraph 64 was to be used for the conversion of the existing equipment in Unesco's sound recording studios or for the purchase of new equipment. Most of the existing equipment had been in use for six years.

Apart from the normal wear of such apparatus, account had to be taken of the progress since made in this field. Mr. Maheu assured the Committee that the appropriations asked for did not in any case overlap with the sums provided for the installation of the Organization's headquarters in the new building.

(77) In reply to a comment from Mr. COWELL, Mr. MAHEU added that he had no doubt that Unesco's Bureau of General Services would succeed in selling the outdated recording equipment advantageously.

Staff Tables I and II (paragraphs 222-251)

(78) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) enquired how, in view of the higher and lower priorities decided on, the staff table would be affected.

(79) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that the Committee had made pretty drastic alterations in the priority projects. It would be wise to postpone discussion of the staff tables to give the Secretariat time to draw up new tables in accordance with the decisions taken by the Committee.

**CHAPTER 7: GENERAL RESOLUTIONS**

(80) The project on National Commissions (7.1) was deferred for discussion at a later stage in connexion with the general discussion on decentralization.

Project 7.2: Study of international cultural relations (paragraphs 13-21)

(81) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the appropriations requested were small, considering the importance of the work.
(82) It had been decided by the General Conference in Florence in 1950 that Unesco should compile a collection of cultural agreements. It was to include bilateral and multilateral agreements. There had been a large number of requests for the collection from Member States and non-governmental organizations.
(83) Work had then begun on an analysis of the agreements from the legal standpoint. For that reason the Bureau of Legal Affairs was originally made responsible for the work and efforts had been made to elaborate model clauses for submission to Member States to guide them in their negotiation of subsequent agreements.
(84) Since then the analysis of cultural agreements had proceeded along different lines. It had been realized that the agreements were juridically fairly simple, but what mattered most was not the letter of the law but the application of the agreements. Hence the new direction given to the study of agreements, with the Executive Board's approval, in the course of the past two years.
(85) Document 8C/PRG/11, which had been submitted to the General Conference, was only an interim report; the material on which it was based was far from complete and some of the analyses were rather superficial. It should, however, show the Conference the full importance of cultural agreements in international co-operation.
(86) This might be a good opportunity of taking stock; the programme of Unesco had practically never taken systematic account of cultural agreements concluded by Member States between themselves. The Conference might consider what influence it might exercise on the relations of Member States outside the Organization and what support this important network could give it in the accomplishment of its mission.
(87) The Secretariat was asking for authority, and the necessary means, to continue its analysis of cultural relations in order to go more deeply into what it had already learnt. It would then be able to produce a real "study of cultural relations" instead of a "report on cultural agreements".

(88) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked whether the study of international cultural relations was so technical in character as to require the services of experts.

(89) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that it was a highly complex technical problem. For the rest, the consultants provided for were not theorists but essentially practitioners. The amount of $2,000 a year did not seem to be excessive.

(90) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), though admitting a logical reason for this study, doubted its practical value. As it would not be affected by a delay, he suggested it should receive a lower priority.

(91) Mr. BOW (Canada) supported that proposal.

(92) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said the constant task of Unesco was to stimulate cultural activities in the different countries. It was surely necessary therefore to find out everything possible about the way cultural agreements between them were made and carried out. However, there again was an activity where Unesco could count on the co-operation of National Commissions, with resulting savings in budget.

(93) Mr. CABOUAT (France) supported resolution 7.2 and considered that Unesco House in Paris was the best place in the world to find information about cultural relations between countries. He had some sympathy, however, with the views voiced by the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, as he too, thought that the study of cultural agreements and of the relations between States should be carried out by members of the Secretariat without calling in outside consultants. He proposed that the Programme and Budget Commission should be asked to consider particularly carefully to what extent the sums provided for consultants could be deleted.

(94) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked what the Secretariat thought of the French delegate's proposal.

(95) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) supposed that the qualified motion of the delegate of France might, in budgetary terms, mean the deletion of the sum of $2,000.

(96) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) maintained his own proposal, which he considered more drastic.

(97) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) insisted that jobs that could be done through ordinary channels did not call for consultants. He supported the proposal of the French delegate that the project should be maintained but the consultants suppressed.

(98) The motion presented by the delegate of the United Kingdom and supported by the delegate of Canada to lower the priority of the activity was rejected by 3 in favour, 6 against and 2 abstentions.

(99) The motion presented by the delegate of France that the question should be re-examined with the possibility of suppressing the consultants in mind was carried unanimously.

Project 7.3: Regional Office in the Western Hemisphere

(100) This project was deferred for later discussion.

CHAPTER 8: DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS SERVICE

(101) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) explained that his Service had no independent programme of its own but consisted of technicians, who were responsible for every stage of the technical production of the documents and publications, and for the distribution of publications.
(102) He emphasized the importance of the Administrative Liaison and Editorial Control units, and finally mentioned certain changes in the budget estimates for his Service, shown in document 8C/5 Corrigendum.

(103) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that in the Corrigendum an amount of $24,000 in 1955 and $34,000 in 1956, provided for freight and postage, had been eliminated, since it was considered reasonable and justified that these costs should come out of the Publications Fund, being related directly to sales turnover. He also explained that, in the Appropriation Resolution, the amount to be credited to Miscellaneous Income from Publications Fund had been reduced to $16,000 a year so as to give a more realistic reflection of anticipated sales.

(104) In reply to a question, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Director-General had given much thought to the question of publications. They were an integral part of the programme and not an independent activity, as in the case of private publishing firms. They always had to be considered in relation to the programme and were really nothing else than instruments for its execution.
(105) The Documents and Publications Service had the necessary technical and budgetary resources for the production of those publications. However, as some machinery for supervision for the whole of the Secretariat was necessary, the Director-General had set up within the House two advisory committees: the Reading Committee and the Publications Board.
(106) The former, presided over by Mr. Chevalier, consisted of a very few permanent members and of other members who were added to the Committee when different subjects had to be dealt with. It was an ad hoc Committee convened as requested. It had to consider any manuscripts about which there was doubt, either because they left something to be desired or because they were unsuitable for publication by an intergovernmental organization, which was subject to restrictions from which the private publisher was free. It might also happen that a manuscript commissioned might not entirely fulfil expectations, or that the programme might change in the interim. In such a case, the manuscript had to be adapted to the new circumstances, or even to readers for whom it had not originally been intended. All manuscripts were of course considered by the departments responsible for them and by the editors in the Documents and Publications Service. It was generally not even necessary to submit them to the Committee. The Reading Committee met only to advise the Director-General in difficult cases and was convened at the request of the departments or of the Documents and Publications Service.
(107) The Publications Board, presided over by the Assistant Director-General, was quite different. The whole of the Secretariat was represented on it, with the exception of the Bureau of Personnel. It met regularly with an agenda issued in advance. It was responsible for formulating administrative and financial procedures for the implementation of publications plans. It dealt with such subjects as copyright negotiations, series of publications format, etc. It was also and more particularly responsible for considering the publication projects included in the work plans drawn up by the departments every six months. So far, all decisions had been adopted unanimously. The decisions and plans were submitted to the Director-General for approval.
(108) In conclusion, Mr. Maheu felt justified in claiming that the last two years had seen substantial progress made in the regularity, quality and appearance of Unesco's publications and in their reception by the public. This progress was largely due, he thought, to the administrative arrangements he had just described.

(109) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) wished to know how far the work of sales promotion and planning was connected with the tasks of the Publications Board and the Reading Committee.

(110) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) gave a brief description of the part played by the Sales and Distribution Division in the work of the Publications Board, where advantage was taken of its experience of distribution problems. He drew special attention to the use of sales statistics and to the expansion of sales promotion and circulation, with the help of specially prepared questionnaires, in countries where the National Commissions were able to co-operate actively in that work.

(111) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked for comments on the specific observations made by the Budget Committee at the seventh session of the General Conference. In what degree had the staff been able to correct its methods of work along the lines suggested at that time, reducing the time-lag in the planning of publications, slowing down the publication of bibliographies and alternating their languages?

(112) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) replied that all the recommendations of the Budget Committee had been followed up. Thirty publications fewer had been planned for, and the budget for 1955, for instance, showed a marked decrease in funds allocated to contractual printing, compared with 1953. Publications were often appearing in tri- or bilingual form.

(113) Miss LAISE (United States of America) congratulated the Secretariat on these changes, but enquired why, if the costs of printing were down, the total costs of Documents and Publications Service had increased.

(114) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) replied that originally the staff had been exactly sufficient to meet the needs of the Department. Publications had been reduced but the carry-over had had to be absorbed. That was an expense which would not occur again.

(115) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked how many of the publications came out of the intellectual resources of Unesco, and how many from outside.

(116) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that 1954 was the last period for which there had been a carry-over of publications from the previous year.

(117) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 16 in the justification (Documents and Publications, paragraph 16), mentioning that there had been no increase in staff except in the Sales and Distribution Division, where a regional organization was to be set up. The production of documents took up as much of the time of his Service as did the production of publications, if not more, and cuts in the appropriations for contractual printing did not reduce the work of all the divisions. The Service had not only carried out printing work, without extra cost, in 1954, which, if done in the ordinary way outside the House, would have come to $47,000, but had been able to achieve a 12% reduction in the cost per standard page printed outside. Consequently, a reduction in the cost of outside printing did not mean a reduction in the work the Service was expected to do.
(118) In reply to the delegate of India, Mr. Delavenay was unable to say what percentage of the manuscripts were produced outside Unesco House.

(119) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that he had referred to 1953-54. During the last General Conference his delegation had raised this question and been informed that a large number of publications were produced by the departments themselves.

(120) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) paid tribute to the very satisfactory state of the Documents and Publications Service. He asked whether a code of practice containing the Publications Fund policies could be made available, embodying the reforms introduced in the rules of the Fund after Conferences.

(121) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) thanked the delegate of the United Kingdom. He reminded the Committee that the rules governing the Publications Fund had been promulgated by the General Conference at its fourth session and subsequently amended at the sixth and seventh sessions. An amendment (cf. Corrigendum, page 25) was also before the current session of the Conference. It would be advisable, as Mr. Cowell had suggested, to combine all the resolutions adopted at successive sessions in a single document.

(122) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked (1) whether, in accordance with similar reforms in other international organizations, it would not be possible to reduce the number of publications and documents in number and in length. (2) What efforts were being made to achieve more economical publishing? (3) Whether the transfer of the promotional activities included in this chapter to Mass Communication could not be studied when the reorganization of that Department was being examined by the working party which had been envisaged for the purpose.

(123) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), in reply to questions by the delegate of the United States of America, said that every Unesco document, after being produced by the originating service, was examined by the Documents and Publications Service and submitted to the Office of the Director-General which decided whether it should be for general distribution or whether the circulation should be restricted. There was therefore a real central control.
(124) The Secretariat was entirely in favour of reducing the number, format, length and volume of documents. It asked only to be protected against the often unreasonable requests of organizations, Member States and National Commissions; protected also against itself, for every secretariat had a tendency towards bureaucracy.
(125) The Director-General saw no objection to the proposal that the working party on the administrative structure of the Department of Mass Communication should consider the possibility of making that Department responsible for sales promotion, but nothing should be done to anticipate the decisions the working party might take about the organization of that Department.

(126) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) replied to the comments regarding the costs of publishing and the decentralization of printing contracts. The offset process, which was often recommended as being cheaper than type-setting, was more expensive in certain cases, for instance, when a revised edition was contemplated. Lead type was easier to readjust than the photographic plates for offset. Offset was less expensive in certain special cases: the printing of the proposed programme and budget by the offset process had made possible an economy of $5,000, and a considerable saving of time.
(127) With regard to the efforts made to secure lower rates for printing contracts, only 10% of the contracts were made in "hard currency" countries, such as Switzerland and the United States of America, and, in the latter case, those contracts were mainly for publications for local use. The remainder were

divided between France, the Netherlands, Belgium, the German Federal Republic, Austria, Italy, etc. Consideration was being given to the possibility of printing in Spain publications written in Spanish. Publications in Arabic were printed in Cairo and Beirut.

(128) In reply to a request from Mr. CABOUAT (France) for information about the conclusions of the thirty-seventh session of the Executive Board on the question of reducing the volume of documents, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) added that another question before the Board had been the reduction of the items regularly placed upon its agenda. The number and length of reports had not, however, been reduced at all. The order to reduce the volume of paper should come from above, from the General Conference.

(129) Miss LAISE (United States of America) offered to make a proposal and put it before the next meeting of the Committee.

(130) Agreed.

**PART III**

(131) Chapter 1 was deferred until the arrival of the Director-General.

**CHAPTER 2: BUREAU OF THE COMPTROLLER**

(132) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the various functions and staffing pattern were much the same in the budget for 1955-56 as they had been in the past, except for the suppression of the $2,200 spent on rental of IBM equipment, and the inclusion of $2,200 for an additional social security post. This was necessary because staff members in the field who had not been included in the pensions scheme had now been included.

(133) Miss LAISE (United States of America) questioned the inclusion of $500 for appeals to the United Nations Administrative Tribunal on pension fund matters.

(134) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) replied that this was a contingency item.

**CHAPTER 3: BUREAU OF PERSONNEL AND MANAGEMENT**

(135) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) remarked that the seventh session of the Conference had reduced the service from 32 to 26 persons. The present proposals would now enable the Bureau to do its work, some of which was complex and difficult.

(136) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked for a statement giving the distribution of present staff nationwise throughout the departments.

(137) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) replied that document 8C/ADM/11, which was to come up for full discussion before the Administrative Commission, contained that information.

(138) Miss LAISE (United States of America) wished for a statement on the number of reclassifications planned, by comparison with those that had taken place in 1953 and 1954.

(139) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), at the request of the Assistant Director-General, explained that posts were subjected to a very strict review to ensure that work was directly related to grade. There was a possibility of reclassification upwards as well as downwards. In professional staff in the last two years, 25 had been upgraded and 7 down.

(140) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked for the budgetary implications of the increases and decreases mentioned.

(141) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked why there were so many upgradings.

(142) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that in a strict sense reclassification was a change in grade of a post when its duties had changed. In many cases there had been substantial changes in the duties of staff members, owing to changes in the programme. That should be taken into account in considering reclassification.

(143) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that there was a quantitative and a qualitative expansion. When the new salary pattern along United Nations lines had been introduced in 1952, one purpose had been to broaden and increase the flexibility of grading. How did reclassification in Unesco compare, in terms of total size, with that effected in the United Nations? Miss Laise suggested that caution was called for in that direction.

(144) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) thought it would also be useful to have a comparison of the grade structure of the Secretariat as it was in 1953-54 and as it was proposed in the present document, indicating the movement of the overall structure.

(145) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) understood that the criterion for upgrading was additional duties. Could that point be illustrated at the next meeting with special reference to some reclassified posts?

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

# THIRTEENTH MEETING

*9 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION** (continued)

**PART III: GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**

**CHAPTER 3: BUREAU OF PERSONNEL AND MANAGEMENT** (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN asked the Chief of Bureau of Personnel and Management to reply to questions raised at the previous meeting.

(2) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that the changes in grading proposed for the period 1955-56 comprised 25 movements upwards and 7 downwards in the Professional category and 61 and 3 respectively in the General Services category, 24 of the 61 concerning the Documents and Publications Service. To illustrate his previous statement on reclassification, he proposed to give an example of each of the various kinds of approach.
(3) (i) Department of Education: The replacing of a P-3 post under Adult Education in 1953-54 by a P-2 post in 1955-56 was not a reclassification, but was due to a reduction in the programme by transferring some of the work to the Department of Social Sciences.
(4) (ii) Department of Natural Sciences: The provision for two P-4 posts in 1955-56 instead of two P-3 posts in 1953-54 was an upgrading. The reorganization of the Department in 1954 by amalgamating two divisions each headed by a P-5 official eliminated one P-5 post and placed extra responsibilities on the two P-3 officials.
(5) (iii) Department of Natural Sciences: The substitution of a post under Teaching of Science from P-4 in 1953 to P-3 in 1954 and again to P-4 in 1955-56 reflected the growth of the programme.
(6) (iv) Department of Mass Communication: The raising of a Press Relations Officer from P-2 in 1953 to P-3 in 1955-56 was a genuine reclassification in recognition, after very careful study, of a mistake in classification.
(7) (v) Exchange of Persons Service: The proposed P-5 post for 1955-56 to replace a P-4 post in 1953-54 represented a reclassification of the existing post and an upgrading of the incumbent. The recommendation had been made, after considerable discussion, as a result of the increase in fellowships and in the number of agencies and governments concerned - both under the incumbent's administration - and the abolition of a P-4 post for administration of fellowships under the Technical Assistance Division, which led to an increase in the responsibilities attached to the post, the increase in work load alone not being a reason for upgrading.
(8) (vi) Documentation and Publications: In 1953-54 four Grade F proof-readers and four Grade P-1 copy-preparers were employed. Experience in 1954 had shown that the work would be performed more efficiently by staff able to carry out both functions, and it was accordingly proposed to replace the existing posts by eight at Grade P-1.
(9) (vii) Workshops Division: Eleven changes were proposed, all in the General Services category, the total cost for two years being $572. Technical developments in the Unesco Workshop had altered methods of handling documents, and the typing pool had been replaced by eleven technicians in types of reproduction who were doing work calling for technical skills above those of a typist. The proposals therefore reflected a change in the nature of the work. An important consideration in fixing salaries had been the best prevailing rates for the technicians, who were extremely difficult to recruit in Paris.
(10) The total cost of changes for two years was $73,000.
(11) With regard to the practice in the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies, comparison was difficult owing to differences in work and structure, but the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions and other bodies were endeavouring to work out common lines of policy, so far as was practicable.
(12) The following figures were based on the most recent budgets of the organizations concerned.
(13) Comparison of Professional and General Service Grades:

| | Professional | General Services |
|---|---|---|
| Unesco | 45% | 55% |
| United Nations | 41% | 59% |
| FAO | 39% | 61% |
| WHO | 61% | 39% |

Comparison of Professional Grades:

| | P-5 | P-4 | P-3 | P-2 | P-1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unesco | 10% | 30% | 26% | 18% | 15% |
| United Nations | 11% | 26% | 38% | 15% | 10% |
| FAO | 9% | 26% | 27% | 22% | 17% |
| WHO | 8% | 29% | 15% | 34% | 13% |

The average level was therefore:

| | |
|---|---|
| Unesco | P-3.0% |
| United Nations | P-3.13 |
| FAO | P-2.99 |
| WHO | P-2.86 |

(14) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether there was an increase in activity corresponding to the 86 upgradings, and pointed out that, while Unesco had 86 upgradings for a staff of 864, the United Nations had only 25 for a staff of 4,000. Although

individual changes were adequately justified, it was not clear why there was a constant shift of activity which resulted in an upward movement. It would be interesting to have comparative figures for other years. As had been pointed out in the United Nations in establishing the new salary scales, which were fairly liberal, it had been intended that fewer individual justifications should be necessary.

(15) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) promised to submit a written document giving the required comparative figures at the next meeting.

(16) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that at the United Nations, staff was being reduced, which was no doubt the reason why few upgradings were recommended. Moreover, the United Nations work, being of a more administrative type than Unesco's, provided a higher degree of transferability.

(17) Miss LAISE (United States of America) agreed that an organization reducing its staff would be unlikely to consider reclassifications; nevertheless the difference between the figures relating to Unesco and the United Nations was so striking that she wondered whether it was due in part to the stability of the United Nations programme. Was it possible for Unesco to endeavour to achieve more stability.

(18) Mr. ROW (Canada) supported the statement of the United States delegate, adding that it was necessary to achieve stability both of reclassification and of the programme itself, since they were interrelated.

(19) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it would facilitate the Secretariat's task if a level of reclassification could be set which should not be exceeded. There would, of course, be risks, since a growing programme needed flexibility, but it could be handled in the same way as the ceiling which had been given for the number of posts.

(20) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked whether, in the case of reclassification, the existing incumbent was retained in the higher post. He also wished to know the proportion of the budget spent respectively on the Professional and General Service categories.

(21) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) replied that the incumbent of a reclassified post did not automatically assume the higher-grade post; a decision had to be made by an appointments committee. He proposed to answer the second question of the Indian delegate at a later stage.

(22) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), while agreeing with the view of the United States delegate, could not support the Canadian delegate's suggestion that the programme must be stabilized. A growing organization needed flexibility, and he hoped to see an increase in both the budget and the activities of the Organization.

(23) Miss LAISE (United States of America) welcomed the Director-General's proposal on reclassifications, but wished for time to consider a proposal along the lines he had suggested.

(24) Mr. BOW (Canada) explained that his remarks concerning stability had been made from the budgetary angle. It was possible to have flexibility within the programme regardless of the budgetary appropriation.

(25) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the setting of a level, based on the average given by the Chief of the Bureau of Personnel and Management, would automatically allow for control of the budget. The average could always be reduced, but it would be unwise to limit spending on reclassifications, because it was difficult to estimate the total very far ahead.

(26) The CHAIRMAN said that the Director-General's proposal had the advantage of providing the Organization with a positive policy on personnel. He proposed that it should be discussed in the light of the additional information to be provided for the next meeting.

(27) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to the table on steps in salary grades (Annex VI, page 250), pointed out that a senior P-1 post would receive more than a junior P-2, so that the freezing of grades would not result in budgetary savings. He naturally supported any efforts to reduce expenditure, but was willing to give the Director-General a free hand within the total level, bearing in mind that the Constitution granted him full powers in staff matters.

(28) In reply to a question from Mr. JUNANKAR (India), Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that where, under reclassification, incumbents were not given the higher posts, they were either offered lower posts or dismissed.

(29) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) hoped that every effort would be made to find other work for people who lost their posts through reclassification. He asked whether there were any such cases in the proposals under consideration.

(30) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) was unable to give any examples and pointed out that recruitment had been slowed down until after the Conference. In reply to a question from Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), he said that the average of P-3.02 was calculated on the first step of each grade. The reason why the cost of the 11 upgradings in the Workshops Division only amounted to $572 was that many incumbents had reached a step where an upgrading meant an increase of only $20 annually.

(31) The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Rao for information on indirect personnel costs.

(32) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), referring to Table I on p. 243 of the proposed programme and budget, read the items under Common Staff Costs with the relative budgetary figure. Any savings that might be made in the course of executing the programme would be used on programme expenditure.

(33) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether any decrease was likely under item 14, Reimbursement of National Income Tax, as more members acceded to the International Convention on Privileges and Immunities.

(34) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the item related almost entirely to staff at UN headquarters who had to pay United States income tax, as well as to a few United States citizens employed by the Organization who had not yet qualified for tax exemption.

(35) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked for an explanation of the high cost in 1955 under item 13, Travel of Staff and Dependents on Home Leave.

(36) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that a larger number of staff would be going on home leave in that year.

(37) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that the United States Government was exploring the possibilities of introducing legislation on income tax in connexion with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

(38) With regard to the question of home leave, she reaffirmed the belief of the United States delegation that home leave should be on a three-year and not a two-year basis, since the latter practice could not but have a deleterious effect on Unesco's work. She wished to have that view recorded and also the continued concern of the United States delegation at the amount spent on temporary assistance during home leave periods.

(39) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Conference had already approved the right of the staff to annual leave and Unesco simply increased the travel allowance to enable staff members to return home. In the case of air travel, there was a slight increase in the time lost to the Organization, but time spent in travel by other means had to be taken out of the holiday period. In reply to a further question from Miss LAISE (United States of America), he confirmed that leave could only be taken when convenient to the Organization.

(40) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the granting of home leave probably encouraged staff to take their holidays at one time, rather than spacing them out.

(41) Answering a question by the CHAIRMAN, Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that she would not press for inclusion of her remarks in the Committee's report, provided they appeared in the Summary Record.

**CHAPTER I: OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

(42) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to p.26 of the Corrigendum.

(43) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the changes in question were based partly on the Executive Board's decision to establish the post of Assistant Director-General for the remainder of 1954 and beyond that period subject to approval by the Conference. A further corrigendum had been discussed in private by the Executive Board, and would be submitted in a document, namely the addition of another Assistant Director-General and the elimination of the post of Deputy Director-General. He would like the Committee to discuss the two posts of Assistant Director-General, for both of which the Executive Board had proposed salaries of $14,000 with $2,000 representation allowance. Certain changes were proposed, resulting in a net saving, the most significant being the abolition of the Chief of Bureau of Official and External Relations (D-1) under paragraph 13 and the Director of Office of Director-General under paragraph 9, to be replaced by an Assistant Director-General and a P-5 post in the Director-General's office. He hoped to proceed further with reorganizing his office in order to make it a more effective instrument of general administration and would take every opportunity of saving. In reply to Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), he stated that the paper to be submitted would describe the work of the two Assistant Directors-General.

(44) Miss LAISE (United States of America) considered that the alterations would provide a much sounder administration. She hoped the new arrangement would be tried over the next two years and that no further changes would be made before the next Conference.

(45) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL confirmed that the Executive Board had already taken a decision on the lines of the United States delegate's suggestion; he assumed that it referred only to the three top posts.

**NEW YORK OFFICE**

(46) It was agreed that the item should be deferred until the discussion of general problems.

**BUREAU OF LEGAL AFFAIRS**

(47) No comment.

(48) The CHAIRMAN invited discussion on the Offices of the Directors of the Programme Departments, recalling that it had been agreed to discuss them on a comparative basis.

(49) Miss LAISE (United States of America) repeated an earlier observation on the tendency in Unesco to establish directorate staff regardless of the volume of work or number of staff to be supervised.

(50) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that every department had a Director and Deputy Director and the Departments of Education and Mass Communication each had additional D-1 posts to take care of large sections of their programme. Each department had also an Administrative Officer at grade P-3 except in the case of Social Sciences, where the grade was P-2. No department was small enough not to need an administrative officer. Because of their size, the Departments of Education and of Mass Communication had an additional P-1 administrative assistant each, and a further similar post was proposed for the Department of Cultural Activities.

(51) Miss LAISE (United States of America) considered

that three points called for explanation: the need for a Deputy Director in each department; the reason why heads of divisions could not deputize for directors; whether administration could be centralized. The United Nations had similar problems and the view had been expressed that one way of developing personnel was to make division heads deputize for directors.

(52) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it was essential to consider the nature of the responsibilities of heads of departments. In Unesco, in addition to heavy administrative responsibilities, there was considerable work in connexion with other organizations and with Member States. Experience had demonstrated the need for a Deputy, and he suggested that it might be useful to hear the view of a Director of one of the departments.

(53) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought it essential for Directors of Departments to be assisted by a Deputy. Of the eight years he himself had spent in charge of a Department, he had had a Deputy only for the last four, and only then had he been able to attend adequately to the intellectual side of his work and with less detriment to his health. All Directors of departments agreed that the division of responsibilities had been satisfactorily arranged and had greatly improved the work of departments. Mr. Auger emphasized that it was important for Directors of departments to have a person with whom they could discuss each day's developments. Although Heads of Divisions could, if need be, deputize for Directors, it should not be overlooked that their work was, and had to be, of an even more specialized character. They did not, therefore, necessarily have the general grasp of the work of the department that was essential for a Director and his Deputy.

(54) With regard to the problem of Administrative Liaison Officers, Mr. Auger thought they were most useful in assisting the Deputy Director in his administrative duties and keeping in regular touch with all other services.

(55) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should recommend that the question be studied during the next two years and a special report made to the next Conference on the question of Deputy Directors and Administrative Officers. While she appreciated Mr. Auger's statement, it was important for the efficiency of the Organization to have greater exchange of persons and less specialization so that staff should gain a wider knowledge of the work of the Organization.

(56) It was agreed that the United States delegate's views should be included in the Committee's report.

(57) The CHAIRMAN recalled a suggestion, made during discussion of the Department of Cultural Activities, that the Library should be considered as a service to all departments and should not therefore be placed administratively in any one programme department.

(58) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the suggestion was logical, but that it was difficult to decide which part of the administration should house it. There were reasons why it was preferable to keep it in a programme department, and Cultural Activities, which contained Unesco's bibliographical services, seemed a suitable department, but he was prepared to consider its transfer if there were strong feelings in favour of it.

(59) Mr. BOW (Canada) proposed that the matter should be included in the study suggested by the United States delegate. He would like to see a centralized machinery for evaluation rather than decentralized evaluation within departments, and asked if the Director-General in his review of administration could study the relative merits of centralization and decentralization.

(60) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he had already considered the idea of a Department of Administration but had come to the conclusion that it was undesirable to increase top bureaucracy. He would, however, be glad to study the whole problem and make a report to the ninth session of the Conference.

(61) Miss LAISE (United States of America) suggested that the budget organization might be strengthened to enable it, in addition to controlling finance, to survey methods and organizational practices and especially to supervise field activities.

(62) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed the establishment of a planning section attached to the Budget Bureau, so that methods of evaluation could be arranged at the same time as finance, and a direct means of ascertaining the results of a new project be established at the time the project was initiated. That would make evaluation of results far more effective.

(63) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that the question of Archives ought to be considered in connexion with the Library.

(64) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, referring to the Egyptian delegate's proposal, pointed out that the Bureau of Programme and Budget was already responsible for a considerable amount of planning and submitted a twice-yearly review of work plans, in addition to supervising all travel and all changes in work plans. It also joined the Director-General in tripartite discussions of work plans and travel in the different departments.

(65) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) insisted that criteria for judging the success of a programme should be established at its inception, so that the Director-General in executing it and the Conference in studying it could see whether or not the original aims had been successfully met.

## CHAPTER 4: BUREAU OF CONFERENCE PLANNING AND GENERAL SERVICES

(66) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Bureau had been operating in the most satisfactory way: it was well organized, had good personnel and excellent management; posts were kept to the minimum and the service had reached maturity in its procedures and activities.

(67) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) fully supported the Director-General's statement.

(68) Miss LAISE (United States of America)asked whether full use was being made of the Bureau, not only in connexion with conferences, seminars and meetings of experts, but also in connexion with administrative work in the departments. She asked who was responsible for providing administrative officers for meetings outside Unesco House in Paris.

(69) Mr. MONTAGNIER (Chief, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) pointed out that there were several categories of meetings. When meetings were held in Paris, the Bureau of Conference Planning was responsible for all practical arrangements. For important meetings held elsewhere, the Bureau helped in the preparations and delegated a member of the Bureau to be responsible for the organization of the Conference. For small meetings away from headquarters, a member of the department concerned handled all administrative arrangements, which was more economical than sending for the same purpose an official from the Bureau of Conference Planning.

**PART IV: COMMON SERVICE COSTS**

(70) Mr. Montagnier drew attention to the first paragraph of Part IV showing the savings proposed for the administration of the Common Services. Those savings were due partly to reduced prices(particularly for paper). Furthermore, after eight years, the Organization had sufficient equipment to meet its needs in the way of typewriters and office furniture, and the budget estimates provided for the periodic replacement of some items only. A slight increase in the appropriations requested for the Cleaning and Security Services (paragraph 24) would be required, owing to the decision to increase salaries in France. The Secretariat obtained those services under contract and was therefore required to make provision for that increase, which amounted to $9,600 in 1955 and $11,072 in 1956. Mr. Montagnier pointed out that that increase was offset by the reduction for office supplies referred to previously (paragraph 6). The expenses involved in the transfer of the Organization to its new premises had been calculated very closely and amounted to approximately $30,000. If the new building were not completed by the date indicated, an extra $15,000 or so would have to be provided for rental.

(71) The CHAIRMAN, referring to paragraph 4, asked whether it could still be expected that the new headquarters building would be completed during the first half of 1956.

(72) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the most recent information was to the effect that the next Conference could be held in the new building by the beginning of October, although the main Secretariat building would not be entirely completed. In reply to a question from Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), he confirmed that the work would be carried out at the normal cost.

(73) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that the salary and allowances for the Secretary of the Staff Association in paragraph 39 be deleted. A Staff Association should be independent.

(74) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) seconded the proposal.

(75) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested that the sum in question could be awarded to the Staff Association in the form of a subvention.

(76) Miss LAISE (United States of America) referred to the provision of $1,000 a year for staff cultural and recreational activities and proposed that the funds be transferred to the staff training programme, which was one of the weakest parts of the programme.Efforts being made to improve geographical distribution and to employ younger people emphasized the need for a language programme.

(77) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), supported by the delegate of the United States of America and Norway, asked whether other Specialized Agencies made similar budgetary provisions.

(78) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that the provision for a Secretary to the Staff Association had first appeared in the 1953-54 budget. Staff Regulations provided for a Staff Association, and its proper functioning was in the interests of the Organization, which accordingly felt justified in providing for a Grade E secretary. Membership was voluntary and included about 90% of the staff on payment of a subscription. The Association financed many activities which contributed to the well-being of the staff and consequently of the Organization. Its constitution had been approved by the Director-General, and it was conducted in a representative and democratic manner. Moreover, it was able to deal with many queries which would otherwise have to be handled by the administrative services. Speaking as a former Chairman of the Staff Association and as existing Chief of the Bureau of Personnel, he considered that the Association served a useful purpose.

(79) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, while there had been controversy between himself and the Staff Association, he believed that it was instrumental in developing a spirit of unity among the staff which was of value to the Organization. Its possibilities could be considerably developed in the coming two years.

(80) Miss LAISE (United States of America), while appreciating the Director-General's views, maintained her proposal. The Executive Board at its last session had stressed that the Organization should share responsibility when providing funds; it was not responsible for the actions of the Staff Association.

(81) After further discussion, it was agreed to defer the item until the information requested by the United Kingdom delegate had been provided, and that, if it were not forthcoming in time for a recommendation to be made, the Committee should point out the desirability for further study of the problem.

**PART I: GENERAL POLICY**

**CHAPTER 1: GENERAL CONFERENCE**

(82) Mr. MONTAGNIER (Chief, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) explained that the budget estimates had been drawn up on the assumption that the General Conference would hold its ninth session at the Organization's headquarters in Paris and that the session would be roughly on the same scale and last for the same period as that held in Paris in 1952. The greatest difference compared with the 1952 appropriations was for temporary assistance, which accounted for $137,000 in the 1952 budget, compared with $148,000 in 1953. That difference was due to the fact that it had been decided to alter the staff rules and to bring the salary of temporary staff into line with the initial salary of permanent Secretariat officials of the same category. There was an increase of $4,000 for supplies and materials (to cover the purchase of paper for the reproduction of documents during the Conference). In that connexion Mr. Montagnier reminded members of the wish expressed both by the Executive Board and the Committee itself to include under Part I all expenditure occasioned by the General Conference. The great difference in the provision for hospitality ($204 for 1952 and $3,000 for 1956) was due to the cancellation of the big final reception in 1952.

(83) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that, with the growth of the Organization and the increase in the number of Member States, it was time to consider the programme of work of the General Conference. It was useless, in his view, for problems to be discussed by the Advisory Committee, the Programme and Budget Commission and the Conference, often including the same members, and he asked if the Secretariat and the Executive Board could consider the problem and report to the next Conference.

(84) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the subject was automatically discussed by the Executive Board. The views of the delegate of Israel would be kept in mind.

(85) The CHAIRMAN said that it would be useful to have the views of the Administrative Commission

(86) Miss LAISE (United States of America) welcomed the statement of the delegate of Israel. The United States delegation hoped that the change in the status of the Executive Board might eliminate the need for the Advisory Committee.

**CHAPTER 2: EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(87) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, referring to the budget proposed by the Chairman of the Executive Board, in consultation with its members and the Secretariat, said that the most important consideration was the number and length of sessions. The information appeared in paragraph 21.

(88) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) pointed out that his Government had extended an invitation to the next Conference, whereas the figures in the document were based on its being held in Paris.

(89) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that a paper had already been prepared giving the additional cost in case the Conference were held in India, and including appropriate additions to the cost of the Executive Board sessions which would be held at the time.

(90) It was agreed to discuss the document as it stood.

(91) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed reducing sessions of the Executive Board from 4 to 2 in one year, both to be held at the time of the Conference in a conference year.

(92) The proposal was supported by the delegates of the United Kingdom and France.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.

# FOURTEENTH MEETING

*9 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

(1) Opening the meeting, the CHAIRMAN announced a change in the order of discussion in order to co-ordinate the Committee's work with that of the Executive Board. Instead of examining the new draft resolutions submitted by delegations, the Committee would first continue its discussion of the chapter in the draft programme and budget relating to the Executive Board. It would then go on to discuss the following items: (1) decentralization; (2) the general question of subventions; (3) draft resolutions submitted by delegations; (4) the budget balance between the various programme chapters; and (5) the Executive Board's Report on the Remodelling of Unesco's Future Programme.

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION** (continued)

**PART I – CHAPTER 2: EXECUTIVE BOARD** (continued)
**(Paragraphs 14 - 22)**

(2) The Chairman recalled that the delegate of the United States of America, seconded by the delegates of the United Kingdom and France, had proposed that, in order to allow for persons of the necessary calibre to be able to attend the sessions of the Board, the duration of these sessions be shortened and their number per year limited to two, plus the session held concurrently with that of the General Conference.

(3) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) assured the Committee that the Board never met for its pleasure, but was often obliged to exceed two meetings a year in order to deal with important matters which cropped up and upon which the Director-General wanted its advice. He believed it impossible to decide in advance exactly how many meetings would be required in 1955-56. He recalled that the Constitution stipulated that the Board should hold at least two meetings a year.

(4) As a former member of the Executive Board, Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) endorsed the remarks of the Chairman of the Board.

(5) Miss LAISE (United States of America) explained the reason for her delegation's proposal. It was felt that the General Conference should not refer so many administrative and financial questions to the Board, but should leave it free to discharge its primary duty, which was to examine the Organization's programme and make comments to the General Conference thereon. It should be concerned with policy matters, and not with administrative and financial details.

(6) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) remarked that the Board had made a careful study of the possibility of lightening its task, but had come to the conclusion that there were no questions with which it could cease to deal, unless the General Conference altered its resolutions. The programme and budget were henceforth the Director-General's responsibility, and it was not laid down in the Constitution that the Board should advise him thereon, but Sir Ronald Adam felt that the Board had been able to give the Director-General valuable advice on the programme during 1954, and he (Sir Ronald) would very much regret it if the practice were discontinued.

(7) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) associated himself with the remarks of the delegate of Norway. He thought it undesirable to lay down a rigid rule on the question. He agreed that it would be well to reduce the work falling on the Executive Board but thought that no fixed number of meetings should be prescribed. Under the terms of resolutions 41.122 and 41.123 of the seventh session of the General Conference, the Board had new responsibilities, while the extension of the period between sessions of the Conference to two years had increased its work in connexion with the execution of the programme. He therefore felt that the burden on the Board should be reduced but without fixing a definite number of meetings per year.

(8) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) recalled that the discussion had stemmed from budgetary considerations. Agreeing with the Chairman of the Board that it was very difficult to decide in advance when and how often the Board should meet, he proposed that the budgetary provision in document 8C/5 be approved, on the understanding that, if additional meetings of the Board proved necessary, the requisite transfers would be made.

(9) As the whole question was linked with the Conference's decision on the United States proposal to transform the Executive Board into a governmental body, so that no final decision could be taken for the time being, Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that the Committee confine itself to drawing the attention of the Administrative Commission to the problem, adding that the length of the Executive Board's sessions was having unfavourable consequences.

(10) It was agreed to do as Miss Laise had suggested.

General discussion on decentralization, with particular reference to the Science Co-operation Offices, the Liaison Office in New York, the Regional Office at Havana and work with National Commissions

(11) At the CHAIRMAN's request, Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) gave the Board's views on the question. The Board had in private session discussed decentralization and methods of stimulating National Commissions; it had reached a conclusion on the general question of decentralization, but had not yet considered the Indian delegation's proposal on the subject. The majority of members of the Board were against a decentralization of Unesco, they were in favour of regional work through National Commissions and experts in various parts of the world. They were strongly against a rigid definition of regions.

(12) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General)spoke on the same lines as Sir Ronald Adam. In his view, decentralization of activities did not necessarily involve administrative decentralization. He favoured the utmost flexibility in putting the resolutions into effect. There were three main procedures for achieving decentralization:
(13) (i) Experts or members of the Secretariat could be sent out to help governments of Member States in specific undertakings. Such missions, adapted in their make-up to varying needs, should be on national lines rather than "regional" in the more or less arbitrary sense given to that term.
(14) (ii) Again, the co-operation offices could be used as vehicles for decentralization. Those offices were a proved success and it could be said that they met a definite need in the present state of scientific and technical civilization, the centres of which were still inequitably spread throughout the world.
(15) As far as the administrative structure of the offices was concerned, changes were possible, as Mr. Auger would be able to explain to the Committee. In that connexion, Mr. Maheu instanced the Far East and South Asia Science Co-operation Offices.
(16) The Director-General was willing to consider other ways of making the holders of these posts more mobile and of using them for the execution of the programme rather than on liaison.
(17) At Havana, the Regional Office functioned on different lines from the Science Co-operation Offices. Its scope was comprehensive. The Director-General hoped that the Committee would discuss this matter exhaustively.
(18) (iii) The third procedure consisted in developing National Commissions under resolutions 7.11 and 7.12. This project had been given what was hardly more than a token budget but nevertheless opened up a whole range of possibilities; it was another case in which rigid patterns would negate the objects aimed at; much flexibility, adaptability, indeed constant inventiveness were needed.
(19) As regarded, lastly, the New York Office, its purpose was to maintain touch not with one Member State or one group of Member States, but with the headquarters of the United Nations. It was not therefore concerned in the present study of how to decentralize administratively in carrying out the programme. Nor was it proposed to make any important change in the New York Office.

(20) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought that the term "decentralization" should be more clearly defined. He asked whether it was a question of administrative geographical decentralization, or of decentralization of the execution of the programme.

(21) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) stated that the Board had taken "decentralization" to mean the putting out of sub-branches of the Secretariat all over the world, and that was what members of the Board were strongly against.

(22) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) agreed that the problem was how far administration should be decentralized; Unesco's programme activities obviously had to be decentralized. At the present time, there were seven administrative units outside Paris, and the question was whether that policy should be continued. Personally, Mr. Avidor thought not. The ideal would be for every Member State to have a permanent delegation at Unesco headquarters and for Unesco to have a representative in every Member State, but until that came about, Unesco should work through National Commissions and stimulate co-operation between Member States, without opening new offices. Indeed, the delegate of Israel considered that five of the existing seven offices could well be abolished. In setting up regional offices, the three following criteria might be followed: (1) the office should be in a geographical region where communications between the various units were easy and good; (2) it should be in a region where the Member States concerned had strong linguistic ties and a more or less common cultural level; (3) it should be in a region sufficiently far from headquarters for Unesco's influence not to be felt without the existence of such an office. Those conditions were not fulfilled by the offices in Delhi and Jakarta, nor by those in Cairo and Istanbul. As for Latin America, the Montevideo Office should suffice, and the Havana Office could be abolished.The delegate of Israel proposed that the Committee make a very strong recommendation to the General Conference on the lines he had suggested.

(23) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) agreed with the distinction between administrative and operational decentralization, but he thought that, if the Science Co-operation Offices were doing good work, they should be allowed to continue, as their activities formed part of Unesco's assistance to the less developed countries. He was also in favour of the Office in New York. He suggested that the Secretariat might be asked to make a study of the question of administrative decentralization, and to report the results to the ninth session of the General Conference.

(24) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) shared some of the doubts expressed regarding the Science Co-operation Offices; they accounted for nearly one-third of the budget of the Department of Natural Sciences. There was, however, another form of decentralization which should be encouraged, and that was through non-governmental organizations. In his opinion, Unesco's policy of granting subventions

to international non-governmental organizations should be considered in the context of the general question of decentralization.

(25) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) strongly defended the Science Co-operation Offices. Although everything could be done from headquarters in Paris, distances were so great in certain cases that they would retard and hamper the work. His delegation would very much regret it if Unesco's offices in the East were abolished, for they rendered invaluable services there.

(26) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) proposed that no hard-and-fast recommendation be made to the General Conference. The Committee was not representative of all the geographical or cultural divisions of the world and the views of many regions had not been heard. It was not wise to generalize. Each office had its own characteristics, and it would therefore be inappropriate to adopt a firm recommendation. It was preferable to leave the Commission free to come to its own decision.

(27) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) supported the remarks of the delegate of Mexico.

(28) Since his visit to the Liaison Office in New York, Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) no longer had any doubt of its utility; it did an enormous amount of work, particularly in connexion with Unesco's Gift Coupon Scheme. With regard to the Science Co-operation Offices, it was precisely because there were no international non-governmental organizations in certain regions that such offices were needed. The Executive Board felt, moreover, that the offices should not come under anyone but the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences; no one should intervene between Professor Auger and the scientists working in the field. The Board had suggested that the Delhi and Jakarta Offices be merged at Jakarta, because India was developing its science rapidly and could obtain help from non-governmental organizations, whereas Indonesia could not. With regard to the Havana Office, a member of the Board had prepared a confidential report on it, and it had been decided to suggest that the Secretariat should assess the value of the office again in two years time. After dealing with the very important question of the remodelling of Unesco's future programme, the Board had returned to the question of co-operation with National Commissions, which, in its view, were one of Unesco's greatest weaknesses. It intended to produce a paper on ways of strengthening National Commissions, but he doubted whether the Board would be able to finish it before the Conference opened.

(29) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed the establishment of a small working party to define the problem and to consider the various means of decentralizing Unesco's activities, i.e. through the Science Co-operation Offices, the Fundamental Education Centres, international non-governmental organizations, National Commissions, the Liaison Offices in Havana and New York, and the major projects in the remodelled programme. The working party would report back to the Committee, which would include those conclusions in its own report.

(30) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew the Committee's attention to the draft resolution submitted by India on the decentralization of Unesco's activities (8C/DR/7). That resolution asked that a working party of the Programme and Budget Commission be set up, but if the Committee set up another working party the latter would be covering the same ground with all the risk of confusion that that entailed.

(31) Mr. CABOUAT (France) felt that his own views were very close to those of the Executive Board. In his opinion, the problem of decentralization was a vast one into which an enormous variety of considerations entered and he thought the Executive Board had been better placed to explore it than the working party proposed by Miss Laise would be.

(32) As Rapporteur, Mr. Cabouat therefore suggested that the Committee in its report

(1) draw the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission to the problem;

(2) ask the Commission to lay down criteria for the evaluation of the regional offices; and

(3) recommend to the Commission the formation of the working party suggested by the Indian delegation.

(33) The CHAIRMAN shared Mr. Maheu's misgivings at the idea of having a working party at the present stage. He thought that the Committee might limit its action for the time being to formulating the problem. Later, the Programme Commission might wish to ask the Committee to make a more detailed study of certain aspects of the problem of decentralization, and then it might be time to think about setting up a working party.

(34) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) seconded the proposal by the delegate of France.

(35) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) was prepared to accept what the delegate of France proposed but was insistent that the Committee make no firm recommendation. It should rather confine itself to settling criteria and general principles to guide subsequent discussions in the Commission, where more States affected were represented.

(36) The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to consider the section of the draft programme and budget concerning Science Co-operation Offices.

Project 2.41: Science Co-operation Offices (paragraphs 140-184)

(37) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought that the project should be moved to Section I of the Natural Sciences chapter, thus connecting it directly with the Director of the Department.

(38) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) was anxious to remove any wrong impression in the mind of the delegate of Egypt. The Department of Natural Sciences comprised divisions and sections with general responsibilities and Science Co-operation Offices, which were the outposts of the Department at

regional level. Those offices were directly responsible to the Director of the Department through his deputy.

(39) To go farther and to merge the Science Co-operation Offices in the Director's Office would unduly burden the latter. In particular, it would artificially increase the latter's budget by a sum equivalent to one quarter of the total budget of the Department.

(40) The CHAIRMAN remarked that in the Department of Social Sciences, the co-operation posts were included with that of the Director.

(41) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that, in the Department of Social Sciences, the whole regional co-operation staff amounted to two persons in all, and there was no objection to their attachment to the Office of the Director of the Department. The reasons which had led the Secretariat to adopt a different solution for the Department of Natural Sciences were due to the very large number of officials concerned; they had their basis in practical considerations rather than in logic.

(42) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) accepted the explanation for pragmatic although not for rational purposes.

(43) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said it would be difficult, after having referred the subject to the Commission, to make any recommendation on it now. It might, however, be possible to go through the section item by item, and see if the activities could be run in each case by Member States or from headquarters just as cheaply.

(44) The CHAIRMAN shared the view of the delegate of Israel, who wondered whether it might not be better to ask Mr. Auger what activities could not be run by Member States or headquarters.

(45) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) answered that it was indeed possible to do everything from Paris, but, if so, results could not be expected to be as good as under the existing system and expenses would be higher. Not everything could be done by letter: replies sometimes took a long time to arrive and letters were occasionally simply not answered.

(46) The rôle of the field officials was often difficult to describe in cut-and-dried terms but it was a very real one. For instance, they could reach the whole of their respective regions with little expense. From Paris the cost of similar journeys would work out much higher. Yet it was essential to have direct personal contacts, since many activities owed their success to them. For proof of that, it was only necessary to glance over the activities attributed to the offices abroad: thanks to those offices, scientists in the regions served could assess the importance of their own scientific standing, and exchanges of scientific publications could be established between the regions.

(47) The offices abroad were not an example of administrative decentralization but of decentralization of activities; they were administered from Paris.

(48) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) was not satisfied with that explanation. The same could be said of other Departments of the Secretariat.

(49) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) remarked that science and education activities could not be placed on the same level. Every country had a more or less organized educational system, through which activities could be handled from Paris, but that did not apply to scientific activities.

(50) Mr. BOW (Canada) shared the doubts expressed by the delegate of Israel of the value of the regional offices.

(51) If the Committee had not agreed to refer the matter to the Programme and Budget Commission, he would have proposed lowering the priority of the projects. He asked Mr. Auger whether he was convinced that one-third of the budget for Natural Sciences should go to these offices.

(52) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the co-operation offices, on the basis proposed in the draft programme and budget, would absorb not 30% but about 25% of his Department's budget. Fuller consideration could be given to possible changes in their activities, and some economies, say in their staff, could be effected. But there was little ground for hoping that the percentage proposed could be reduced appreciably as long as it was desired to maintain contacts on the existing scale.

(53) The CHAIRMAN did not consider that the decision on the problem of decentralization excluded changes in the relative priority of one part of the programme or another.

(54) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) pointed out that the figure of 25% for the field offices included a number of services for other departments in Unesco which were covered by regional offices. That should be taken into account in discussing the proportion between the two categories of activities.

(55) As the delegate of Canada had said, the Committee could not now take a decision on a question of principle.

(56) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that the meeting had not had the opportunity to gain enough real information on the regional offices. It might be advisable to suggest that an enquiry be held by a neutral observer unconnected with Unesco or the Member States concerned, willing to undertake a systematic review of the management of these offices, before terminating an activity on which so much had been spent.

(57) In reply to what the delegate of the United Kingdom had said, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that extremely full details were given in the Director-General's report. In addition, an informatory booklet, entitled "Science Liaison", had recently been produced. It would be distributed during the meeting, and Mr. Maheu hoped that the delegates would be able to find adequate additional information therein.

(58) Regarding critical evaluation, the Secretariat was at the disposal of delegates. He thought, however, that expert missions to evaluate the work of offices abroad would cost money which could be better employed in the offices themselves on programme work. Besides, if the Committee wanted a body independent of the Secretariat, it could always approach the Executive Board, which met that last requirement and whose work of supervision could be - and was done - without extra cost.

(59) The CHAIRMAN added that the remarks made by the Assistant Director-General could apply to any of the evaluation projects for which the Co nmittee had agreed to vote funds.

(60) Mr. BOW (Canada) said that it was after having read the report of the Director-General that he had made his remarks. He maintained that the Committee was not in a position to pronounce on the real value of the offices. This was an example of the evident need expressed by the delegate of Egypt for setting up a machinery of evaluation in the Secretariat in some form or another.

(61) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that his Government had studied the projects as thoroughly as possible, but there was a residuum of uncertainty, and he therefore supported the delegate of Canada in his assertion that a continuing review was necessary.

(62) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) considered the Canadian delegate's proposal on evaluation important from a general point of view. It was not necessarily expensive. Auditing, for instance, could be carried out from Paris. He was asking for evaluation in order that the offices should be maintained, and eventually strengthened.

(63) Miss LAISE (United States of America) suggested that there should be a completely new perspective in the evaluation, in the light of the proposal to remodel the programme. Apart from the excellent job the offices might be making of the exchange of scientific information, was this activity one that Member States felt the most need of?

(64) Mr. CABOUAT (France) wished to make certain observations on the plea by the United Kingdom delegate for special evaluation machinery. In his view, the matter was rather outside the subject under discussion. The evaluation of activities was a normal function of the Secretariat and it was not clear how a new service to undertake evaluation could make an effective additional contribution. Moreover, there would be some danger of the new service's growing to a size which its usefulness did not warrant.
(65) It would be better to leave Member States the responsibility of making the evaluation and forwarding their remarks. In any case, the Programme and Budget Commission should be left entirely free to settle the question.

(66) The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said there had been two categories of remarks on the regional offices project: (1) general remarks and proposals linked with the problem of decentralization, which should be left to the working party; (2) interventions that were more specifically related to the Natural Sciences programme; Canada's proposal on the proportion of the Natural Sciences budget to be devoted to these projects; and the proposal of the United States delegation in terms of the future development of the programme, in relation to whether or not these activities were needed by a Member State.

(67) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia), on the resolution that a working party should be established by the Programme and Budget Commission which would discuss the regional offices, requested that delegates from the interested countries should be appointed.

(68) Agreed.

(69) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought the Indonesian delegate had made a constructive suggestion. He himself had no wish to intervene on the substance of the discussion but he had two remarks to make:
(1) The Committee would have noted that the delegates of Indonesia, Uruguay and Egypt, who represented States in whose territory Science Co-operation Offices were in operation, had pronounced in favour of the maintenance of such activities.
(2) Delegates had an admirable opportunity for assessing the work of one such Office either themselves or with the assistance of scientists in their delegations: a Science Co-operation Office was working in Montevideo itself and delegates were cordially invited to visit it.
(70) The suggestion of the delegate of the United States of America that some form of emulation between the services of Unesco be instituted contained the germ of an idea worth bearing in mind. Member States could be asked to comment on this point, either through questionnaires or on the occasion of visits paid by senior Unesco officials.
(71) Subject to more detailed study of the question, such a proposal was quite in line with the Director-General's views.

(72) Mr. BOW (Canada) hoped the project would not be evaluated in terms of its value to the country in which it was located, but in terms of the whole region.

(73) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) explained the method of work employed by the Executive Board in evaluating the project. It first considered the reports presented by the Secretariat on the achievements due to the Science Co-operation Offices, and the information received from the regions concerned. Then members of the Executive Board from the regions gave their own views, which made it easier to appreciate the real value of the work, and, lastly, the Executive Board had considered the reports brought back by the Director-General, the Chairman, and members of the Board who had visited the different regions.
(74) Mrs. Pecson gave details of the results achieved by the Science Co-operation Office in Manila: interest in scientific research had been accelerated, the tempo of work for the improvement of industrialization had been heightened, and National Science Councils had been stimulated to produce new legislation. Work

on oceanography and medicinal plants, the Pacific Science Congress, the Humid Tropical Zones project, irrigation systems and the propagation of increased opportunities for earning a living were some of the activities influenced.

(75) Mrs. Pecson added that a thorough evaluation, if undertaken now, would require the setting up of an expert committee, which would involve some expense.

(76) The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the proposal by the delegate of Egypt for granting high priority to the project, subject to the findings of the working party, was seconded.

(77) At the request of the delegate of Israel, the sections were taken separately. No comment was made on Sections A, B and C.

(78) On Section D, Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) asked for an explanation of the combination of the two separate offices in one, in view of the Indian delegate's proposal about a regional office in Delhi.

(79) Answering the delegate of Egypt, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that relations between Paris and the Jakarta and Delhi Offices respectively were direct and, as the plans stood, would remain so.

(80) He did not think, incidentally, that if the Indian proposal were adopted it would bring about major alterations in the programme.

(81) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that it was for reasons of economy that consideration had been given to combining the Jakarta and Delhi Offices.

(82) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that with a budget below a certain minimum the effectiveness of a Science Co-operation Office diminished appreciably; it was not enough merely to pay the salaries of the officials on the spot for them to be able to do useful work. It was for that reason that the appropriations had been kept at the 1953-54 level, but spread over three offices instead of five.

(83) The CHAIRMAN asked the meeting to decide on the motion presented by the delegate of Egypt to recommend a higher priority for the project as a whole, subject to the decision of the working party on the question of decentralization.

(84) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought there had been a motion presented by the delegate of Canada to lower the priority of the project. He had asked for the project to be taken section by section, in case the meeting wanted to give a different degree of priority to the different sections.

(85) Mr. BOW (Canada) explained that he had not formally made that proposal, as he had not wanted to trespass on the ground of the working party, but he now proposed the lower priority, on the understanding that the offices would not be immediately eliminated, before any evaluation had been made.

(86) Mr. CABOUAT (France) doubted the appropriateness of taking a vote at that stage. He appealed to the delegates of Egypt and Canada to withdraw their motions, the upshot of which might be the elimination of an administrative organ - something the Committee had not yet done.

(87) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) withdrew his proposal to raise the priority of the project.

(88) Mr. BOW (Canada) withdrew his proposal to lower the priority of the project.

(89) Miss LAISE (United States of America), referring to the remarks made by the Assistant Director-General, expressed the interest of her delegation in any machinery that might be set up to evaluate the relative merits of the different services of Unesco from the point of view of Member States. She also appreciated the invitation to see the field office in Montevideo.

Project 3.01: Social Science Co-operation Offices

(90) Paragraphs 16-24 were approved without discussion.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

# FIFTEENTH MEETING

*10 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION** (continued)

**CHAPTER 7: GENERAL RESOLUTIONS**

Project 7.3: Regional Office in the Western Hemisphere (paragraphs 22-27)

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited discussion on the Havana Office, bearing in mind the decision to recommend to the Programme and Budget Commission to set up a working party on the problem of decentralization.

(2) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) introduced Mr. Francovich, Director of the Havana Regional Office.

(3) Mr. FRANCOVICH (Director of the Regional Office in the Western Hemisphere) reported briefly on the work of the Havana Regional Office. Despite its official title, it worked only in Latin America, among a group of peoples who were not only geographically related but linked by similarities of political, linguistic and economic organization, etc. so that they formed a homogeneous whole, an international community in which Unesco could develop the general lines of its policy. That was the real reason why the Office was necessary.

(4) The Havana Regional Office differed from the Science Co-operation Offices, in that the field of activity of the latter, being limited to the natural sciences, was sharply defined, whereas the Havana Office carried out in the whole of Latin America the full range of work required by the programme of Unesco, dealing with governments, National Commissions and scientific centres and covering an extremely wide and varied field.

(5) The activities of the Office could be divided into three main sections; the first was concerned with relations with the Member States in the region, the governments of those States, and their Ministries and authorities, and included the encouragement of the growth of National Commissions and the supplementing of their work. The Commissions were not functioning as they should and constant effort had therefore to be devoted to them. That work was carried out by the Regional Office through visits and through assistance to meetings and congresses, in regular consultation with the National Commissions, with whom it also maintained a considerable correspondence. In order to provide a stimulus to the Commissions, the Office produced and circulated its Monthly Information Bulletin, which gave news about Unesco and the Office itself.

(6) Secondly, the Havana Office was always at the disposal of the Secretariat for carrying out Unesco's programme in the countries of the region. Work done in that way was more effective than if done from Paris. The officials of the Regional Office were better acquainted with political, social and religious conditions, etc. in the countries concerned and knew better which people in Latin America were interested in the Unesco programme. Moreover, in carrying out the programme itself, technical assistance activities had to be conducted, and advice and guidance provided, in close co-operation with people who took an interest in Unesco. The assistance thus provided by the Regional Office reduced the amount of official travel necessary for members of the central Secretariat. It was easier to work from Havana than from Paris and the expenditure on travel was naturally lower.

(7) The third aspect of the work of the Havana Office was extremely important: through the Office, Unesco and all its regular forms of activity were continuously represented in the region. Unesco did not mean a programme only: it was a kind of conscience whereby a new type of international co-operation could be developed.

(8) In Latin America, there was a tendency to hold frequent meetings and conferences, between the countries designated as Spanish American, Latin American, Indo-American, etc. according to the special characteristics and cultural features of that region. If it were not for Unesco, such trends towards regionalism would become excessive.

(9) The Office collaborated in these meetings, attended them and offered them the benefit of its own experience, keeping before them the world-wide interests of Unesco. It took part in the meetings, acquainted them with the Organization's programme and made every effort to ensure that the resolutions they adopted were in accordance with Unesco's ideals. The Centre of American Studies, the Health Institute and the Caribbean Commission, for instance, were in direct and continuous contact with the Havana Office and could thus be influenced by Unesco. The work of the Office therefore covered a very wide field and entailed not only office work but travel.

(10) The Unesco Bulletin for Libraries was published in Spanish by the Regional Office and had a circulation of 1,000 to 1,500 copies. One thousand copies of the monthly Information Bulletin were distributed to Ministries, organizations and individuals interested in it throughout the region. In the same way, the Spanish edition of the Bibliographical Newsletter was distributed to people interested in that publication.

(11) To give an idea of the activities of the Havana Office, mention might be made of

some carried out in the previous month.
(12) On 4 October 1954, the study and information seminar for youth leaders in Latin America was opened. Sixty representatives took part in that seminar, which was extremely successful, as Mr. Maheu, who had been present at it, had seen. Mr. François had also expressed his satisfaction at the results of the meeting.
(13) On 15 October, the Office took part in the Second Inter-Latin American Congress on Education, held in Quito by the Institute of Hispanic Culture and attended by seven Ministers of Education and representatives of 14 countries. Unesco was invited and was also present. At that Congress, Mr. Francovich had reported on the work of Unesco and, as a result, the Congress adopted resolutions concerning co-operation with Unesco on many points.
(14) On 24 October, the Medellin pilot project Public Library for Latin America was opened - an extremely important event. The Regional Office had taken an active part in the preparations for the opening, and an expert, Mr. Carlos Victor Penna, had worked for five months organizing it. The Director-General, who had been present at the opening ceremony, had been able to appreciate the importance of the project, which was of great value to Colombia and should help enormously towards the development of public libraries in Latin America.
(15) Mr. Francovich did not think it necessary to enumerate further aspects of the work the Havana Regional Office was doing in execution of Unesco's programme in Latin America but was prepared to provide the Committee with any further information delegates might desire.

(16) Miss LAISE (United States of America) considered that neither the statement of the Director of the Regional Office nor the justification in the Director-General's Report gave a clear indication of what the Office had achieved. It was true that the initial activities would be largely concerned with disseminating information on Unesco and its work, but enough time had now elapsed for people interested in the development of regional programmes to ask what were the lessons to be learnt and what were the specific accomplishments expected from a regional office which could not be achieved by other means. She asked if it would be possible to have a brief summary of the Havana Office's contribution to the development of National Commissions in Latin America.

(17) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed that the question put by the delegate of the United States of America was a very important one but he emphasized that it was difficult to give a brief, categorical, immediate reply. Miss Laise had, in fact, asked what the Office had done which could not have been done without it. In his statement, Mr. Francovich had shown that the functions of the Office were of a general character and that the influence it exercised was indirect; it was rather difficult to say what was directly and exclusively due to the Office. The Secretariat did not claim that the Office was essential for the representation of Unesco in the region. The fact that the Office was situated in the centre of the countries it served conferred upon its activities a psychological value which, although difficult to measure, should not be underestimated.

(18) Mr. FRANCOVICH (Director of the Regional Office in the Western Hemisphere) said that an idea of the practical achievements of the Office could be gained from a description of the work it had done for libraries. The staff of the Office included a specialist on cultural activities, and work with libraries was an item in the programme of the cultural section. The work in that field would not have been done if there had been no such Office. The libraries specialist brought out the Unesco Bulletin for Libraries in Spanish and distributed it throughout the region, but the Bulletin published by the Office was not simply a literal translation of the one published in Paris; a quarter of the contents of each number was composed of material relating to the countries of Latin America. It was an important work of reference which would not have existed if it had not been published by the Office and it was thanks to it that Unesco's activities were known throughout Latin America.
(19) The same specialist circulated the Bibliographical Newsletter in Spanish, a task which took up much of his time.
(20) In addition to its publications, the Havana Office was greatly interested in library activities and took part in the librarians' conferences, of which two had already been held in Cuba, and others in Panama and Colombia. Those conferences were attended by librarians, who derived from them guidance and encouragement in their work. The libraries expert had also prepared a handbook on library conferences.
(21) There had also been a conference in Cuba on the exchange of publications. The countries concerned had concluded agreements on that type of exchange, but experience had shown that the agreements were often not implemented. The Havana Office had helped to publicize Unesco's programme regarding the exchange of publications for 1955-56.
(22) The influence of the expert was felt in the schools and universities but also reached out to other spheres. He had, for instance, taken part in other meetings such as that on rural libraries at Turrialba.
(23) The Havana Office also maintained close contacts with the National Commissions and had helped in establishing those of Nicaragua and Chile. Besides stimulating the work of the Commissions, it supplied them with information they required, through the Information Bulletin.

(24) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) confirmed that the work described in the statement by the Director of the Havana Regional Office was useful and constructive. The support of Unesco was extremely useful in the Caribbean region, Mexico and the whole of Central America. The National Commissions had made considerable progress, and the Mexican Commission, at least, had to thank the Regional Office for its co-operation in securing that result.
(25) Moreover, the Havana Office was doing work which could not be carried on in the same way from Paris. America, like Asia, had special characteristics that made Regional Offices necessary for carrying out campaigns which could thus be better

planned and more successfully executed. Lastly, the Havana Office was also necessary for securing the best results from missions of experts. The purpose of these Regional Offices was not decentralization but the extension of the activities of the Central Secretariat.

(26) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) entirely agreed with everything the delegate of Mexico had said and felt that the Havana Office was a necessary auxiliary for Unesco's work in Latin America. There should be continuity in the activities of Unesco, and he considered that the Havana Office should retain the priority allotted to it in the budget.

(27) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked for information on the extent of co-operation between the Regional Office and the Organization of American States.

(28) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) expressed appreciation of the Cuban Government's contribution of $10,000 and asked whether financial assistance had been received from other Member Governments or from the Organization of American States and, if not, whether any might be expected in the future.

(29) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that such assistance from OAS was neither forthcoming nor expected.

Project 7.1: Development of National Commissions (paragraphs 3-12)

(30) The CHAIRMAN invited the Chief of the Division for Relations with Member States and National Commissions to introduce the item.

(31) Mr. CHEVALIER (Chief, Division for Relations with Member States and National Commissions), introducing project 7.1, mentioned that 62 of the 72 Member States at the moment had National Commissions, the highest proportion so far achieved. Their structure and operation were very varied; some were practically independent bodies, with a staff of up to 60 full-time officials and a budget of as much as $100,000, whereas others consisted only of a single official in a central government department, who had a list of leading people in the country; in some countries, meetings of those people were held, in others not. National Commissions of the second type could be regarded as existing in name rather than in fact. Between those two extremes were National Commissions consisting of a small nucleus of government officials, together with representatives of the world of culture. The Secretariat had drawn up a schedule of all the National Commissions in order to study their relations with government circles, and that survey had revealed a very great diversity. The distinguishing feature of the proposed programme was the desire to ensure that the necessary variety of methods made the Commissions really effective; the budget estimates set forth in material terms what were almost symbolic projects, indicating the directions in which the Secretariat wanted to act and the directions in which it had been asked to act by the National Commissions themselves. All the proposed activities had been tried and their efficacy proved. They included visits by the Secretaries of National Commissions, selected from different continents, to the headquarters of Unesco, at the rate of about ten a year, in order to see how the Secretariat worked and the kind of liaison that could be established between the Secretariat and their own countries. It was essential for the success of the system that the Secretaries of National Commissions should remain in office. The budget estimates for the project, which had amounted to $13,000 a year, had been reduced by 50% in order that the 50% saved might be devoted to another form of activity complementary to the former.

(32) This second activity consisted in the appointment of national correspondents, a method of procedure in accordance with the Constitution and widely used by the International Labour Organization, which devoted no less than $350,000 a year to correspondents and regional offices. This activity had been thought advisable by the Secretariat, but its efficacy naturally depended on the choice of the correspondents, who, it was proposed, should be appointed for a limited period in countries experiencing difficulties in setting up a National Commission, during which time they would take steps to establish the Commission. In the meantime, they would act as Secretaries of the National Commissions; an appropriation of $6,500 had been proposed for that purpose - a sum not exceeding that included in the previous budget and which should make it possible to appoint two or three such correspondents, paid at local rates, in different countries, whereas, if an international official were employed, all the funds would have to be used for one person.

(33) The third activity included in the programme, missions of members of the Secretariat, had already been tried out: in 1954, for instance, an official had visited two National Commissions which required reorganization and had taken the opportunity of attending regional seminars and meetings; $1,500 had been provided for work of that type.

(34) The programme then went on to provide for the organization of a regional conference; two conferences of that kind had already been organized by Unesco, at Havana in 1950 and at Bangkok in 1951. A third conference, which it had been decided, in 1952, should be held in the Middle East in 1953, had had to be replaced by a series of activities of interest to the region. A proposal had been made, at the instigation of a delegation to the General Conference, that a conference of 16 European National Commissions be held in 1955. In the light of experience with the previous conferences, and having regard to the smaller distances to be covered, a sum of $20,000 had been requested for that purpose.

(35) Mr. Chevalier concluded his statement by mentioning one other project, for the republication of the Handbook of National Commissions in looseleaf form so that sections which were out of date could be replaced. One thousand dollars was requested for that purpose for 1955.

(36) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the following comment by the Executive Board in document 8C/5 Add.1:

"The Executive Board therefore stresses the necessity for governmental action to make National

Commissions more active and effective. On the other hand, provision should be made for the secondment of Secretariat members to National Commissions in accordance with Article VII 3 of the Constitution."

(37) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway), referring to paragraph 7, said that his Government had opposed the appointment of national correspondents at previous conferences and the situation did not merit any alteration in that attitude. It was a dangerous policy to encourage Member States to believe that everything was to be paid for by Unesco, and to take away the incentive of countries which had not yet established National Commissions.
(38) He also opposed the Regional Conference of European National Commissions proposed in paragraph 9. If such a conference were desired, it could be organized by other cultural organizations in Europe or by the National Commissions themselves.

(39) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the National Commission in his own country had received invaluable help from the Division for Relations with Member States and National Commissions, with which it was in almost daily contact. Nevertheless, he agreed with the views of the delegate of Norway and deplored especially the revival of the proposal to appoint national correspondents. He appreciated the Secretariat's concern at the relatively slow development of National Commissions, which were essential to Unesco's work, but felt that it would not be hastened by financial aid or stimulation of individuals in the countries concerned. In any case, it was not clear what the functions of a national correspondent would be and, as he could not perform what must be essentially national functions without government aid, the government might well take care o. the entire activities. He also shared the delegate of Norway's objection to the proposed conference, which, while useful in areas with limited means of communication, was not really necessary in Europe.
(40) He supported the remainder of the programme, in particular the proposed Unesco Handbook of National Commissions (paragraph 11) and the visits by Secretaries of National Commissions to the Organization's headquarters (paragraph 6).

(41) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) supported the views of the two previous speakers. The fact that there were already 62 National Commissions was proof that national correspondents were unnecessary. With regard to paragraph 9, while regional conferences were important in areas outside Europe to strengthen National Commissions, they were unnecessary in Europe. He proposed that the funds saved by suppressing the two projects should be applied to other activities for strengthening National Commissions.

(42) The CHAIRMAN asked the Chief of the Division for Relations with Member States and National Commissions if he could provide any evidence of the value of missions of Secretariat members proposed in paragraph 8.

(43) Mr. CABOUAT (France) reminded the meeting that complaints that the Organization was failing to secure a hearing, not only among the general public but also among teachers and cultural circles, were very common. The French delegation was convinced that the best means of securing such a hearing was through the National Commissions, and it would always be prepared to support any action to strengthen National Commissions or to encourage their establishment. The means proposed in paragraph 7 - appointment of national correspondents - seemed to be necessary in countries where the governments did not appear to take as much interest as they should in the setting up of a Commission. With regard to the organization of a conference of European National Commissions (paragraph 9), Mr. Cabouat was inclined to agree with the United Kingdom's view, although he felt that the appropriation requested might be left as it stood in order to give the Secretariat the opportunity of encouraging the establishment of new Commissions throughout the world or of promoting the work of existing Commissions; in that respect, he favoured the proposal of the delegate of Israel.

(44) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) agreed with part of what the representative of the United Kingdom had said, and was anxious that provision should be made, in paragraph 7, for another, different form of remuneration. He proposed that the activities referred to in the paragraphs in question should be carried out, at least in some cases, through the Co-operation Offices and Regional Offices, as that would make the work easier.

(45) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that the United States Government considered the development of National Commissions a unique feature and one of the most important parts of Unesco's work and was disappointed that Secretariat efforts in that direction had been so small. She was disturbed by the small obligation for 1953 and the transfer of unused funds to another section through the non-materialization of a project. She asked whether the Secretariat could provide information on activities during the past two years.
(46) With regard to exchanges between the Secretariat and National Commissions, she proposed that these be expanded to include exchanges between National Commissions themselves.

(47) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) supported the previous speakers and, in particular, the proposals of the delegates of Israel and the United States of America.

(48) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that there had been adverse criticism of the reciprocal activities of Unesco and National Commissions and asked whether the Secretariat had made any effort to discover why, in spite of efforts by the Secretariat and Member States, National Commissions had never fulfilled their intended rôle. He supported the United States delegate's proposal for exchanges between National Commissions.

(49) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), replying to the delegate of the United States of America, said that the low level of obligations in 1953 was due to an allocation of $25,000 for

a regional conference in the Middle East being transferred from 1953 to 1954 and being assigned to other activities in the Middle East. The amounts for 1955-56, however, represented the minimum required to carry out the proposed activities. With regard to the transfer of funds to another section, the Director-General had considered that it would not be useful to invite the Secretaries of National Commissions to headquarters when the Secretariat was absent in Montevideo.

(50) Replying to the objections raised to the proposal that national correspondents be appointed, Mr. CHEVALIER (Chief, Division for Relations with Member States and National Commissions) agreed that it was an innovation, but the Secretariat, which had foreseen the objections in question, had endeavoured to anticipate them by proposing that correspondents be appointed only for a limited period, not exceeding two years. If, at the end of that time, they had not succeeded in setting up a Commission, the experiment would automatically come to an end. The establishment of a National Commission was still the aim, but it had been thought expedient to provide, in certain cases, for someone who could learn the work of Secretary of a National Commission. With regard to the relations between the correspondents and governments, it had been stipulated that correspondents could be appointed only at the proposal of their own governments, and that they would work only in full agreement with the national authorities; they would receive programme instructions from the headquarters of the Organization. It should not be forgotten that certain countries had great difficulty in seconding a full-time official for work connected with Unesco, and that the appointment of correspondents would provide a temporary solution. Mr. Chevalier left it to the Assistant Director-General to answer the objections to the proposal for a European conference.

(51) The usefulness of missions of members of the Secretariat to other countries had been questioned and, as an answer to the doubts expressed, Mr. Chevalier quoted the case of one of his colleagues, who had been sent to the Middle East, where he had been able to make arrangements for the reorganization of one National Commission and to promote the establishment of another; he had also taken advantage of a regional meeting to attempt to co-ordinate work throughout the region. The idea of exchanging information among the Secretaries of National Commissions had been put forward, and Mr. Chevalier could inform the Committee that the experiment had already been tried out during the current year when visits of Secretaries of National Commissions to headquarters had been made to coincide and several of the Secretaries had been given the opportunity of visiting other countries to study the organization of their National Commissions.

(52) The delegate of India had spoken of evaluating the results achieved and Mr. Chevalier mentioned that the Secretariat had considered doing this by assembling all the available information in order to determine the best way of organizing the National Commissions and of establishing contacts between Commissions in different countries. Overlapping had sometimes been discovered between National Commissions and governmental bodies and improvement in that respect was necessary. It might be well, when the working party had finished its discussions, to make a more detailed study of the organization and functions of National Commissions and their relations with governments.

(53) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), referring to the proposal for convening a conference of European National Commissions, remarked that the justification for such a meeting was rather different from that for the similar regional meetings held in Havana and Bangkok or for the assistance it had been proposed to give to a regional conference in the Middle East in 1953. In those three cases, the object had been to encourage and help countries handicapped by their distance from headquarters, in setting up National Commissions or developing those already in existence which were still in the very early stages. In Europe, though there was still room for improvement, it could be said, in general, that the organization and functioning of the National Commissions were satisfactory. It had to be remembered, however, that in Europe several regional organizations wielded an influence over Member States which Unesco could not ignore. It had to maintain its influence in a region which was the scene of very important internal developments, all the more so because European representation on Unesco did not coincide with the membership of the organizations referred to. After recalling that certain European countries not represented on the Committee were closely interested in this proposal, the Assistant Director-General said, in conclusion, that the motives behind it were political rather than technical; it was for the Conference to say what should be done.

(54) The CHAIRMAN said that a vote had to be taken, first on the proposal of the delegate of Norway, seconded by the United Kingdom, to delete the activities in paragraphs 7 and 9 and, if that were adopted, on the proposal of the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegate of the German Federal Republic, to retain the funds for other activities in the Division.

(55) Mr. CABOUAT (France) put forward a third proposal. If the project for a European conference were accepted, it would be wiser to hold the conference in 1956, as it would then be able to discuss the draft programme to be submitted to the General Conference at its ninth session. If it were held in 1955, it would have to limit itself to the current programme and to general considerations.

(56) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed that the proposal made by the delegate of France was a good one, but he pointed out that it raised a problem; the project, as proposed, drew the attention of the proposed conference to methods of implementing the programme, whereas the French delegate's proposal directed it towards the study of future programmes. The National Commissions were, however, government advisory bodies and Member States would have to decide whether it was a good thing to lead them to express their views formally on the draft programme.

(57) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) reminded the Chairman that he had made a proposal with regard to paragraph 7, suggesting that the activities there mentioned should be carried out through the Regional Offices. That did not imply any criticism of the existing system, but the procedure he had suggested would be cheaper and more practical.

(58) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) mentioned that the Director-General was suggesting a variety of methods to the Conference so that the latter could decide which it preferred. The proposal for action at the national level was an alternative to another possibility - regional co-operation. But so far as he was concerned, there was no reason of principle for preferring one method to another; that was a question for consideration by the working party on decentralization.

(59) The CHAIRMAN asked if the delegate of Mexico would agree to his proposal being brought up when the working party was established.

(60) The Mexican delegate accepted the suggestion.

(61) Mr. CABOUAT (France) explained that he had never intended that National Commissions should be given powers normally pertaining to governments but, from the meetings of the French National Commission he had attended, he had gained the impression that the Commission would be very much interested in having an opportunity to discuss with other National Commissions problems it thought particularly important. A comparison of views on the draft programme might produce very good results.

(62) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that paragraphs 7 and 9 should be voted on separately. With regard to paragraph 9, one of the difficulties was perhaps that the objects of such a conference had not been clearly defined. The United States National Commission considered an activity of that character necessary, since the object of developing National Commissions was not only to create new ones but to help existing ones to be useful to Unesco. The United States Commission had been hampered by the fact that its rôle was not clearly established and, if a conference could usefully be devoted to what National Commissions could and could not do in relation to the 1955-56 programme, it would serve a useful purpose. She supported evaluation among National Commissions but was in favour of the subject being discussed by the proposed working party.

(63) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the proposal of the delegate of Norway, seconded by the United Kingdom delegate, to delete paragraph 7.

(64) The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 1 with 4 abstentions.

(65) A discussion ensued on the proposal of the delegate of Israel that the funds released should be retained in the Division for other activities.

(66) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) understood that the disposal of funds was to be left to the working party.

(67) The CHAIRMAN explained that the Committee could recommend the transfer of funds to other activities within the chapter, leaving the Director-General to make specific proposals. The procedure would be correct, since members had expressed views on priorities for specific items. The Director-General could, if necessary, make immediate proposals.

(68) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied in the negative to the Chairman's last point and in the affirmative to his opening remarks. The Director-General's position was clear: he received the right, according to the Committee's recommendations, to make any subsequent proposals likely to help the Committee or the Programme Commission in its work. The Chairman was right in saying that the Committee could properly recommend the transfer of funds within any given chapter, but the Secretariat was not in a position to make immediate, practical proposals for the use of the sum thus made available.

(69) The CHAIRMAN was opposed to leaving the matter open; if no decision were taken, an unallocated sum would be left on completion of the examination of the programme and budget.

(70) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) considered that, as the Committee was acting in a programme and a budgetary capacity, it could assign funds in general terms to the section and defer proposals on their specific purposes.

(71) Turning to general considerations, one of the difficulties in Unesco's work had often been said to be the inactivity of National Commissions. The problem should therefore be one of Unesco's major considerations, even if inactivity were due to circumstances outside the Secretariat and the Conference. He would propose a higher priority, in respect of both finance and status, to the question of National Commissions, which were an instrument for judging the success of Unesco's work.

(72) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was in complete agreement with the Egyptian delegate on the importance of the work of National Commissions. With regard to the vote on the delegate of Israel's proposal, he was not sure that it was necessary for funds to be spent within the Division in order to achieve the desired objective; they could, for example, be used to increase the expenditure for staff travel under different chapters to enable heads of Departments to visit National Commissions. He was reluctant to vote a sum for unspecified activities.

(73) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked if the Secretariat could prepare a document setting out the functions, scope and place of National Commissions in Unesco's programme and stating why it was considered they had not developed as had been originally hoped.

(74) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked the delegate of India if he would be satisfied with a preliminary document; the Secretariat would be able to make a full analysis and submit a constructive report on the matter in 1955-56. The Director-General needed directives from the General Conference and the purpose of the project submitted had been

to evoke those. He was sorry to say that it was impossible to make a proper critical assessment immediately.

(75) The CHAIRMAN thought it would be preferable to rely on Secretariat participation in the working party and not ask for a document.

(76) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that the Committee should recommend that the amount in question be assigned to general purposes in aiding Member States to strengthen their National Commissions.

(77) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) regretted that the suggestion did not solve his difficulty.

(78) The proposal of the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegate of the German Federal Republic, that the sum of $13,000 released under paragraph 7 be retained in the project for activities in the development of National Commissions was put to the vote and adopted by 9 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

(79) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed, and the Committee agreed, that the following words should be inserted after "headquarters" in paragraphs 6 and 12: "and/or National Commissions".

(80) The Committee then voted on the Norwegian delegate's proposal, seconded by the United Kingdom delegate, to delete paragraph 9. The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions.

(81) Mr. CABOUAT (France) did not press for a vote on his proposal, but pointed out that it related to the same conference, except that it would have been held in 1956.

(82) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the proposal of the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegate of the German Federal Republic, that the sum of $20,000 available under paragraph 9, be retained for the purpose of developing National Commissions.

(83) The proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

(84) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) supposed that the decision taken on paragraph 6 applied to paragraph 12, which also related to visits by Secretaries of National Commissions to the Organization's headquarters, and that the total budget was therefore $26,000 instead of $13,000.

(85) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the Egyptian delegate's proposal, seconded by the delegate of the United States of America, to accord a high priority to the development of National Commissions.

(86) The proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

(87) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) summed up the results of the voting on project 7.1: the project as a whole had been allotted a high priority; the whole of the proposed appropriations stood; sub-paragraphs (b) and (d) were deleted.

(88) The CHAIRMAN confirmed that the Rapporteur's summary was correct.

New York Office (Part III, Chapter 1), paragraph 13

(89) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said there had been no appreciable changes. The staff for which provision was made in 1955-56 was the same as the existing staff. He wished to remind the Committee of the comments of the Chairman of the Executive Board, which were borne out by what he had seen for himself. The many and, in the aggregate, heavy functions carried out by the New York Office were not always appreciated, and the only criticism which could be made of the budget estimates was that they were too conservative, too modest. He recalled that the Office had nothing to do with decentralization; it was a liaison office between the United Nations and Unesco.

(90) In reply to a question from the United Kingdom delegate, Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that the two upgradings in the Professional category were reclassifications through increase of work.

(91) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) mentioned that the Director-General, in view of the increased volume of work, had a choice between two possible courses - maintaining posts at the existing level and establishing an additional post, or increasing the responsibilities of existing posts without establishing a new post. The latter course had been adopted as being more economical.

(92) Discussion on the New York Office being concluded, the CHAIRMAN asked the Chief of Bureau of Personnel and Management if he was ready to supply the information asked for at the previous meeting.

(93) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management), referring to paragraph 39 of Part IV of the programme and budget, said that he had some information on the practice in other Specialized Agencies, but was waiting for additional information from the New York Office.

(94) It was agreed to defer discussion until complete facts were available.

(95) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether the promised information on reclassifications was available, as she could not submit a proposal without information on the General Services category. With regard to the suggested average for the Professional category, she would like to suggest P-2.9, based on the averages quoted for Unesco, the United Nations, WHO and FAO. In the meantime, in connexion with the amount of $73,000 for reclassifications for 1955-56, she asked what was the total cost of within-grade increments in the same period.

(96) The CHAIRMAN understood that it had been agreed to accept the Director-General's average for the General Services category as being between grades D and E.

(97) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was puzzled by the United States delegate's proposal. He considered that the system of working on an average grade was administratively impracticable and wondered how, if adopted, it could be put into practice. He asked whether it was used in other agencies.

(98) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management) said that the United Nations and all the Specialized Agencies kept a careful watch on the tendency for grading patterns in their secretariats to become higher. He was not, however, aware of any action to lay down methods of control, except that the Fifth Committee of the United Nations Assembly, on receipt of the Secretary-General's proposals for upgrading, had reduced the amount available. The Director-General's proposal had been for the Committee to set an average grade rather than deal with the matter in terms of finance. In maintaining the average, he would consider the administrative structure of divisions where upgradings were proposed, and make equivalent downgradings if necessary.

(99) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was still sceptical of the procedure and considered it too arbitrary. Unesco's Constitution gave the Director-General complete freedom of action in staffing and, having appointed a Director-General, it was not advisable to restrict his actions in that respect.

(100) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that she too had been sceptical, but had made her suggestion in view of the wishes expressed by the Director-General. She still wished for the information she had requested and also asked whether the 86 reclassifications had been taken into account when calculating the within-grade increases for 1955-56.

(101) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that within-grade increments had increased by $319,027 in 1955-56 over 1953-54, and he confirmed that the 86 reclassifications had been taken into account. An amount of 6% was deducted from the budget for established posts in each department to allow for turnover and lapses in recruiting for new posts.

(102) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed that the amount of $73,000 for reclassifications should be reduced to $50,000.

(103) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) wished to know whether it was the intention of the delegate of the United States of America that the proposed reduction should be made specifically on reclassified posts, or was it to be spread over all the appropriations for established posts? Did she agree to a reduction of $23,000 in the whole budget for established posts, as a gesture?

(104) Miss LAISE (United States of America) accepted the Assistant Director-General's interpretation of her proposal.

(105) Mr. BOW (Canada) remarked that the Director-General would still be free to increase the proportion of high-grade posts if he so wished.

(106) The CHAIRMAN said that, while that would be the budgetary effect, the Director-General would no doubt wish to take account of the considerations behind the proposal and not make reclassifications on a large scale.

(107) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) confirmed that opinion and thanked the delegate of the United States of America for her understanding of his question.

(108) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that, in the light of possible proposals to reduce the budget, it would be advisable to examine the summary by object of expenditure in Annex V of the programme and budget to see if cuts could be made in the major items. Staff costs being a major item, he supported the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America.

(109) The proposal of the United States delegate, seconded by the United Kingdom delegate, was adopted by 7 votes to nil with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

# SIXTEENTH MEETING

*10 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56, BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE SESSION (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN announced that, before the meeting could proceed to the discussion of the draft resolutions, a few general questions remained to be cleared up. He therefore asked if the delegate of Israel wished to comment on the general matter of subventions.

(2) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that, after the advice offered by the Assistant Director-General, he was prepared to leave the matter to the Administrative Commission.

(3) The CHAIRMAN then opened discussion on document 8C/ADM/5, Report of the External Auditor, requested by the delegation of the United States of America at the seventh session of the General Conference.

(4) Miss LAISE (United States of America)suggested that, as the External Auditor was not present, the Committee's Report should contain a recommendation to the Administrative Commission to look into the question of whether the Secretariat should exercise a more detailed financial control over the funds allocated by contract to the Commission for the Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind. The question had arisen for the 1953 period, but, as the 1955-56 programme also included a contract to that Commission, it would be desirable to consider it.

(5) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the discussion was confined to that international non-governmental organization, or whether it referred to a general principle. In the Directives governing relationships with non-governmental organizations, there was a new clause which provided for the auditing of their accounts. Did the delegate of the United States of America wish to extend her recommendation about the International Commission to non-governmental organizations as a whole?

(6) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this was a contract subject to normal legal controls, but the United States proposal aimed at a more detailed control than would otherwise be secured.

(7) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) asked for a more detailed account of how the funds had been used hitherto.

(8) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the remarks of the United States delegate, in so far as they related to the 1955-56 budget, referred to a point concerning which the auditor had made certain observations. He suggested, therefore, that the delegate should put the question to the Administrative Commission. Not only was the Commission better placed to deal with it, but also it was a question referring to a document not presented to the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(9) The CHAIRMAN remarked that there would be two further opportunities of raising the question: (1) during discussion of the auditor's report to the Administrative Commission, (2) during discussion of the annual report of the International Commission by the Programme and Budget Commission (document 8C/PRG/7).

(10) Miss LAISE (United States of America) explained that she felt a need to go into the question at that stage for the reason that the Committee's willingness to support the project in the programme would depend on a satisfactory solution of the question of financial control over it. Payments in 1954 had been excessive and a satisfactory agreement between Unesco and the Commission would have to be found.

(11) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the point of view expressed by the delegate of the United States of America and asked for a reference to it in the report.

(12) The proposal of the United States delegate, seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, was adopted by 11 votes with 1 abstention.

(13) The CHAIRMAN opened the debate on the question raised by the United Kingdom delegate as to the proportion of manuscripts produced within the Secretariat, compared with those prepared under contract.

(14) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that there was not a single Unesco publication on which the Secretariat did not do some work. The amount done fluctuated between two extremes: (1) Booklets emanating from departments, such as, The Social Sciences , No. 12 in the series, Unesco and its Programme, which was issued jointly by the Departments of Mass Communication and Social Sciences. The Assistant Director-General further mentioned an illustrated publication entitled, Tambien las montañas se mueven, for the idea of which the Department of Mass Communication was wholly responsible and which had been brought out entirely by the Documents and Publications Service. Such publications were entirely the work of the Secretariat. (2) Publications commissioned under contract from one or more writers; e.g., Culture and Human Fertility, and Economics and Action, by Mr. Mendès-France. At this end of the scale, the Secretariat's contribution was smallest, but it did nevertheless play an active part by deciding on the work plan, the subject of the publication, the public for whom it is intended, and the author. In addition, Unesco put the manuscript into shape and undertook all the other technical and commercial operations leading up to the final publication of a book.
(15) With regard to the other two questions raised to which answers had not been given, Mr. Maheu said he would take the opportunity of mentioning that the document dealing with the expenditure for 1952 by categories of expenditure had been requested from Paris and had not yet arrived. Also, no reply had yet been received about the way the other Specialized Agencies arranged for the payment of the Secretary of their Staff Association.

**ANNEX VI, PAGE 250 OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET**

(16) Miss LAISE (United States of America) wished to know: (1) whether experience had led to any adjustment in the standards since the 1952 programme; (2) to what degree the standards were co-ordinated with those of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies; and (3) whether the size and number of posts in local field staff would not be considered?

(17) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), in answer to point 1, replied that standards in the proposed budget were in most cases lower than those for 1953-54, particularly in respect of consultants' fees and contracts. There was a 12% reduction, compared with the 1953-54 budget, in the average cost of the standard page of contractual printing; a lower rate had been used in computing consultants' fees, etc.
(18) In answer to the second question, the United Nations and Specialized Agencies all had the same system of established posts, local field staff, etc., based on the same staff regulations. On the third question, Mr. Rao replied that a list of posts had not been included in the document for reasons of brevity, but it was available. Figures, for instance in the case of the Science Co-operation Offices, had been calculated on the basis of exact needs. In paragraph 197 of the chapter on Natural Sciences there was a list of local field staff, without details of the salaries paid to each, although the total number was given.

(19) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked when Technical Assistance (8C/5 Annex VIII) would be discussed.

(20) The CHAIRMAN explained, in agreement with the Assistant Director-General, that this, being an activity external to the House, could be more suitably discussed after the general discussion of the results of the Committee's work, of the balance of chapters, and of the Executive Board's document on the future programme.

(21) Miss LAISE (United States of America) felt that it was important for the meeting to examine Technical Assistance forthwith, from the point of view of its administration, and also in terms of future programmes.

(22) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) recalled that the United States delegation had expressed a wish at the opening of the session to consider the proposed programme and budget in the light of the previous programme and budgets and of the Executive Board's Report on the Remodelling of the Future Programme of Unesco. By that procedure, the Committee would be keeping within Unesco's own field of activity, whereas the technical assistance programme was a project in which Unesco merely participated in a joint undertaking by the United Nations and all the Specialized Agencies. The connexion between the technical assistance programme and the programme and budget proper was thus less immediate, and on that account less instructive than the relationship between the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56 and the Remodelling of the Future Programme.

**ITEM 7.3 OF THE AGENDA: DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBER STATES**

(23) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that the draft resolutions of Member States be examined by the Committee one by one as the Executive Board finished its discussion of each and put forward its recommendations. These resolutions had been classified by the Secretariat in document DIV/55, which indicated the departments concerned. They fell into the following categories: (1) draft resolutions affecting a single department; (2) those affecting two or more departments; (3) those relating to Unesco's general policy and sometimes going beyond the purview of the Secretariat. If the Committee was agreeable to taking the resolutions in that order, the Secretariat was ready to answer any questions regarding draft resolutions affecting the Department of Education.

(24) The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Australia, suggested that the Committee recommend the submission to the Director-General, in future years, of resolutions on the programme at the time when it was being prepared, rather than when it was being adopted.

(25) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the Chairman. In earlier years, when the programme was being built out of nothing, those resolutions had been more urgently needed, but at the present stage there was not so much excuse for last-minute novelties, particularly since, with a biennial Conference, Member States had ample time in which to submit their views. It was advisable to revise the rules and time-limits for the presentation of new resolutions.

(26) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) proposed taking the idea a step further by asking the Director-General himself to invite Member States to send their suggestions before he formulated his proposals.

(27) Mr. LEE (United States of America) endorsed the observations by the delegate of Australia, the United Kingdom and India. Before taking up the resolutions one by one, he wished to remark that from the point of view of the desired concentration of the programme, even if some of the resolutions contributed to it, a considerable number would work against it. He thought that a good many might be referred to the Secretariat for consideration in the future execution of the programme.

(28) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) believed that the Director-General would favour the principle of the delegate of India's proposal. But such requests for action should not, as in this one, assume the form of draft resolutions, because in that case the Secretariat might find its hands tied and difficulty in including these requests with the others in a general scheme. It would be better for Member States to make simple suggestions.

(29) Mr. LEE (United States of America)agreed with the view expressed by the Assistant Director-General.

(30) It was decided to include it in the report.

Draft Resolutions relating to Education, Nos. 28, 37, 38, 39, 40 and 53

DR/28: Amendment to resolution 1.122 (paragraphs 99 and 100)

(31) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the

Executive Board had not recommended this resolution, because there was already a project on the question in the programme.

(32) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested that the resolution be referred to the Secretariat for information.

(33) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal.

(34) Agreed.

DR/37: Promotion of health education

(35) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) explained that the Board would prefer this draft to be reworded, in order to make it clear that it was a continuation of work already being carried out by the Organization.

(36) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) remarked that this draft resolution merely instructed the Director-General to do something he was already doing. He suggested the Committee should propose a method of implementation, seeing that the Secretariat was already, and would continue to be, in contact with the World Health Organization.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) reminded the meeting of the danger of adding to school curricula. Would the delegation of Uruguay not be content to ask for the project to be studied by the Secretariat, as there was no suggestion of a method of work and no budgetary study.

(38) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) accepted the suggestion of the delegate of the United Kingdom.

DR/38: Teaching of the Charter of the United Nations and the Constitutions of the Specialized Agencies

(39) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) informed the Committee that the Executive Board recommended this project for approval.

(40) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said his Department was already engaged with the subject, although not necessarily and exclusively in the particular form of urging the teaching of the Constitution.

(41) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that, in the absence of elaboration, the resolution was no more than a reaffirmation of what was being done. It should be referred to the Secretariat.

(42) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) supported the proposed resolution.

(43) It was put to the vote and adopted by 7 in favour, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

DR/39: Parallel use of Spanish and English in the Americas

(44) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) explained the Board's view that, since there was no assurance that other American States were in agreement with this proposal, which concerned them, further study of it was necessary.

(45) Agreed.

DR/40: Free education at all levels

(46) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) informed the Committee that this had not been recommended by the Executive Board, which felt the Organization should proceed by stages.

(47) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) said that draft resolution No. 40 submitted by his delegation related exclusively to official State-controlled education.

(48) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) agreed with the view of the Executive Board and proposed its adoption.

(49) Agreed.

DR/53: Work by children of school age

(50) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Board recommended adopting this resolution.

(51) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked for its budgetary implications.

(52) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that these would be postage expenses for letters to the International Labour Office in Geneva.

(53) It was agreed to recommend adoption.

DR/55: Teaching about human rights

(54) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) informed the meeting that it had been recommended for adoption by the Executive Board.

(55) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) remarked that the first part of the resolution was addressed to Member States, and was a standard request on which Unesco was as active as possible. The second part, addressed to the Director-General, referred to the field of social sciences.

(56) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the Department of Social Sciences had in mind to conclude a contract amounting to $5,000 in 1955 with the International Political Science Association for a study on the teaching of human rights.

(57) Mr. CABOUAT (France) recalled that in the course of the discussion on the programme and budget of the Department of Social Sciences, his delegation had proposed the restoration of an activity which had been included in the first version of the proposed programme and budget. He considered that the Uruguayan draft resolution was similar to the French proposal and his delegation was accordingly ready to support it.

(58) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), with reference

to the expression "rule of law" in (a) of the last paragraph, asked: what law?

(59) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought it referred to the international acceptance of human rights. The Secretariat had only outlined a work plan based upon a provisional interpretation of a text it had not composed. The final interpretation would have to be given by the Commission.

(60) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said it was very difficult for the Secretariat to make a detailed work plan. He abided by his earlier views and proposed that the resolution should be given a low priority.

(61) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) called the attention of the meeting to the fact that the concept "rule of law" was in Article I of the Constitution of Unesco, and was, apart from that, a general theme of humanistic discussion, and therefore not an entirely practical proposition.

(62) Mr. BOW (Canada) hoped that during the hurried examination of the resolution the priorities allocated to projects already in the programme would not be changed.

(63) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that a study under (b) would be difficult, but in respect of (a), the Community Development project (8C/5, paragraphs 211-213 of the chapter on Social Sciences) might be extended to include a comparative study of the economic, social and political elements referred to. That might best be achieved through the independent non-governmental organizations envisaged.

(64) Mr. CABOUAT (France) explained that his delegation accepted the Uruguayan proposal as qualified by his own interpretation of it and by the work plan. He then read the passage he had wanted to see included in chapter 3 (Social Sciences) of the draft programme and budget:

"B. Community Development

213-bis Democratic institutions in development programmes

In most development plans it is essential to provide not only for the application of democratic methods but also for the gradual introduction of the machinery of democratic government. To what extent can a particular form of democratic government existing in one country be transposed to another country, and what would be the consequences if it were? Experts with a special knowledge of comparative politics are at the present moment giving more and more detailed thought to these problems. Unesco should help in directing these studies so as to satisfy more fully the needs of countries undergoing rapid development. For this purpose the International Political Science Association will be asked to organize, in conjunction with its 1955 Congress, a symposium on this problem, at which reports would be submitted dealing with several different parts of the world.

1955 - $4,000 (Contract)
1956 - Nil"

(65) Mr. Cabouat added that he hoped this work would help to facilitate the task of the Secretariat in interpreting the Uruguayan proposal.

(66) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) accepted the French delegate's interpretation.

(67) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) did not think that the interpretation given by the French delegation facilitated the Secretariat's task; it only complicated it.

(68) The CHAIRMAN asked the meeting to consider the French delegation's proposal recommending the adoption of draft resolution 55, subject to the interpretation given by Mr. Cabouat.

(69) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), seconded by Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), asked for the resolution to be taken in two parts, as the first part had no budgetary implications.

(70) In view of what the Assistant Director-General had said, Mr. CABOUAT (France) expressed his willingness to withdraw his motion if it was felt that it complicated the task of the Secretariat.

(71) A vote was taken on this offer, which was accepted unanimously.

(72) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that (a) would have to precede any work under (b), which, she thought, must be deferred.

(73) Sub-paragraph (a) was put to the vote and carried by 3 in favour, 2 against and 6 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (b)

(74) Mr. LEE (United States of America) wished this point to receive a low priority and be deferred for the moment to the Secretariat.

(75) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) seconded the proposal.

(76) Adopted by 9 in favour, none against, one abstention.

Draft resolutions relating to the Natural Sciences Nos. 1, 9, 18, 29, 32, 35, 42, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61.

DR/1: Radio-isotopes

(77) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) informed the meeting that the Executive Board recommended the resolution, on the understanding that Member States in Europe would be consulted before a meeting of experts was called.

(78) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) questioned the Board's decision. Was this new activity really necessary? The matter was now being discussed in the United Nations. Two international organizations should not be working at the same time in the same field, and he proposed that the project be deferred.

(79) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) seconded the proposal by the delegate of the United Kingdom for deferment.

(80) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) supported the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(81) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Director-General had forwarded the text of the French draft resolution to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Secretary-General's reply, dated 4 November, had reached Montevideo on the seventh and read as follows:

"I appreciate your thoughtfulness in consulting me on the draft resolution relating to European research on problems connected with radio-isotopes which has been submitted by the French delegation to the Unesco Conference. It would naturally be my hope that Unesco's action under such a resolution would make the fullest contribution to any wider programme for the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy that may be undertaken through the United Nations; for this reason, some reservation may be desirable at this stage regarding the detailed programme for 1955 suggested in the second paragraph of the draft. Apart from this comment, I can only say that intensified research on problems connected with the production, distribution and use of radio-isotopes is clearly very desirable and that Unesco is the international body which should promote and co-ordinate it."

(82) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that during his stay in New York he had discussed the question in detail at United Nations headquarters. The prospective International Atomic Agency would undertake responsibility for relations with non-governmental organizations, governments and regional bodies. He had encountered no opposition to a meeting of European experts as proposed by the French delegation.

(83) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed that the resolution should be referred to the International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences, which could advise what part Unesco should take in this field. That would mean that the resolution could only be taken into account in the 1957-58 budget.

(84) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences had the duty of advising the Director-General not only on the planning of future programmes but also on the execution of current programmes.

(85) If the Conference approved the proposal before them, the Director-General would be in a position to consult the Committee at its Milan meeting.

(86) In reply to Mr. Avidor, who seemed to have understood that the Secretary-General of the United Nations meant that a decision on the Unesco scheme at this stage might be premature, Mr. Maheu said that the Secretariat did not take the letter in that sense but as indicating that the Secretary-General of the United Nations hoped that Unesco would take action but in concert with that to be taken by the United Nations. The last sentence of the passage he had read left no doubt on that point.

(87) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) remarked that there was no specific reference in the letter to the proposal to create an International Atomic Agency, which was due to come before the General Assembly of the United Nations shortly. That was an important consideration both for DR/1 and for DR/9.

(88) Mr. LEE (United States of America), while deferring his judgment until the United Nations Representative had been heard on the subject, still felt a lot could be done in the exploration of the use of radio-isotopes in medicine and agriculture. He added a hope that, while the meeting was a regional one, it would not exclude experts from outside the area.

(89) Mr. CABOUAT (France) felt he should give the Committee some explanation of the advantage, from the international and inter-governmental standpoint, of research undertaken in Europe on the medical, radiological and agricultural applications of nuclear energy. The suggested European laboratory for nuclear research would be less costly than the International Institute for Atomic Research, but would still be too heavy a financial charge for a government to shoulder by itself.

(90) The Council of Europe had decided to contribute up to 500,000 francs towards the financing of the project, a sum equivalent to that which the French delegation was asking Unesco to provide. In addition, the Pasteur Institute, the Institut National d'Hygiène and the Italian Government had indicated their intention of making funds available. The aim of the French proposal was not to launch a new activity but to assist one already in being; the idea was to place the experience of Unesco and its Secretariat at the disposal of this branch of science. If the Unesco budget could not support the expense, the Organization might at least provide certain professional services in the early stages.

(91) Finally, the delegate of France confirmed that, whatever the Committee and the General Conference decided, account would be taken of the subsequent decisions taken by the United Nations.

(92) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed two amendments to the resolution: (1) that the meeting of experts be convened in 1956 instead of 1955, in order that it might receive the comments of the Secretary-General of the United Nations; (2) he supported the United States proposal that experts from outside Europe should also be invited to the meeting.

(93) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that, as draft resolutions 9 and 32 were connected with this one, they should all be examined before a decision was taken on any of them.

(94) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that at the moment it was difficult to instruct the Secretariat in too much detail as to who should participate in the project and how it should be financed, and also pointed out that they were dealing with 1956 and not 1955. The point was that they did not yet know what the General Assembly of the United Nations would decide.

(95) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) signified agreement.

(96) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought it would be useful, in connexion with these three draft resolutions, for Mr. Auger to tell the Committee about the conversations which had taken place currently at United Nations headquarters in New York. Before the meeting of the Committee presided over by Dr. Ralph Bunche, the Director-General had informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations that Unesco held itself at his disposal for taking part in the examination of the scientific aspect of the problem of the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful ends. Accordingly Mr. Auger, himself a distinguished atomic scientist, had gone to New York and spent a fortnight attending the meetings of the Bunche Committee. He had left New York ten days past, but he was fully abreast of the decisions being taken there. Since his departure the question of the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes had come before the First Commission of the General Assembly. The proposal put forward by Mr. Cabot Lodge (United States of America), currently under consideration by the First Commission, did not appear to differ much from what information in Mr. Auger's possession had suggested.

(97) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) began by reminding the Committee that atomic energy had already been in use for peaceful purposes for ten years but that the military application of this branch of science had prevented the detailed discussion in international organizations of its peaceful uses.

(98) However, a discussion on the subject had been inaugurated at the current session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the principal project, presented by seven countries, provided for: (1) a Specialized Agency which, on coming legally into being, would enter into relations with the United Nations in exactly the same way as WHO, FAO, Unesco itself and the other agencies had done before it; (2) a scientific conference to be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. On the programme to be submitted for its approval, the Secretary would be able to consult Unesco, FAO and WHO. It was probable that the Director-General would be approached by the Secretary-General regarding the preparatory work for the Conference, which was likely to take place in August 1955 and, like any other international conference of such importance, would require some months of preparation, beginning, probably in January 1955. The intention was that the Conference should be attended both by government delegates and also by various experts and scientists invited personally. There would be a Preparatory Committee for the Conference, which would be empowered to enter into direct consultation with Unesco on matters within the latter's province.

(99) These circumstances invested draft resolutions 9 and 32 with great importance as concerned the Director-General's future action. The uranium reactors which generated electricity also gave off radio-active material from which the public must be protected. If the Committee decided on the means to be given the Director-General for meeting the request of the United Nations, the intentions of these draft resolutions would be automatically satisfied.

(100) Mr. Auger added that he had made a very provisional estimate which might be sufficient to cover the expenses envisaged for 1955-56.

(101) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board), speaking on draft resolutions 9 and 32, said that, in the light of Mr. Auger's information, the Board had taken the two resolutions together and decided to recommend DR/9 proposing collaboration with the United Nations on the use of atomic energy for the benefit of man. With regard to DR/32, the means of collaboration prepared should be reviewed in the light of arrangements currently being made by the United Nations.

(102) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) felt the decision taken about resolutions 9 and 32 was clear. On No.1 there was a good proposal.

(103) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked whether the meeting could not dispose of DR/1 at this stage, and refer Nos. 9 and 32 to the Programme Commission, on the assumption that they would be referred to working parties which would include people more qualified to discuss them in the light of information arising out of United Nations action.

(104) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) thought that DR/9, which merely authorized the Director-General to extend the co-operation of the Organization to the United Nations, need hardly be referred to a working party. The Committee should recommend the resolution to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(105) The delegates of INDONESIA and ISRAEL agreed.

(106) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the purpose of the resolution (DR/9) was to authorize the Director-General to continue the co-operation already undertaken with the new agency envisaged. Was it specifically necessary to make such a resolution?

(107) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) informed the United States delegate that a representative of the United Nations would be present at the General Conference and would be able to give all necessary information on the results of the discussions currently proceeding in New York. With regard to the point raised by the delegate of the United Kingdom, the Secretariat did need such a resolution and he would draw the delegate's attention to the last clause of draft resolution 32.

(108) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the proposed budget for the whole project was $26,500 in 1955 and $10,000 in 1956. Protection of the civil population, which was the subject of draft resolution 32, was only a part of the whole and could be reckoned at about a fifth in budgetary terms.

(109) Mr. LEE (United States of America) was in favour of the spirit of the resolution. The formulation could be left until later.

(110) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought resolution 9 should stand even if 32 fell, because it was an invitation to all Member States, and even as a declaration it had some force.

(111) The CHAIRMAN pointed cut that Mr. Auger had said that in approving DR/9 the meeting would be implicitly approving DR/32 as well.

(112) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), on DR/9, had two minor drafting amendments to propose: line 1, after "Conference" insert "believing in the urgent necessity of action in disarmament, invites all governments to join together in a common action as a result of which efforts..."; and line 2, after "armaments", insert the words "could be diverted".

(113) The CHAIRMAN said the Committee could mention that a Draft would be accepted if revised as suggested, but the meeting should not be asked to accept drafting alterations.

(114) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) wanted the resolution approved as it stood.

(115) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) accepted the Chairman's remark. He had merely not wanted to give the impression that the United Kingdom had agreed to the unrevised version.

(116) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed with the delegates of India and the United States of America that the Committee should decide on the general lines of the resolutions and the corresponding estimates without regard to details of wording. The drafting would be done later.

(117) The CHAIRMAN indicated that a note to this effect could be included in the Committee's report.

(118) Put to the vote, draft resolution 9 was adopted unanimously.

(119) The CHAIRMAN said that the meeting was not in a position at that stage to adopt resolution DR/32 with its budgetary implications. It could merely say that it considered the proposal to belong to the type of activity Unesco was called on to carry out.

(120) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with that view, considering that at that time some other agency besides Unesco might be making a working plan.

(121) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) recalled that the Indian text (document 8C/DR/9) had no financial estimate attached to it but that preliminary costings had given a figure already suggested by the Secretariat.

(122) A vote was then taken on the proposal by the delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by the delegates of Israel and India, to refer draft resolution 32 to the Secretariat and recommend that it should be implemented in the light of the report made by the United Nations. This proposal was adopted by 6 in favour, 3 against and 3 abstentions.

(123) The proposal by the delegates of the United Kingdom, Norway and Mexico to defer draft resolution 1 was then taken up.

(124) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that any essential activities could be undertaken by the Relationship Agreement between the United Nations and Unesco.

(125) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the proposed operation was conditional and depended on the decisions taken later by the General Assembly of the United Nations. However, if no financial provision were made, no activity would be possible before 1957.

(126) Mr. CABOUAT (France) shared the view of the Assistant Director-General and suggested that the resolution be adopted subject to the two amendments proposed by the delegate of Israel (paragraph 92).

(127) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) agreed with the delegate of France.

(128) A vote was taken on the proposal by the delegates of the United Kingdom, Norway and Mexico to defer draft resolution 1 until the United Nations had dealt with the question. It was rejected by 4 in favour, 8 against and no abstentions.

(129) The proposal by the delegates of Israel, France and Egypt to adopt the resolution with the two clarifications made by the delegation of Israel - that the framework of the project should be widened and meetings held when the Secretariat considered it most practical - was approved in principle.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

# SEVENTEENTH MEETING

*11 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.3 OF THE AGENDA. DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBER STATES** (continued)

DR/18

(1) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences), introducing draft resolution 18 submitted by the delegation of India, pointed out that a number of proposals were combined in the resolution, the first being concerned with the development of international collaboration and the possibility of taking the Indian National Scientific Documentation Centre as a model for the establishment of similar centres in the underdeveloped areas. The Secretariat welcomed a proposal which showed that the Indian Centre had been a genuine success and was proving useful. What was suggested was that the Director-General be asked to study the possibility of taking such action with a view to eliciting requests for technical assistance from the countries concerned.

(2) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether it was not true that much of the activity proposed under the first section of the document was covered by resolutions already dealt with by the Committee.

(3) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that it was a new proposal, whose object was simply to make known in underdeveloped areas the achievements of the Indian National Scientific Documentation Centre.

(4) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the proposal was intended to emphasize the importance of the Documentation Centre in India and the value of contributions from underdeveloped areas.

(5) In reply to a question from the delegate of Israel, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) confirmed that the Centre in India had been set up under the technical assistance programme.

(6) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the Indian Government should be commended for its initiative, but, as the Secretariat already had authority to carry out the kind of work envisaged, he did not see any point in passing resolutions to confirm existing powers. He therefore proposed that no action be taken.

(7) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) could not recall any such programme in the Department of Natural Sciences. The Centre had been established by the Indian Government under the technical assistance programme, and the resolution supported the lines of action.

(8) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that he was not opposing the idea, which he considered an excellent one.

(9) Interpreting the feeling of the meeting, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that, when the technical assistance programme came up for discussion, the delegation of India should make a statement drawing attention to the value of the project and thus providing the Secretariat with pointers to the degree of importance to be given to the proposed activity in that programme.

(10) The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Executive Board to report the comments of the Board.

(11) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Board's views were as follows:

First section: Development of International Collaboration

The Executive Board recommended its adoption on the understanding that Unesco would only be required to inform Member States of existing centres and encourage them to ask for similar ones under the technical assistance programme, and also that the project involved no budgetary implications for Unesco.

Second section: International Exchange

The Executive Board expressed its approval, noting that there were no budgetary implications.

Third section: Dissemination and Teaching of Natural Sciences

The Executive Board welcomed the proposal and recommended that a study be prepared for the ninth General Conference and that Member States be encouraged to submit suggestions as early as possible to help the Secretariat in its work.

Fourth section: Development of Scientific Co-operation

The Executive Board was opposed to the proposal, since the activities under (a) and (b) were already being carried out and (c) was a programme within the field of the United Nations.

Fifth section: Subvention of $3,000 to the Indian National Committee for Mathematics

The Executive Board was favourable to the proposal.

(12) The CHAIRMAN said that the Advisory Committee had already agreed to make a recommendation on the necessity for resolutions to be sent at an early date for inclusion in the next programme and budget.

(13) He invited the Committee to return to discussion of the first resolution (Development of International Collaboration).

(14) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) moved the adoption of the resolution on the understanding that it did not come within the budget of the regular programme.

(15) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that budgetary implications could not be avoided: the Secretariat would inevitably be called upon to incur some expenditure, if only in time allocated to the project.

(16) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked whether the action proposed in the draft resolution was not already covered by certain passages in the Organization's programme, in which case it would be pointless to adopt it.

(17) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that the proposal of the delegation of India was not completely covered by the programme as it stood. Under draft resolution 2.12 (paragraph 40), the Director-General was authorized to advise and encourage international organizations concerned with the development and improvement of scientific documentation; with the standardization of terminology; with the compilation of multilingual dictionaries and with the improvement of scientific translations. The project before the Committee was designed to assist towards the establishment of national centres and was a typical technical assistance item; Unesco had already taken action on four separate occasions under that programme to assist in the foundation of scientific bodies which had proved successful. He felt it preferable not to confuse the ordinary and the technical assistance programmes.

(18) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that there were no budgetary implications at the present stage, since the resolution was only concerned with possible future action. While the United Nations technical assistance programme was limited, that of Unesco was broad and spread over all parts of the programme; it would therefore be possible to support the idea in general terms, leaving the Secretariat to arrange projects in accordance with the wishes of Member Governments.

(19) The CHAIRMAN interpreted the Indian delegate's statement as seconding the delegate of Israel's proposal, in spite of the comment of the United States delegate on use of Secretariat time.

(20) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that his comment should not be taken as indicating disapproval of the idea behind the resolution.

(21) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the Indian Government was to be congratulated on its Scientific Documentation Centre, and it was a good principle to make useful activities in one country known to others. He thought, however, that, before adding to existing resolutions, it would be well to consider whether there were other methods of achieving the desired object, for example, through clearing house activities in the Department of Natural Sciences, or through the Indian National Commission. He supported Mr. Auger's remarks concerning resolution 2.12 (paragraph 40) and on the advisability of not confusing regular and technical assistance programmes. Unesco already had enough work to handle at the international level, and should not undertake activities at a national level. He appealed to the delegate of India not to press the proposal.

(22) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) was puzzled by the remarks of the United Kingdom delegate. A resolution could not be ruled out of order because it related to an activity initiated in a Member State, and in any case Unesco performed its work through Member States.

(23) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that the exploration of the possibility of establishing such centres be treated as a normal activity of the science co-operation offices, to be undertaken in conjunction with the Member States of the region concerned. If such projects took shape, they could be included in the draft programme for 1957-58, when the Director-General would consider whether they should be put in the ordinary or the technical assistance programme.

(24) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the proposal of the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegate of India, that the resolution be approved on the understanding that it had no budgetary implications.

(25) The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

(26) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) introduced the second item of the Indian motion (International Exchange) dealing with the international exchange of technical books, periodicals, scientific films and other scientific material. What was proposed was in fact one of the normal responsibilities of the Director-General and the effecting of such exchanges was a routine task of the Secretariat and more especially of the science co-operation offices. Thus, the only point of the proposal would be to remind the Secretariat of the importance of such exchanges.

(27) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that elaborate and expensive machinery already existed for working out programmes and integrating plans and ideas; what was needed was to encourage the initiative of the Secretariat and Member Governments. He did not oppose the Indian Government's resolution, but believed that from a procedural point of view the Secretariat already had the necessary authority.

(28) Mr. BOW (Canada) agreed with the United States delegate. It was important to give the Secretariat a free hand and not restrict it by the terminology of resolutions. He proposed that the recommendation be referred back to the Secretariat for information.

(29) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) did not understand the procedural complications. Unesco had a programme for 1955-56 covering a vast variety of subjects and he could not see how recommendations concerning emphasis on different aspects would either hamper or give unlimited powers to the Secretariat. He would like clarification from the Secretariat on the subject.

(30) The CHAIRMAN said that the remarks of the United States and Canadian delegates did not concern the procedure of the Committee, which was entirely within its rights in making recommendations to the Programme and Budget Commission. They related to the general procedures of the Organization and it would be useful to have comments from the Secretariat on its general procedure in dealing with new projects.

(31) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that a major question of procedure had indeed been raised. He felt that, if such resolutions were adopted by the General Conference and incorporated in the programme, the effect would be to give an impression of dispersion which the Director-General had been at pains to avoid in drawing up the programme. Besides, it would overstress certain aspects of a given problem and the Secretariat would have the feeling that it was likely to be too definitely committed - which was certainly not the intention of the Indian proposal.

(32) The Committee might perhaps suggest a procedure to the General Conference for dealing with such resolutions; it would consist in recommending the Director-General to take any such proposals submitted by delegations into account, in the execution of the programme adopted and in the preparation of the programme for the following period. In other words, he would suggest that such proposals be covered by a general directive accompanied by a list of the suggestions of delegations. That procedure would avoid supplementary resolutions, while still satisfying delegations wishing to see emphasis laid on certain programme items. The Secretariat would thus have the benefit of directives while retaining its freedom of action.

(33) The CHAIRMAN said that the Assistant Director-General's suggestion was helpful. It was not clear, however, whether the indication that the Committee might want, in certain cases, to recommend to the Commission that resolutions be borne in mind by the Secretariat in executing the 1955-56 programme and preparing the 1957-58 programme, implied that the Committee considered that the text of the resolution should not be approved.

(34) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed with the Chairman. As he had already mentioned, the Secretariat would be sorry to see the text adopted as it stood, and he suggested that its substance, in summarized form, be incorporated in a list of suggestions to the Director-General.

(35) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that, in the light of what had been said, the Committee could, as each draft resolution came up for consideration, decide whether it was a real resolution with budgetary implications, or whether it was a suggestion suitable for inclusion in the proposed general resolution to be addressed to the Director-General.

(36) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) considered that the resolution had budgetary implications and he proposed that it should not be adopted as a recommendation but submitted for the Secretariat's attention.

(37) Mr. BOW (Canada) thanked the Assistant Director-General for his able elaboration of his remark on terminology. The Secretariat and the Executive Board had constantly given assurances that they were in the hands of the Committee, but he did not wish to see them bound by resolutions in respect of which there had not been time to study either the terminology or their effect on the programme and budget.

(38) The CHAIRMAN asked for a vote on the proposal of the United States delegate, seconded by the delegate of Israel, that the resolution be transmitted to the Secretariat for guidance in executing the 1955-56 programme and preparing the 1957-58 programme.

(39) The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 1 with no abstentions.

(40) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) introduced the third part of DR/18 on the dissemination and teaching of natural sciences. The proposal appeared to be covered by the decision just taken by the Committee, for it was a question of authorizing the Director-General to examine the matter and submit the resolution formally to the General Conference at its ninth session, if he thought that satisfactory results could be expected. The proposal might, therefore, be included among the suggestions to the Secretariat for the ninth session of the General Conference.

(41) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) questioned the right of the Committee to change the nature of resolutions submitted by Member Governments.

(42) The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee, under its terms of reference, could make any recommendation which it deemed fitting in respect of the adoption or modification of a proposal. In reply to a further comment by the delegate of India, he said that the Conference was free to take whatever action it considered advisable on the Committee's recommendations, but the Committee had freedom of recommendation.

(43) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should recommend adoption of the resolution on the understanding that the Secretariat would consider it within the framework described by the Chairman in respect of the previous section.

(44) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal.

(45) Mr. CABOUAT (France) pointed out that the procedure proposed by the United States delegate was contrary to that which the Committee had recently decided to follow. It was not a question of adopting a resolution, but of including the item in a general resolution giving the Director-General directives for the execution of the programme for 1955-56 and the preparation of the programme for 1957-58.

(46) Mr. LEE (United States of America) accepted that interpretation.

(47) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that his idea was to sort the draft resolutions into two lists of directives to the Director-General: (1) for action under the programme for 1955-56 and (2) for use in the preparation of the programme for 1957-58. The substance of draft resolutions would be given in one or other of those lists, or possibly in both. He felt that the draft resolution at present under discussion should appear only in the second list.

(48) The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal of the United States delegate was henceforth to be envisaged under the second category of projects, those calling for study with a view to possible inclusion in the programme for 1957-58.

(49) The proposal was adopted unanimously.

(50) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) introduced the fourth point in the draft resolution - "Development of Scientific Co-operation", which had several subdivisions. Section (a) - symposia on subjects connected with geological and geophysical studies of the earth's crust in South East Asia - was largely covered by ICSU's arrangements for a "Geophysical Year" in 1957-58 and it seemed pointless to stage another symposium over and above its programme, in which Unesco was collaborating. Section (b) provided for regional symposia on the development of wind, water and solar energy; there again, a symposium on the same subject had recently been held in Delhi and Mr. Auger thought that the publication of the proceedings of that meeting would achieve the delegate of India's purpose. Section (c) concerned symposia on calendar reforms and it would be recalled that the Executive Board had taken the view that it was an activity falling rather within the province of the United Nations; Unesco could deal only with the scientific aspect, which had already been dealt with thoroughly. In any case, the obstacles to the adoption of a universal calendar were less scientific than political.

(51) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed the adoption of the Executive Board's recommendation.

(52) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal, which was adopted unanimously.

(53) Taking the last paragraph in the resolution (Subvention of $3,000 to the Indian National Committee for Mathematics), the CHAIRMAN recalled that the Executive Board was in favour of the resolution.

(54) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the project was one to which the Union of Mathematical Science attached great importance.

(Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether the subvention would meet the criteria established for Unesco subventions.

(56) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that it would meet the criteria for contracts but not for subventions.

(57) Mr. LEE (United States of America) opposed the recommendation on the grounds that the project needed more study. A large sum of money was involved and it should be weighed up as carefully as other projects.

(58) The proposal of the United States delegate, seconded by the delegate of Canada, that the Committee should not recommend adoption of the resolution was adopted by 5 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions.

DR/29: International Computation Centre

(59) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board recommended adoption of the resolution in order to keep the project in force pending the decision of Member States on ratification.

(60) The CHAIRMAN asked for information on the budgetary implications of the project.

(61) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that, if the Committee decided, in accordance with the Italian proposal, that a subvention should be granted to the Preparatory Committee of the Computation Centre, the Secretariat would propose to allocate a total sum of $3,000 for the two years. Obviously, if the necessary ratifications were not secured in the two-year period 1955-56, all aid from Unesco to the Committee would cease. One thousand five hundred dollars would be appropriated for each of the two years, on the understanding that, if all the ratifications were secured in 1955, the subvention to the Committee for 1956 would automatically lapse. To date, four ratifications had been received, coming, in chronological order, from Japan, Belgium, Italy and Ceylon. Six further ratifications were needed for the Centre to come legally into being.

(62) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked whether the project was described in the proposed programme and budget.

(63) The CHAIRMAN said that it had appeared in previous programmes but was not included in the present proposals.

(64) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) confirmed that nothing was included in the proposed programme for 1955-56; what the Italian delegation was asking for was the restoration of the appropriations in the 1953-54 budget of $5,000 per year. The intention of the Secretariat was to set aside $1,500 per year for this project, on the understanding that, if ten ratifications were received before 1956, the appropriation for 1956 would be cancelled automatically.

(65) In reply to a question from Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) why there was no appropriation in the proposed programme for 1955-56 Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that the omission was on grounds of principle: with a convention in prospect, the Secretariat was bound to assume that it would be ratified and that there would be no time-lag between its signature and its entry into force. The Italian delegation, on the other

hand, anticipated such a time-lag and was requesting aid to cover it.

(66) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked the nature of the Preparatory Committee's present work.

(67) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that its task was to prepare premises for the prospective centre; as a result of the contract concluded by Unesco in 1954, office space had been made available to the Centre in Rome and some people were already working there. The Committee had to draw up a list of the material needed in order that the Centre might start to operate immediately the necessary ratifications were received. The Italian Organizing Committee could continue that preparatory work.

(68) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked whether, if the Centre was only to come into existence at an unspecified date in the future, there would be a loss on time and money already expended and on deterioration of machinery.

(69) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that the Italian Organizing Committee was conducting negotiations with manufacturers of computation machines with a view to securing them on free loan for a given term of years or to obtaining special purchase prices. The work already done would be lost if suspended, as the entire series of negotiations would have to be started again.

(70) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked whether the assistance in question could not take the form of a subvention.

(71) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the assistance given to the Italian Organizing Committee had been in the form of contracts for the fitting out of the offices and that it was requesting the extension of those contracts.

(72) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Centre was mentioned in paragraph 61 of Chapter 2 of the proposed programme and budget in conjunction with the European Centre for Nuclear Research. The latter was established under the impetus of Unesco but with the entire cost provided by participating Member States; he wondered whether the same principle was applied to the Computation Centre. In that case, the grant should be in the form of a loan and not a subvention, and he asked whether or not it would be recoverable.

(73) To clarify the proceedings, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that the European Centre for Nuclear Research had cost Unesco the relatively low sum of $25,000, because the main expenses of preparation had been borne by the Member States of the interim and, later, the permanent body. In the case of the Italian Committee, provision had been made for a sum of $60,000 as a loan repayable within three years, but, as the Centre had not started operations, the relevant authorization had lapsed. What was henceforth proposed was merely the conclusion of an ordinary contract of $1,500 per year.

(74) The CHAIRMAN asked how many countries had signed the agreement and how many ratifications might be expected in the near future, bearing in mind legislative procedures in the respective countries.

(75) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that eleven signatures had been received, which was one more than the number of ratifications required to bring the Convention into force.

(76) Mr. BOW (Canada) asked whether the Committee or the Secretariat had the right to amend a governmental resolution in respect of the form or the amount of the money involved. He also wished to know how long the Convention had been open for ratification and how many instruments had been deposited within the past year.

(77) The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee had the power to recommend modifications and had in fact done so with regard to a previous project.

(78) Mr. BOW (Canada) pointed out that in that instance a representative of the proposing government had been present. There was no Italian representative at the present discussions.

(79) The CHAIRMAN said that the Italian delegate to the Programme and Budget Commission would have an opportunity to express his views.

(80) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the Convention had been open to ratification since 1952; the Italian ratification - which was essential - had not been secured until 1954 and there were grounds for hoping that it would lead to other ratifications, though it had to be remembered that a somewhat lengthy procedure was always involved.

(81) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General)stated that the eleven signatories were Belgium, Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Turkey, Netherlands and Ceylon.

(82) Mr. CABOUAT (France) moved that the Committee recommend adoption of the project in contract form, with appropriations reduced to a total sum of $3,000 for the two years.

(83) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that the application be rejected. If his motion were defeated, he would propose that a grant be made in the form of a recoverable loan.

(84) The proposal of the United Kingdom delegate, seconded by the delegate of Norway, was rejected by 3 votes to 5 with 3 abstentions.

(85) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) submitted his alternative proposal as an amendment to the proposal of the delegate of France, agreeing to the reduction of the figure to $3,000.

(86) The delegate of France accepted the amendment.

(87) In reply to a question from Mr. AVIDOR(Israel) the CHAIRMAN said that the loan would be made to the Interim Committee.

(88) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew attention to a legal difficulty, namely, that the advance would be made to one body - the Preparatory Committee - but would be repayable by another, the Computation Centre, when and if it came into existence.

(89) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether, should the Convention not be ratified, the Preparatory Committee would be in a position to repay the loan.

(90) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that he would find it difficult to answer that question.

(91) The proposal of the delegate of France, amended and seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, was adopted by 9 votes to nil, with 1 abstention.

(92) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked how the loan would be recovered if, through lack of ratifications, the Interim Committee ceased to function.

(93) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed to make a statement on this point at a later stage.

DR/35: Conservation of Natural Resources

(94) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) introduced draft resolutions DR/35, DR/54 and DR/60, which the Executive Board had dealt with together because all three related to the same problem. In very many countries, dam building, irrigation and other work were undertaken for commercial ends without regard to the wider considerations of their possible long-term effects on hydrology, flora and fauna. It was suggested(DR/35) that a committee composed of engineers, public works contractors and naturalists be convened to draw up a scheme for the requisite research, which would be handled by contract. The proposal in DR/54 was connected with that project and DR/60 concerned the publication of a book. The Executive Board had suggested that the project be executed in three stages: (1) preparatory stage (bibliographical research and a brief report on work already carried out); (2) meeting of an expert committee to draw the inferences from the preliminary investigations; (3) publication of results in a book suitable for the general public. The Executive Board's idea was that only the first two stages could be attacked in 1955 and 1956 and that the appropriations would be for the preparatory work and the meeting of the committee. The Secretariat had suggested reducing the appropriations requested by concluding a contract of $2,000 for the first item and allocating $4,000 for the meeting of experts, i.e. a total of $6,000 for the two years.

(95) The CHAIRMAN asked whether it was a fact that the Executive Board had decided in favour of draft resolution DR/35 and against draft resolution DR/54.

(96) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) believed that the Executive Board had approved DR/35 and DR/60, which related to the effects of catchment works on flora and fauna, but without approving the figures suggested and with postponement of the third stage of the work until 1957-58. Document DR/54 had not been considered by the Executive Board.

(97) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) confirmed the statement of the Director of the Department of Natural Sciences. The Executive Board had recommended that the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/60 be postponed until the ninth session of the General Conference.

(98) The CHAIRMAN said that three stages were envisaged: initial bibliographical work, establishing a committee of experts, and publication of the results for inclusion in the 1957-58 programme.

(99) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether, in so far as the project related to the construction of hydroelectric dams, Unesco had approached non-governmental organizations or the industries concerned with a view to obtaining financial and other assistance.

(100) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) was under the impression that what the delegate of the United Kingdom had in mind was not so much the International Union for the Protection of Nature as the International Commission on Large Dams and the World Power Conference, which were concerned exclusively with the technical aspect of hydraulic works without regard to their biological implications. What was proposed was a joint committee consisting of representatives of the three organizations he had just mentioned. The proposed appropriations were very modest ($2,000 and $4,000), as the Secretariat was counting on a financial contribution from those organizations, which could not but be interested in the question.

(101) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the resolutions concerned a very important subject, on which there had been much investigation, both nationally and internationally. He proposed that, as with earlier resolutions, the Secretariat be authorized to draw up plans during 1955-56 and prepare proposals for the 1957-58 period.

(102) The CHAIRMAN defined the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America as recommending the acceptance of the tenor of the projects and authorizing the Director-General to make a study in 1955-56 with a view to possible proposals in the 1957-58 programme.

(103) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that it had already been agreed to give priority to arid zone research and he assumed that the Secretariat would bear that in mind if any additional funds should be available.

(104) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) reminded the Committee that arid zone matters were the responsibility of an Advisory Committee which commended specific tasks to the Secretariat. The suggestion of the United States delegate to include the problem of dams in the Committee's responsibilities would have to go before the Executive Board and the Committee itself.

(105) The CHAIRMAN, referring to the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America (paragraph 101) said that the Director-General would be authorized in 1955-56 to study the question in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Arid Zones and, if the results were satisfactory, to include proposals for further work in 1957-58.

(106) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) suggested that the proposed survey be combined with the studies advocated by the delegation of Uruguay (document DR/42), which appeared to have a connexion with the subject under discussion.

(107) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) did not see how the proposal in DR/42 could be combined with the other three (DR/35, DR/54 and DR/60), which embodied purely technical proposals, whereas the suggestion of the delegation of Uruguay was only to awaken the public to the question of the conservation of natural resources in general.

(108) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) thanked the representative of Mexico for his kind thought, but agreed with Mr. Auger that the draft resolution submitted by Uruguay differed fundamentally from that of France in document DR/35. The Uruguayan proposal related rather to the preservation of flora and fauna and the soil, and should be studied separately.

(109) The CHAIRMAN thanked the delegate of Uruguay and said that, if there were no objection, DR/42 would be dealt with separately.

(110) In the hope of soon reaching a solution, Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked Mr. Auger what the Secretariat's budget estimates would be if the Committee advised the Programme and Budget Commission to combine the three draft resolutions.

(111) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that, as he had already indicated, the budget estimates for the three resolutions together, excluding the publication of the book were $6,000, i.e. $2,000 for the preparatory study and $4,000 for the meeting of the proposed Committee. That meeting would be possible only if the organizations concerned also made a financial contribution. The book suggested might be published in 1957-58.

(112) Mr. BOW (Canada) seconded the United States delegate's proposal, in the interest of concentration of the programme, and on the understanding that the project would be considered in direct relation to arid zone research.

(113) Mr. CABOUAT (France) pointed out that the proposed activities transcended the scope of arid zone research and involved other types of regions as well. He therefore formally moved that the Director-General be authorized to undertake such activities with a total appropriation of $6,000 for the next two years, and that the whole project be given a lower priority.

(114) The above proposal was seconded by Mr. AVIDOR (Israel).

(115) The proposal of the delegate of the United States of America was put to the vote and adopted by 6 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

(116) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that the Committee's decision meant that the project would be included in the second list of suggestions, the list of pointers for the preparation of the programme for 1957-58.

DRs 42 and 58

(117) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) outlined the substance of DR/42 and DR/58, and gave additional details. For the special case to which DR/58 related, he quoted an estimate of $6,000. The Executive Board had approved all those suggestions, together with the appropriation of $6,000 for the special purpose of publishing a book.

(118) In reply to a question from Mr. AVIDOR(Israel), the CHAIRMAN said that the Executive Board's attitude had been favourable to both resolutions, the total budget for which was $6,000.

(119) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the resolutions be dealt with in the way he had suggested for previous projects.

(120) The proposal, seconded by the delegates of the United Kingdom and Germany, was adopted by 8 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

(121) Mr. CABOUAT (France) remarked that the whole position needed clarifying; as a result of the voting on the two resolutions, the Director-General was authorized to undertake in 1955-56, with the funds provided in the draft programme and budget, studies relating to the conservation of natural resources and teaching on that subject. Yet the Assistant Director-General seemed to think that the result of the voting was merely to provide directives for the preparation of the programme for 1957-58.

(122) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that he had not intended to bring in new issues.

(123) The CHAIRMAN said that his understanding was that the Director-General would study the proposals themselves and not the studies which they provided for, with a view to possible inclusion of precise proposals in the 1957-58 programme.

(124) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that no action by the Secretariat was planned in 1955-56, beyond preparatory studies

with a view to the inclusion in the programme for 1957-58 of resolutions defining specific tasks.

(125) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the meeting that no funds were available, so that the Secretariat could not even put preliminary studies in hand; all it could do was to consider the possibility of including the project in the future programme.

(126) Mr. CABOUAT (France) explained that he had raised the question because the delegate of the United States of America apparently anticipated that the actual work would be begun in 1955-56.

(127) The CHAIRMAN said that the Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research would be called on to advise the Director-General in his study.

(128) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) repeated that there was no money available.

(129) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that, as the project was not included in the programme for 1955-56, the Secretariat could not take action on it.

DR/44: Establishment in Spain of a Pilot Centre for the Study of Methods of Teaching Science in Secondary Schools

(130) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had studied documents 8C/DR/44 and 8C/DR/51 together and was not in favour of the latter. With regard to the former, the Board recommended that the proposal be carried out under the technical assistance programme.

(131) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that DR/51 was not identical with DR/44. The latter provided for the establishment of "a Latin American Pilot Centre for the study of methods of teaching science in secondary schools and for the training of teachers of scientific and technical subjects for such schools", whereas DR/51 provided explicitly for the establishment of such a centre in Spain. Was DR/51, therefore, an amplification of DR/44?

(132) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that, offhand, such appeared to be the case.

(133) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) suggested that, as the representative of Spain was present, perhaps he could say whether that interpretation of the draft resolution was correct.

(134) The CHAIRMAN, in reply to a question from the delegate of Israel, confirmed that the Executive Board had recommended that the Government of Spain be advised to apply for technical assistance, and the proposal would accordingly not be submitted to the General Conference.

(135) A proposal by the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, that the Executive Board's recommendation be followed, was adopted unanimously.

(136) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the delegate of Spain would have an opportunity of stating his point of view at a later stage.

DR/47: Scientific Exchanges

(137) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board was interested in the proposal but, in the light of information from the Director, Department of Natural Sciences and the Director, Department of Cultural Activities, had decided to refer it to the International Council of Museums.

(138) Acceptance of the Executive Board's recommendation was proposed by the delegate of Canada, seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom and adopted unanimously.

(139) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) wished to hear from Mrs. Pecson what the Executive Board's views were on the subject.

(140) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) explained that the Board regarded the activity proposed by the Uruguayan delegation as extremely important;however, a body responsible for carrying out such work was already in existence. That did not mean that the Board rejected the Uruguayan proposal.

(141) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General)asked whether the Executive Board intended that the meeting of directors of zoological gardens, referred to in DR/47, should be financed out of ICOM's budget, or whether it felt that, since an additional task was to be imposed on the Council, a special contract should be concluded with it.

(142) The CHAIRMAN interpreted the vote as recommending the transfer to ICOM, which would be free to take it up or not, within the limits of its own budgetary resources. Replying to a question from the delegate of Israel, he said that ICOM might possibly ask for a subvention.

DR/56: Dissemination of Science

(143) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Board had postponed a decision pending further information.

(144) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought that it would be difficult to throw any further light on the question. As he did not know the Scientific Information Centre of the Municipality of Montevideo, it was difficult for him to form an idea of what its use would mean. It was impossible to give any figures for the project until a thorough preparatory study had been made.

(145) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether it would be possible to carry out the study to which Mr. Auger had referred before the Committee took a decision in the matter and, if not, whether the draft resolution of Uruguay would have to be rejected.

(146) The CHAIRMAN said that the procedure would be first a clarification from the delegate of Uruguay, then comments by the Executive Board, after which the Secretariat would fix budgetary limitations and the Advisory Committee would consider action before the proposal was submitted to the Programme Commission.

(147) Mr. LEE (United States of America) objected that action could not be taken in time for the matter to be dealt with by the present Conference. There was considerable merit in the project, but there was need for much investigation before the Scientific Information Centre in Montevideo could be accepted as a pilot project. He proposed that, as with earlier resolutions, the matter be referred to the Secretariat for study.

(148) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that the possibility of action under the technical assistance programme should be considered.

(149) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that a study should be made in 1955-56 and the project be included in the proposals for 1957-58 either under the regular programme or under the technical assistance programme.

(150) Mr. RANIERI (Uruguay) found the proposed dates satisfactory and stated that the Uruguayan authorities would gladly provide whoever was responsible for the initial study with all the data and information he might require.

(151) The proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

DR/59: Arid Zone

(152) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had considered it unnecessary to endorse the proposal since the project already appeared in the programme.

(153) It was agreed that no action was necessary.

DR/61: Physical Oceanography and Marine Biology

(154) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board, after an explanation by the Director, Department of Natural Sciences, had agreed to support the Secretariat's proposal to set up an advisory committee on marine biology.

(155) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) recalled that, when the question of oceanography had been raised, he had made a statement proposing certain modifications of the programme. The proposal in DR/61, of which he had been unaware at that time, put the Secretariat's proposals in a rather more legal form. Accordingly, acceptance of this Japanese proposal would amount, for the Secretariat, to acceptance of its own proposals, involving transfers within the budget with no additional funds.

(156) Document DR/61 was approved.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

# EIGHTEENTH MEETING

*11 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.3 OF THE AGENDA: DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBER STATES** (continued)

Draft resolutions affecting the Department of Social Sciences

DR/5: Peaceful Co-operation

(1) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had not recommended this resolution because it felt that the proposed study would not produce practical results for Unesco's work.

(2) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the major part of this resolution consisted of an appeal to the General Conference for an expression of faith in the possibilities of resolving all tensions through the exercise of restraint, tolerance, understanding and goodwill. The last sentence proposed a study. The Secretariat thought that it would be difficult to propose a work plan for such a study; more information was required. Preliminary work was necessary, which could be undertaken in 1955 and 1956 and could be used to clarify the issue. It would consist of asking international congresses to include the subject on their agendas. Unesco would then give contracts for undertaking the study and, finally, the services of a consultant would be required to make an inventory of all research work being done in this connexion. In future years, the work could

be digested and channelled to give the best results. The budgetary implications for the preliminary work in 1955-56 would amount to $14,000.

(3) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) added an amendment to the text of the resolution. The Indian Government had written to the Secretariat and asked that the word "coexistence" in the title should be changed to the word "co-operation".
(4) With regard to the resolution, he said that the Indian Government had felt the necessity of finding a modus vivendi in the interests of peace. The United Nations were primarily interested in the political aspects, but there was no reason why Unesco should not interest itself in other aspects, especially the social aspect. In the interests of peace the matter was urgent. It might not be possible for Unesco to undertake the complete study at once, but he saw no reason why it should not make an impact in slow and steady stages. He suggested that, by engaging in this project, Unesco could promote an atmosphere of peace, sanity and goodwill.

(5) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that, at the meeting of the Executive Board when this resolution had been discussed, the feeling had been that, as unfortunately the idea of peaceful co-operation had a political connotation, Unesco would be advised not to embark on any work connected with it, in case it became embroiled in political matters which would yield no useful practical results. He reminded the meeting that, at its seventh session, the General Conference had appointed a Committee which was seeking a means of approach by Unesco in the field of co-operation. The basic purpose of co-operation was expressed in Unesco's programme as a whole.
(6) He proposed that the Committee should abide by the decision of the Executive Board and not recommend this resolution to the General Conference.

(7) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that everyone sympathized with the idea behind the resolution, as it would encourage the belief that a time would come when there would no longer be racial discrimination. However, he supported the United States delegate for the reasons which Mr. Lee had given. Research in this field went beyond technical problems and extended into the domestic and foreign policies of countries. Unesco could not undertake a study without examining all the United Nations and Member States in the light of the United Nations Charter, a formidable task. He hoped that resolution 3.4 in the programme of the Department of Social Sciences would be sufficient to take care of the main activities in the field.

(8) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) pointed out that the resolution was in two parts and asked for an explanation of the difference between the second part of this resolution and resolution 3.4 in the programme of the Department of Social Sciences.

(9) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that resolution 3.4 proposed that work begun on certain projects should be continued. Other more specific activities were being proposed for 1955-56, which, if approved by the General Conference, would gradually help to throw light on the elements of the very complicated problem. There was no proposal to embark on a study of the problem itself.

(10) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) would vote in favour of the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America on technical grounds and because he felt that the draft resolution proposed by the delegation of India was outside the compass of Unesco's current programme. He recalled that the preamble to Unesco's Constitution referred explicitly to the wish of Member States to find peaceful means of resolving tensions, and that had been the spirit to which the Mexican Government's delegations to organs and agencies of the United Nations had consistently conformed. Nevertheless, he felt that Unesco had no adequate means at its disposal to implement the draft resolution of the delegation of India.

(11) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that the Committee should abide by the decision of the Executive Board and not recommend the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/5 to the General Conference.

(12) The proposal was adopted by 9 votes in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

DR/8: Race Relations

(13) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had strongly recommended this resolution to the General Conference.

(14) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) remarked that the resolution fitted in with the projects included in paragraphs 174-180 of the programme of the Department of Social Sciences. The Committee had already discussed these projects and had recommended that they be given a high priority. The Secretariat considered that the formulation of a work plan was possible over a wide field, but, as it had already embarked on its programme, did not want to include projects having budgetary implications. In the past, pamphlets had been produced which had now reached a circulation of a quarter of a million copies in various languages. The work of translating these pamphlets into yet more languages could be increased and, if the necessary sums were pooled with those for other translation work, it would only be necessary to ask for a further $8,000 for the period 1955-56.
(15) Further, work in schools could be extended. For that purpose, the Departments of Education and Social Sciences would have to convene a conference of educators, social scientists and educational administrators to consider at what age it would be best to introduce teaching directed against racial discrimination and prejudice. The budget estimate for this work amounted to $11,192.

(16) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought that, as this subject had been of continuous concern to Unesco from the first, it was fitting that work should be continued. After an examination of the practical application of the efforts made in this area,

he recommended slight changes to the wording of the resolution.

(17) The new wording would be as follows:

"Bearing in mind that discrimination, as defined in Article II of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on the basis of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status is one of the greatest dangers to peace and to human dignity, noting that Unesco has already taken some commendable steps in producing helpful publications on the subject of race and race relations, regretting that discrimination in very ugly forms continues to vitiate relations between human beings in certain areas of the world, the General Conference calls upon all Member States and National Commissions of Unesco to eradicate in all possible ways the evil of discrimination and authorizes the Director-General, in carrying out Unesco's programme, to give special attention to measures designed to eliminate such discrimination".

(18) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) remarked that the Indian proposal contained in document 8C/DR/8 had a definite purpose, which was to give particular emphasis to the racial aspect of discrimination, and he proposed that the resolution should be left as it stood.

(19) The CHAIRMAN put the United States proposal to the vote. The proposal is rejected by 2 votes in favour, 7 against and 2 abstentions.

(20) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) felt it essential to seek further enlightenment from the Committee. A work plan had been proposed; it was not final and was liable to readjustment. But it would be illogical to adopt a programme as it stood and then to refuse approval of the appropriations necessary to carry it out.

(21) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) concurred in the remarks of the Assistant Director-General. If publications on racial questions had been given a high priority, it would be illogical to cut the appropriations requested. Those publications were of great help in combating racial prejudice.

(22) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) wondered whether, as the contents of the resolution were approved by the Committee, the project could be fitted into the programme of the Department of Social Sciences without further budgetary expense. It was certain that these projects had a high priority.

(23) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) agreed that the proposed project could be fitted into the Department's programme and that it would have a high priority but reminded the Committee that it would be necessary to increase the budget estimates if this were done.

(24) In answer to a question from Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) who asked what the present total budget was, Mrs. MYRDAL replied that the contracts for two new pamphlets with cost of printing would amount to between $3,000 and $4,000. Personnel costs would amount to a total of approximately $37,000 for each of the years 1955 and 1956 over the whole project, while programme costs would amount to $35,000 in 1955 and $30,000 in 1956.

(25) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the project on race relations was only part of a whole. To finance the whole would require the sum indicated in paragraph 180, plus the cost of printing the two booklets.

(26) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) gave details of the budget for this project: 2 manuals $2,820, information on the campaign $1,000, 2 brochures $2,940, comparative research approximately $1,000. Total: $7,760. To which would have to be added personnel costs, which took up half the total amount (27% of the Social Sciences budget) allocated to the whole project (3.5) = $26,000 for the two years.

(27) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) hoped that the Committee would be prepared to vote an adequate sum.

(28) The Executive Board's proposal to allocate $19,192 for the two years to the Resolution on Race Relations contained in document 8C/DR/8 was put to the vote and adopted by 9 in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

DR/13: Continuation of subsidy to the International Society of Criminology

(29) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had considered the activities outlined in this resolution not sufficiently close to those of Unesco, and therefore did not recommend adoption of the proposal.

(30) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) added that the proposal implied a subvention of $1,000 a year.

(31) The recommendation of the Executive Board was put to the vote and adopted by 8 in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

DR/21: Resolutions on International Understanding

(32) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) informed the Committee that the Executive Board had taken this draft resolution in four parts. The first part was made up of the proposal to hold two seminars in 1955-56 and to disseminate Gandhian ideas and techniques. The Board had asked that this resolution should be resubmitted at the ninth session of the General Conference.

(33) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that this part fitted in with project 3.4, Social Sciences, paragraphs 148-150 which had been worked out on the basis of a previous resolution submitted by the Indian National Commission. Gandhian techniques were one of the methods to be studied. The new resolution went further in proposing seminars that would cost $20,000 to $30,000 each or, if run on the lines of regional seminars, $8,000 each.

(34) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the recommendation of the Executive Board be accepted.

(35) The proposal seconded by Mr. COWELL(United Kingdom) was put to the vote and adopted by 9 in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

(36) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had asked that the second part - paragraph 2 of the draft resolution - on exploring the possibilities of translation of Gandhian literature, could be recommended, on the understanding that there would be no financial implications.

(37) At the suggestion of the delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by the delegates of Norway and Belgium, that this recommendation be accepted, it was put to the vote and carried by 9 in favour, none against and 1 abstention.

(38) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the third part of the resolution (page 2), authorizing the Director-General to bring out a publication embodying the views of leading statesmen of the world, entitled "War and Peace", had not been recommended by the Board.

(39) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that this proposal had no relation to any of the special projects included in the 1955-56 programme. A suggestion along the same lines had been made by a working party at the previous session of the General Conference. A circular letter sent round afterwards had received only 10 answers, of which 3 were in the negative. She considered that the views of Member States would have to be taken into account, with printed statements by leading statesmen, involving much work of analysis and comparison. The total estimate for this wider proposal would be $17,000.

(40) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the resolution was not meant to refer to printed statements. It was proposed to invite living statesmen to make their confession of faith on the most vital problems of the day.

(41) The proposal by the delegate of the United States of America, supported by the delegate of the United Kingdom, to accept the recommendation of the Executive Board was put to the vote and adopted by 8 in favour, 1 against and 3 abstentions.

(42) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the last part of resolution No. 21, referring to a subvention of $3,000 for library and other equipment for a Delhi School of International Relations, had been found by the Executive Board to be inadmissible under existing regulations.

(43) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) agreed with the Executive Board's decision. She suggested that the Government of India might obtain technical aid for this school under the new resolution in the programme, paragraphs 135-139.

(44) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) reminded the meeting that it had agreed to the assistance of three Institutes in the German Federal Republic, and had that morning considered a subvention, contract or loan to the interim committee of the International Computation Centre. There was therefore surely no reason to exclude a subvention to the Delhi school.

(45) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that Unesco was empowered to grant subventions only to (1) international non-governmental organizations; (2) intergovernmental organizations; (3) organizations or preparatory committees set up in implementation of a specific resolution passed by the General Conference.

(46) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed the acceptance of the recommendation of the Executive Board.

(47) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) seconded the proposal, which was put to the vote and adopted by 10 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

Draft resolutions affecting the Department of Cultural Activities

DR/6 and DR/17: Dissemination of Asian and African culture in the West

(48) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Executive Board had taken the Indian delegation's draft resolutions contained in documents 8C/DR/6 and 8C/DR/17 together. The Board's view had been that the second of the documents tended more to specific action, whereas the first might be regarded as a general recommendation. The Board had concentrated on the second document.

(49) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the several items in the two documents were part of Unesco's normal commitments.

(50) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the Board's decisions on the various items in the draft resolutions had differed. It had approved the first item in DR/17, which in fact contained two distinct proposals: (1) the reproduction of works of art, which came under the regular programme and thus involved no new expenditure; and (2) the publication of "popular series of various arts" of the countries of Asia and Africa, about which it was rather difficult to reach any conclusion. On the budgetary side, an appropriation of $8,000 was suggested for 1956 and nothing for 1955.

(51) Mr. CABOUAT (France), seconded by Mr. LEE (United States of America), asked that the item be transferred to the general resolution on the 1957-58 programme.

(52) The proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 2 with one abstention.

(53) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) then commented on the second item in DR/17, dealing with art films and children's films,

referring the meeting to document 8C/5 Corrigendum on art films (paragraphs 162 a - 162 h, Mass Communication) and to document 8C/5 paragraphs 143-145 on children's films. It would be apparent from the passages he had indicated that the adoption of the resolution by the Conference would have no budgetary implications.

(54) This item in the Indian resolution (document 8C/DR/17) was referred back for further consideration.

(55) Mr. Thomas said that the third item in the Indian draft resolution was not recommended by the Executive Board. The type of activity involved was the business of the International Music Council. As far as oriental music was concerned, estimates for arrangement, annotating and distribution alone would account for $8,000 a year.

(56) It was decided to accept the view of the Executive Board.

(57) With regard to the fourth item - the establishment of a science museum in India - Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) noted that detailed estimates were given, reaching a total of $42,000 a year plus the cost of a fellowship payable by the Exchange of Persons Service. The project was not recommended by the Executive Board.

(58) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked whether there was no possibility of including the project in the existing programme.

(59) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that this was not impossible as regards the fellowship, but no provision had been made for the despatch of an expert and the provision of equipment worth $30,000.

(60) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) stressed the importance of the project and the value of any assistance given to it in the programme.

(61) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that the Director-General should be recommended to give all the assistance possible within the existing programme and budget.

(62) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) thought the intention of the Egyptian delegate was that all the possibilities of the existing budget be first exhausted, and recourse be had thereafter to the Government of India for the balance. Within the existing budget ceiling the sole possibility open was the provision of a fellowship. It was not possible to purchase and supply equipment. It might be possible to second an expert on museums for service in India but science museums were a very specialized field of museum work, which made the prospects of carrying out such a mission under the existing budget problematical.

(63) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) pointed out that there was little in common between experts on science museums and on ordinary museums.

(64) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the recommendation of the Executive Board be accepted.

(65) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) seconded the proposal.

(66) Mr. CABOUAT (France) enquired the cost of an expert mission on museums not forming part of the regular staff of the Secretariat.

(67) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that, on average, the cost of sending one expert on a year's mission to a particular country was $12,000. He agreed with the delegate of Belgium that the minimum length for a mission of science museum experts was six months.

(68) The motion of the delegates of the United States of America and Norway that the recommendation of the Executive Board be followed was adopted by 5 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

(69) On the fifth item in the Indian draft resolution, Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the proposed work was one of the normal activities of the International Theatre Institute, a non-governmental organization recognized by Unesco. Accordingly, in his view, no budgetary implications were likely to arise. The Executive Board had felt that the activity was desirable but outside the normal programme of Unesco and on that account it was not recommended.

(70) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) moved that the Committee accept the recommendation of the Executive Board.

(71) This proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

(72) The sixth item in the draft resolution, said Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities), had been recommended for adoption by the Executive Board. The Secretariat proposed to refer the project to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, a non-governmental organization recognized by Unesco. A contract for $2,000 with the Council would, however, be necessary.

(73) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) enquired whether the proposed institute would be an international one.

(74) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) replied that it would be open to any countries interested, but that the study it would be set up for was a specific one.

(75) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) reminded the meeting that the cost of such an institute would be high. Would it be run on the lines of the Institute of African Studies in London?

(76) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked where it was proposed to establish the institute. Similar institutes already in existence should be taken into account. Were they inadequate?

(77) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural

Activities) pointed out that the sixth item in the Indian draft resolution provided for an investigation and report.

(78) After a discussion whether it was possible to consider the location of the institute at that stage, Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that Unesco was merely asked to take the first steps in promoting a study of the need for such an institute.

(79) The delegate of India proposed that the recommendation of the Executive Board be adopted. The delegates of Egypt and France seconded the proposal, which was adopted by 6 in favour, none against and 4 abstentions.

(80) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board was interested in item 7 of the draft resolution, on exploring the possibilities of establishing a regional laboratory of research into preservation of monuments and works of art, but would like to see the outcome of the proposal at present in the programme for an international research centre, before considering this new suggestion.

(81) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities), dealing with item 7 of the Indian draft resolution, said that there was a scheme for an institute for the conservation of monuments and works of art, but not for a regional laboratory in South East Asia. The expert mission could be provided under the heading of aid to Member States (paragraphs 145-147, Cultural Activities).

(82) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that his delegation did not feel that the proposal as it stood in the programme met the requirements they had in view, and had therefore submitted this draft resolution.

(83) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the recommendation of the Executive Board be adopted.

(84) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the motion, which was put to the vote and adopted by 8 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

DR/25: Cultural Activities

(85) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Executive Board had recommended the adoption of the proposal, which involved little or no expenditure and was calculated to foster agreements among art publishers for the exchange of photographic blocks.

(86) A motion, proposed by the delegations of Belgium and the United States of America, that the conclusions of the Executive Board be accepted, was adopted by 10 votes to nil, with 1 abstention.

DR/26: Index Translationum

(87) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the resolution was recommended by the Executive Board, its object being to continue the annual publication of the Index Translationum beyond 1955. In the Corrigendum to the proposed programme and budget (document 8C/5) (paragraphs 83 a - 83 c, Cultural Activities) an appropriation of $10,000 was shown for 1955. The budgetary implications of the Italian proposal for 1956 would be a sum of $10,000, plus one new P.1 post, or a total of approximately $16,500, including indirect and incidental expenses.

(88) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) spoke in favour of the Italian resolution.

(89) Mr. CABOUAT (France) having moved that the recommendation of the Executive Board be followed, the motion was adopted by 3 votes to nil, with 3 abstentions.

DR/27: The Venetian School of Palladian Architecture

(90) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) reported that the Executive Board had not been in favour of the proposal.

(91) Mr. CABOUAT (France), seconded by Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium), endorsed the Executive Board's decision, with the proviso that the draft resolution should figure among the projects on which the decision was to be left to the Director-General.

(92) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought it would be more appropriate for the Italian Government or National Commission to ask Unesco to hold this meeting. He approved the recommendation of the Executive Board.

(93) The delegate of Israel seconded that proposal and it was adopted unanimously.

DR/30: International Association of the Plastic Arts

(94) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board considered that this draft resolution, which was without budgetary implications, merely strengthened provisions already included in the programme, and could therefore be passed on to the General Conference.

(95) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that the draft resolution should be rejected. A proposal that had been adopted did not need strengthening.

(96) The delegate of the United States of America seconded the proposal, which was adopted.

DR/31: Manuscripts in Europe relating to the Histories of Latin America and Asia

(97) The Executive Board, said Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board), recommended that this proposal should be referred for examination to the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies so that a concrete and detailed programme could be presented to the General Conference at its ninth session.

(98) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the object of the Japanese draft resolution was to extend to Asia the arrangements

already made for Latin America. The cost of the project for the two-year period 1955-56 would be $8,000 a year, making $16,000 in all.
(99) A point emerging from the discussion that followed was that the Latin American project had been given a lower priority.

(100) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) proposed the inclusion of an explicit statement that the Executive Board's suggestion did not modify the Japanese proposal.

(101) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) added that the adoption of the project would not affect the remainder of the programme and budget.

(102) The draft resolution was approved.

DR/41: Measures for the Development of Drama and the Spread of Popular Interest in the Theatre

(103) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the Executive Board had approved the draft resolution, which merely proposed an invitation to Member States and had no budgetary implications.

(104) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) moved the adoption of the Board's conclusions.

(105) Adopted by 8 votes to nil, with 2 abstentions.

DR/45: Publication of a Compilation of Copyright Laws in Spanish

(106) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that what had originally been contemplated had been the publication in extenso of an English edition. The cost would be $4,000. and the French version would probably require another $3,950. The original intention had been to issue an abridged version in Spanish. The draft resolution proposed by Spain amounted to a request for the publication of a Spanish version of the work in extenso, which would require $4,000.

(107) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) remarked that this was a highly technical matter. What would be the legal validity of a Spanish translation?

(108) The CHAIRMAN replied that the International Copyright Convention existed in Spanish and was of equal standing in all three languages.

(109) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) recalled that the publication of the compendium in all three languages had already been approved in the programme; he objected to the suggestion that the full collection should not be published in Spanish. A Spanish version of the complete corpus of legislation would greatly assist governments in adapting the copyright laws of their respective countries to the provisions of the Convention, and would furnish them with useful references.

(110) The delegate of the United States of America seconded the draft resolution contained in document 8C/DR/45, which was adopted by 9 votes to nil, with 2 abstentions.

DR/46 Exchanges between Museums

(111) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) indicated that the Executive Board had recommended that this resolution be passed to the International Council of Museums (ICOM).

(112) On the motion of the delegate of the United States of America, seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom, the Executive Board's recommendation was approved by 9 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

DR/3: World Culture, Science and Education Week and Unesco Awards

(113) As the Executive Board had not approved the first part of the project, Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the cost of the meeting would be $6,000. That would lay a fairly heavy burden upon Member States.

(114) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) opposed the proposal contained in document 8C/DR/3. If there were to be a culture week, there might be some danger lest culture were not regarded as necessary during the rest of the year. Nothing would be gained by the proposal.

(115) The proposal was rejected by none in favour, 10 against and 1 abstention.

(116) Regarding the Unesco awards (second part of the proposal in document 8C/DR/3), which had also not been approved by the Executive Board, Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the project was perfectly within the scope of the Department of Cultural Activities. Unesco would be required to select the panel of judges but the provision of the prizes would be the business of Member States or even of private individuals. Unesco would only have to supply the medals and diplomas. On the analogy of experience with the Kalinga Prize, it was probable that the budget for the project would be in the neighbourhood of $4,540 a year.

(117) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that prizes were not in favour in his country. The field was rather large and Unesco prizes might soon debase the currency. Genius should shine with its own brilliance. The proposal should be postponed for further consideration.

(118) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that, although prizes were appreciated in the United States, he seconded the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom, because Unesco had work of higher priority on hand.

(119) The proposal to defer consideration of the second part of draft resolution No.3 was put to the vote and adopted by 10 in favour, none against and 1 abstention.

Draft Resolutions affecting the Department of Mass Communication

DR/10 International Students Correspondence

(120) The Executive Board could not recommend this proposal in its present form.

(121) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) recalled that, at its last Congress, the Universal Postal Union had rejected the same proposal by 35 votes to 21. Unesco had no competence to make recommendations to UPU but could approach its own Member States to secure their support for the project at the UPU Congress in 1957.

(122) The meeting agreed unanimously with the suggestion, made by the delegate of the United States of America, that the recommendation of the Executive Board be accepted.

DR/11: United Nations Stamps honouring Unesco

(123) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had not been able to accept paragraph 1, as the postage stamp in question was already in preparation. With regard to paragraph 2, the United Nations Postal Administration could not return the proceeds of the issue to Unesco.

(124) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the Director-General had already approved the design of the proposed Unesco stamp to be put on sale, but the scheme outlined in the Austrian resolution could not be put into effect, although the stamp sold bore Unesco's name, no part of the proceeds could be passed to the Organization.

(125) The delegate of the United Kingdom proposed that the recommendation of the Executive Board be accepted.

(126) Agreed.

DR/16: Encouragement of International Co-operation in the Field of Educational Films

(127) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board recommended the appropriation asked for.

(128) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that the International Council for Educational Films had in hand the compilation of a dictionary of technical terms which the Secretariat was to reproduce in mimeograph form. To complete the preparation of the dictionary, an appropriation of $1,000 was advisable.

(129) Count von HARDENBERG (German Federal Republic) proposed that the recommendation of the Executive Board be followed.

(130) Mr. BOW (Canada) questioned the word "apportion", in the last paragraph. Was the money to be given by subvention, contract, or in what form?

(131) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the sum was for miscellaneous expenses which were to be covered by a contract.

(132) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) enquired whether the Director-General had received an independent application from the International Council for Educational Films before this resolution was submitted, whether it had been rejected, and, if so, why?

(133) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) explained that the Secretariat had given the International Council for Educational Films certain assurances but, as the proposed programme and budget had already been drawn up, the request for the requisite appropriations could not at that stage be made by the Secretariat.

(134) On the motion of the delegates of the German Federal Republic and Belgium that the decision of the Executive Board be accepted, the draft resolution was rejected. The voting being 4 in favour to 4 against, with 3 abstentions, the Chairman exercised his casting vote in favour of rejection in view of the number of abstentions.

DR/19: Mass Communication

(135) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) asked that the draft resolution be taken paragraph by paragraph, as it covered three matters on which the Executive Board had given three different decisions

(136) First item The establishment of an international film lending library, which the Board had felt it impossible to incorporate in the programme, was an important project but required very large funds. At Unesco headquarters, a small sample film library was maintained and an extremely comprehensive card index. International exchanges of educational films could be facilitated, which would be an excellent thing, but if it were a matter of establishing a full-scale film library, the cost would be $14,249 in 1955 and $14,373 in 1956.

(137) On the motion of the delegate of the United Kingdom that the Executive Board's conclusions be adopted, the first item in the Indian draft resolution was rejected by 9 votes to 1.

(138) Second item: The proposal to establish a research centre "for adaptation of scripts to modern methods of printing", Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) continued, had been rejected by the Executive Board. The Secretariat had taken the wording of that part of the resolution to mean the adaptation of ancient written characters to modern printing methods, but might have mistaken the matter. It would be possible to make world-wide contracts with the Graphic Arts Foundation, the cost of which would total $6,000.

(139) On the motion of the delegate of Norway, the Committee, by 10 votes to 1, followed the Executive Board in rejecting the proposal.

(140) Third item: Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of

Mass Communication) said that this item had been adequately handled for years past by the Department of Mass Communication. At the moment the Radio Division had arrangements with 115 countries for exchanges of programmes. There was a clearing house system for educational, scientific and cultural programmes and a description of these facilities was to be found in paragraph 137 of the chapter on Mass Communication. It could therefore be claimed that the recommendation was already covered by the provisions of the programme and, in any case the Executive Board had decided that nothing ought to be done about it.

(141) On the motion of the delegate of the United States of America that the conclusions of the Executive Board be accepted, item 3 was rejected by 7 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

# NINETEENTH MEETING

*12 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.3 OF THE AGENDA: DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBER STATES** (continued)

DR/20: Education

(1) The CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. Desjardins to explain the effect this resolution would have on the programme of the Department of Mass Communication and whether there would be any budgetary implications.

(2) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the Executive Board had accepted the draft resolution proposed by the delegation of India. He considered that it made a contribution to the work of Unesco and came within the scope of its programme for the coming period; it had no budgetary implications.

(3) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) did not think that anyone would oppose the resolution but wondered what effect it would have. As it was worded, it gave the impression that the Director-General had overlooked the contributions of the Asian and African countries. In addition, he wondered whether the resolution would prove useful, as the Director-General was already doing work in that field.

(4) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) wished to remove any feeling of apprehension with regard to the resolution, which had not been intended to convey that the Director-General had neglected certain parts of the world. The Government of India had confidence in the Director-General as custodian of the interests of all countries. With regard to the evolution of human rights, he thought that insufficient emphasis had been put on the efforts made by the Asian and African countries and was suggesting that an addition should be made to the existing material emphasizing the work being done in those parts of the world.

(5) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed amending the wording of the resolution by adding the words "as well as other countries" after the words "the Asian and African countries".

(6) The CHAIRMAN thought that, if that addition were made, the resolution would lose its purpose.

(7) There being no further comments, he put to the vote the proposal that a decision be taken to recommend to the Programme and Budget Commission the amendment proposed by the delegate of Israel. The proposal was adopted by 7 votes in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

(8) The CHAIRMAN then asked whether the Committee was prepared to forward the resolution to the Programme and Budget Commission in view of the recommendation made by the Executive Board.

(9) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) was surprised at the wording: "Authorizes the Director-General...".

(10) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the Indian resolution could be regarded as a general direction for special consideration by the Director-General in the execution of the 1955-56 programme.

(11) The Committee agreed to signify its approval of the spirit of the resolution and to suggest that the Director-General should use it as a guide when considering the programme for 1955-56.

DR/22: Mass Communication

(12) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) stated that the Executive Board did not recommend this resolution.

(13) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) considered the resolution was not very

clear. In any case, it simply asked for an extension of the work already undertaken by the Secretariat (Mass Communication, paragraphs 143-145). The Secretariat had provided for $6,000 a year; the Italian delegation was asking for $10,000 in 1955 and for $20,000 in 1956.

(14) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that, when considering paragraph 143 of the programme of the Department of Mass Communication, it had decided to give the project a low priority.

(15) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that the Committee should endorse the decision of the Executive Board and not recommend the resolution to the General Conference.

(16) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that the French Government departments which dealt with children's papers, radio and films had always been interested in Unesco's work in that field. His delegation was prepared to approve the Italian draft resolution, but with an additional appropriation of $6,000 in all, instead of the $30,000 proposed in document 8C/DR/22. Mr. Cabouat asked that the body of the resolution be treated as a directive to the Director-General and that the total appropriation be increased by $6,000 over the sums mentioned in paragraph 145.

(17) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal of the delegate of Israel, which was adopted by 8 votes in favour, 3 against and 0 abstentions.

DR/33: Discounts for Administrative Expenses in connexion with Unesco Coupons

(18) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) indicated that the Executive Board did not recommend this resolution to the General Conference.

(19) Mr. ZUCKERMAN (Department of Mass Communication) read resolution 5.422 and explained that the draft resolution proposed introducing a new element by asking that the Director-General should refrain from making participation of suppliers in the Unesco Coupon Scheme conditional upon their willingness to grant a discount. Up to the present, the Director-General had been able to decide whether or not to insist on a discount. If such a change were introduced, it was obvious that all suppliers would decide not to give a discount, which would be a great financial loss to Unesco. The amounts which Unesco had received in discount in 1953-54 were $30,000 and $40,000 respectively, and it was expected that the sum of $50,000 would be received in 1955-56. Those amounts would cover the overhead costs of the project.

(20) Mr. CABOUAT (France) explained that the draft resolution had been submitted at the request of the French authorities, which had noticed price increases or the refusal of suppliers to accept Unesco coupons.

(21) Mr. ZUCKERMAN (Department of Mass Communication) said that there had been a few cases at the beginning of the Scheme where no discounts had been given. The issue had been settled since then and 700 suppliers had now agreed in writing to grant a discount and had given an undertaking not to charge the discount back to the purchasers.

(22) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) proposed that the Committee should adopt the recommendation of the Executive Board not to consider the resolution contained in document 8C/DR/33.

(23) The CHAIRMAN put the proposal to the vote. It was adopted by 9 votes in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

DR/34: Educational Television Broadcasts

(24) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had agreed to recommend this proposal to the General Conference.

(25) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) noted that the resolution was divided into two parts. The first was an invitation to Member States and had no budgetary implications. The effect of the second would be to accord a higher priority to existing appropriations, half of which had been given a lower priority, while the other half stood as it was, under the decisions taken by the Committee.

(26) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium), seconded by Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), moved that the first part of the resolution be adopted.

(27) On being put to the vote, that proposal was adopted by 8 votes to nil, with 1 abstention.

(28) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said he would agree to consider the second part of the resolution as a general directive, designed simply to draw the attention of the Director-General to that item in the programme.

(29) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the seminar mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) was one which had already been started and whether the work proposed in sub-paragraph (b) was not one of the functions of the Unesco clearing house.

(30) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) remarked that the French resolution alluded to the arrangements for co-operation between Unesco and the French Broadcasting and Television Service, which had conducted an enquiry into the effects of its broadcasts in rural areas.

(31) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the resolution could be forwarded to the Director-General as a directive to guide him in work on the programme for 1955-56.

(32) The Committee agreed to this suggestion by 8 votes in favour, 0 against and 2 abstentions.

(33) The CHAIRMAN announced that the two related resolutions contained in documents 8C/DR/43 and 8C/DR/52 submitted by Spain had been withdrawn.

DR/47: Free Movement of Persons

(34) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) intimated that

the Executive Board did not recommend this resolution to the General Conference.

(35) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) said that the draft resolution proposed by the Uruguayan delegation sprang from considerations similar to those behind document 8C/PRG/8 (Report of the Director-General on the draft international instrument to reduce obstacles to the free movement of persons engaged in educational, scientific and cultural activities and wishing to travel for purposes connected with those activities).

(36) Mr. CABOUAT (France) considered that the question should be referred to a working party.

(37) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) stated that the relevant documents were under consideration by the working party on international agreements.

(38) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) moved the endorsement of the conclusions of the Executive Board on the draft resolution.

(39) A vote was taken and Mr. Florkin's proposal was adopted unanimously.

DR/57: Circulation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Publications

(40) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) intimated that the Executive Board did not recommend this resolution to the General Conference.

(41) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) informed the Committee that the issue of a universally recognized stamp was a matter for the Universal Postal Union.

(42) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) gave it as his opinion that there was very little chance of the Director-General's being able to persuade UPU.

(43) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) proposed that the recommendation of the Executive Board be approved.

(44) Adopted unanimously.

DR/23: Exchange of Persons

(45) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) intimated that this resolution had been recommended to the General Conference by the Executive Board.

(46) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that, in paragraphs 101 and 102 in the programme for the Exchange of Persons Service, it was recommended, as part of Unesco's programme, to grant a contract of $1,000 in 1955 and 1956 to the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers for the purpose of completing studies of the conditions relating to the movement of teaching personnel and educational administrators. The substance of the draft resolution would increase those contracts to $2,000 each year.

(47) In answer to a question from Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) as to the purpose of the contract, he replied that it was preferable to undertake those studies under contract rather than to have studies made by the Secretariat.

(48) The CHAIRMAN said that it would be difficult to recommend the contract unless fuller information were available.

(49) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that in 1953 the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers had made studies of equivalences and of the main factors operative in the exchange of teachers. It was proposed that these studies should be continued and extended in 1955-56 in order to build up documentation on problems facing teachers in exchange schemes.

(50) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that use could be made of that information, but proposed, in view of the other projects, postponing a decision on the resolution and sending it to the Secretariat for study in preparation for the 1957-58 programme.

(51) Mr. BOW (Canada) supported the United States proposal. He hoped that, by referring the resolutions to the Director-General for the purpose of developing the programme for 1957-58, the Committee was not drafting the programme for 1957-58.

(52) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) replied that that was by no means the case.

(53) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that, if he had understood Mr. Carter correctly, the question would arise of increasing the annual appropriations by $2,000. If there were no such increase the Committee would have the option of referring the resolution to the Director-General as a guide, for the inclusion of specific proposals in the programme and budget for 1957-58.

(54) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Director-General would not be in a position to find the $4,000 concerned.

(55) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the resolution be considered by the Director-General for the 1957-58 programme.

(56) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that the Committee should agree to forward the contents of the resolution to the Director-General with a request that it should receive his consideration when formulating the programme for 1957-58.

(57) That proposal was adopted by 7 votes in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention.

(58) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) still wished to ask whether any contracts had been granted previously, and whether there was any document on the subject.

(59) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that a contract had been concluded in 1953 with the International Association of University Professors

and Lecturers, in co-operation with the International Association of Universities, to make a study of the equivalence of degrees between different universities. Nothing had been printed, but information was available for consultation, either through Unesco or the International Association of Universities, which had arranged for its publication.

DR/24: Exchange of Persons

(60) The Committee was informed that, in the opinion of the Executive Board, it would disturb the balance of the programme and the Board therefore did not recommend the resolution.

(61) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that this resolution would require a total budget of $21,000.

(62) The suggestion of the delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by the delegate of the United States of America, that the recommendation of the Executive Board be accepted, was put to the vote and adopted by 8 in favour, none against and 2 abstentions.

DR/2: Use of Russian as a Working Language of Unesco

(63) This was not a programme resolution, and the Executive Board was not in a position to recommend it.

(64) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union contained an ambiguity in the preamble, where it spoke of adopting Russian as one of Unesco's working languages "on the same footing as English, French and Spanish". Unesco had only two working languages, English and French. Spanish was not a working language except at the General Conference.
(65) On the assumption that Russian were adopted on the same footing as French and English, Mr. Maheu presented the following table of estimated costs:

| | 1955 | 1956 |
|---|---|---|
| General Conference. . . . . | - | 100,750 |
| Sessions of Executive Board | 23,296 | 25,743 |
| Other conferences and meetings . . . . . | 168,374 | 150,355 |
| Publications . . . . . | 499,885 | 541,912 |
| Total . . . . . | $691,555 | 818,760 |
| Total for 1955-56 . . . . . | | $1,510,315 |

(66) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) (Chairman of the Budget Committee at the seventh session) stressed the importance of the draft resolution under discussion, and the need for the fullest possible information from the Secretariat on the subject. One and a half million dollars were required to place Russian on the same footing as English and French as working languages. What would be the budgetary implications if it were adopted on the same basis as Spanish?

(67) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the expenditure would then be that arising at the General Conference, or £100,750 in 1956, plus the cost of publications on the basis adopted for Spanish.

(68) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) said that the estimated cost of publications in Spanish for 1955 was $150,804 and for 1956, $152,814.

(69) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) mentioned that it would be necessary not only to employ additional staff (salaries and miscellaneous staff costs were included in the figures he had just given), but also to find additional office space for them. He doubted whether the additional staff could be housed in the present headquarters premises.

(70) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) stated that in some departments office space had reached saturation point; for example, the only means of increasing the output of the printing presses would be to work in two shifts, one by day and one by night, a system which would have financial repercussions. With regard to offices for the remainder of the staff, the possibilities varied in the different services. In any event, the permanent headquarters itself would not permit of a possible increase of 30% in the requirements, which the adoption of Russian as a general working language would entail for certain sections of the Service.

(71) Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) quoted, for purposes of comparison, the approximate cost to Unesco of renting the annex in the Rue de Lapérouse on a commercial basis. The figure was 8 or 10 thousand dollars.

(72) In reply to a question by Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium), it was stated that premises equivalent to those in the annex would suffice if Russian were used to the same extent as Spanish at the present time.

(73) The CHAIRMAN suggested that it might be necessary to obtain a clarification of the resolution. It was not certain whether the delegation which had submitted it wanted Russian on the same basis as English and French, or not.

(74) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) enquired whether in the proposed new headquarters building there was no room for possible additional staff.

(75) The CHAIRMAN thought an increase of about 15% had been provided for.

(76) Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) said that it was difficult to give a final answer on that subject, but that it would appear essential to make a fresh distribution of offices and to modify the plans of the new headquarters building.

(77) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked Mr. Leguen whether a rearrangement of the premises in the new building would have budgetary implications.

(78) Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) explained that the architects had already prepared their final plans and that budgetary implications were to be expected if the distribution of the premises were changed.

(79) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the Headquarters

Committee should envisage possibilities of the kind, in making its plans. It should not be forgotten that Unesco aimed at universal membership.

(80) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee was mindful of future needs, but could not at any particular moment foresee the possibilities of expansion in their entirety.

(81) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether a document similar to 8C/ADM/7 on Spanish as a working language, could not be provided with regard to the Russian proposal, with budgetary details and an estimate of the new work entailed. The problem could then be approached in stages, as it had been in the case of Spanish, beginning with simultaneous interpretation and the circulation of certain documents, and full adoption might be deferred to a subsequent General Conference.

(82) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) did not think it possible to comply with the request of the United Kingdom delegate, since, without detailed information about the wishes of the Soviet delegation, the Secretariat would have to fall back on mere conjecture. It seemed wiser to pursue the present practice of distinguishing several stages and to provide the maximum figure for each stage.
(83) In reply to a question from the delegate of Canada, Mr. Maheu said that it was possible, for purposes of comparison, to obtain figures from those Specialized Agencies which used Russian as a working language; but he thought that such comparisons would be less exact than budget estimates by stages.

(84) The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as new elements were bound to arise in connexion with the draft resolution under discussion - for instance, it could not be known yet whether simultaneous interpretation would be required at the Executive Board - the Committee should ask the Director-General for further clarification of the resolution, and recommend it to the General Committee for consideration throughout the Conference as new elements were brought to bear on it.

(85) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) wondered whether the Programme and Budget Commission was competent to make any remarks on the resolution at all.

(86) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) considered that the use of any particular language raised not only a budgetary but also a programme question. For instance, the publication of certain documents and books in Spanish was decided upon in order to reach people who could not be reached by the same publications in French or English.

(87) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), on a point of order, asked whether in view of the explanation given by the Secretariat the draft resolution should not be referred back to the Executive Board for its further comments.

(88) The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Board was free to provide comments or not as it thought fit.

(89) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) reminded the meeting of the decision taken by the Executive Board, contained in 39 EX/DIV/2, by which $50,000 had been set aside for the use of Russian during the eighth session of the Conference.

(90) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) recalled that the United Kingdom delegate, at an earlier meeting, had asked on what authority the Secretariat had undertaken to translate Conference documents into Russian. The authority came from a decision adopted by the Executive Board at its thirty-eighth session. The Assistant Director-General read out document 39 EX/DIV/2 which contained the text of that decision. He added that the actual expenditure amounted to about $25,000 out of a total of $50,000.

(91) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) pointed out that that had been a conditional resolution.

(92) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) considered that the translation of publications attached to the programme were programme matters. The use of Russian in General Conferences, etc. was a matter of general policy, but it still had a budgetary aspect which should be studied.

(93) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked whether the Secretariat could prepare a breakdown of the various categories of expenditure involved (interpretation, the different kinds of records and publications, etc.) in order that the proposal could be studied at each stage.

(94) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) promised the Committee that the Secretariat would prepare an analysis of each category of expenditure. It was understood, for the reasons already stated, that only maximum figures could be given for each category and each stage.

(95) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that if, as a working language, Russian were limited to interpretation, mimeographed records and printed summary and official records, it might be possible to carry out the necessary work on a contract basis, without the additional problems of space and personnel.

(96) In reply to the supposition put forward by the delegate of the United States of America, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat could accurately calculate the budgetary implications for restricted objectives, whenever such objectives were fixed.

(97) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) wished to clarify the notion of "contract" mentioned by the delegate of the United States of America. A contract could be concluded either with another international organization, or with staff engaged on a temporary basis, since, in the case under consideration, there was no private agency able to take over the work.
(98) Experience had shown that, when urgent and important work was involved, it was not possible to conclude contracts with the United Nations, whose peak periods frequently coincided with those of Unesco. As regarded temporary staff, of whom the Secretariat

had wide experience, since it constantly engaged such staff for sessions of the General Conference and the Executive Board, they always needed a stiffening of permanent staff well acquainted with the requirements and terminology of Unesco.

(99) The meeting agreed to defer the consideration of draft resolution No.2 until further information on it had been obtained.

DR/4: Need for Making Unesco a Global Organization

(100) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) explained why the Executive Board had not been able to recommend this resolution. It was in accordance with the spirit and goal of Unesco, but any application by a State to join the Organization was obliged to go through the Economic and Social Council. As some States might not be considered favourably by that body, it would not be wise to extend a general invitation.

(101) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) having enquired whether there were still any Member States in the United Nations that were not members of Unesco, he was informed by the Secretariat that Ethiopia and Iceland were in that category.

(102) A motion by the delegate of the United States of America to accept the recommendation of the Executive Board was adopted by 9 in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention.

(103) Mr. CABOUAT (France), speaking as Rapporteur of the Committee, said that in his report he would give the reasons why the Committee had not recommended the adoption of draft resolution DR/4.

(104) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) asked whether the delegate of India did not intend the word "invite" to mean: "take steps that would lead to admittance to Unesco"?

(105) The CHAIRMAN said that the Board had appreciated that point of view, but had considered it would be awkward to issue such an invitation, in view of the possibly adverse recommendation of the Economic and Social Council.

(106) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) did not see that the recommendation of the Council had any bearing on the value of the actual invitation.

(107) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) was glad the delegate of Egypt had raised the point. The resolution was not intended to imply that the Director-General should depart from any established constitutional practice.

(108) Mr FLORKIN (Belgium) suggested that the essential function of the Director-General was to carry out the programme as agreed by the General Conference of Unesco. It could hardly be expected that the Director-General should make any move to amend the latter's decisions.

(109) Mr. LEE (United States of America) did not wish to give the impression that his delegation believed in the principle of exclusivity. He would be glad to accept any rephrasing of the Indian resolution that might overcome the objections of the Executive Board.

(110) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) shared the view of the Executive Board that embarrassment might arise if a direct invitation were extended. More success might be obtained through the strategy of indirect approach. There was another consideration: at every General Conference, the Director-General addressed an invitation to all States to join Unesco. Therefore the method of direct approach was already in force.

(111) The CHAIRMAN said that the question should be reopened, although it had already been voted on. The vote had been taken accidentally while the delegate of Egypt had been asking to speak.

(112) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed an amended alternative resolution:

"Realizing that Unesco cannot fulfil effectively its great tasks of establishing the foundations of peace upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind without becoming truly global in its membership, character and scope, the General Conference would welcome the admission of all States not yet members of Unesco which have demonstrated that they are willing and able to abide by the obligations of the Unesco Constitution."

This formula, Mr. Lee suggested, would express the desire of the Conference while avoiding an embarrassing situation.

(113) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) thought that there could be no legal bar to the Director-General's extending an invitation. Embarrassments that might subsequently arise were quite unrelated to it.

(114) The amendment submitted by the delegate of the United States of America was put to the vote and adopted by 6 in favour, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

DR/7: Decentralization

(115) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had not recommended this resolution. A working party set up during the Conference would, not be able to cope with so complex a study.

(116) The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that, on the question of decentralization, it had already decided to recommend the setting up of a working party to the Programme and Budget Commission. Apparently that was contrary to the views of the Executive Board. The draft resolution added nothing to what was already being done.

(117) After a brief discussion, the meeting decided to leave its decision on the question of decentralization as it stood, and refer it to the Commission.

DR/14: Establishment of a Regional Office for South and South East Asia

(118) The Committee was informed that the Executive Board did not recommend this resolution.

(119) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the proposal had not been understood. It was aimed at stimulating co-operation with Member States and National Commissions in the working out of programmes. A need for such support was felt by Unesco, as had been recognized in the remodelling document. Facilities were provided and obligations undertaken by the Government of India. The ingredients of international understanding were sometimes forgotten. The proposal should not be rejected in the name of a slogan.

(120) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that about 10 offices would be needed to carry out such work all over the world. That involved the decentralization of Unesco. He therefore recommended that the draft resolution be referred to the working party to be set up by the Programme and Budget Commission.

(121) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) seconded the proposal.

(122) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) supported the delegate of India.

(123) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) made no objection to the proposal of the delegate of Israel, but did not want it linked with a high-sounding word like decentralization, over which misunderstandings might arise.

(124) The proposal was adopted.

DR/12: Translation of Unesco Documents into German

(125) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had not recommended this resolution, because it was already covered by project 5.1 in the proposed programme and budget (Mass Communication, paragraphs 19 and 20).

(126) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that it was a matter of degree. If it were thought desirable to translate only a few documents into German, the present budget might suffice, but beyond a certain limit additional appropriations would be necessary.

(127) Count von HARDENBERG (German Federal Republic) thought the meeting might be interested to hear that the National Commissions of Austria, Switzerland and Germany had begun discussions with a view to co-operating in the issue of Unesco publications in German through normal channels. He had not been able to contact the Austrian delegation before the draft resolution had come up, but, if he understood it rightly, the proposal went a good deal farther than the existing project 5.1. He did not wish to make it a question of prestige, but there was a difference between publications produced by the National Commissions, and those published by Unesco itself, such as the pamphlets on race questions. It was always being asked what Unesco was doing, and these publications were valuable in supplying an answer. Count von Hardenberg therefore proposed that the resolution should be recommended to the Secretariat for further study, with a view to introducing into the 1957-58 programme an allocation for Unesco publications in German. He added that there might be some change in the point of view of his delegation, after the Conference had discussed draft resolution No. 2.

(128) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported the delegate of the German Federal Republic. It would be worth considering whether the 1957-58 budget could not provide for the publication of Unesco works in many more languages than were at present used.

(129) The proposal of the delegate of the German Federal Republic was carried unanimously.

DR/15: "Friends of Unesco" Clubs

(130) This resolution, said Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board), was recommended by the Executive Board.

(131) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) considered the draft resolution interesting and thought that, if adopted, the necessary appropriations would not exceed $500.

(132) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed out that some countries might not like specific ways of publicizing the work of Unesco.

(133) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that Unesco could encourage action by the National Commissions. For example, the Secretariat could draw up a kind of model constitution for the formation of new clubs, supply existing clubs with material for information and exhibition purposes and could pass on information about the activities of those clubs to National Commissions inclined to experiment with them.

(134) Mr. CABOUAT (France) announced that, in France, there were some scores of "Friends of Unesco" clubs which were organized by educational bodies. They arranged exhibitions and lectures. If a handbook were brought out, it might stimulate the work of those clubs and enable them to arrange international exchanges.

(135) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), after one or two minor drafting amendments had been suggested, proposed that the spirit of the resolution be adopted.

(136) The proposal was adopted by 10 in favour, none against and 1 abstention.

Document 8C/ADM/7: Adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board

(137) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the Executive Board had managed without Spanish so far and, in view of budgetary stringency, he appealed to the meeting not to press the proposal at that stage.

(138) Adopted by 5 in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions.

(139) Speaking as Rapporteur, Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked whether the Director-General would have the

option of transferring the appropriations to the Patzcuaro Centre.

(140) The CHAIRMAN said no.

Document 39 EX/5: Place and date of the ninth session of the General Conference

(141) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had discussed this document in two parts: (1) Could the new headquarters building be finished in time for the next General Conference? The answer was that one-third of it would be ready. (2) Should the Organization hold its ninth General Conference at its own headquarters, since it would be celebrating its tenth anniversary?

(142) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) requested that the discussion of the document be deferred until the next meeting.

(143) Agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

# TWENTIETH MEETING

*13 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**PLACE AND DATE OF THE MEETING OF THE NINTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE** (document 39 EX/5)

(1) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) informed the Committee, on behalf of the Indian delegation, that his country would accept full responsibility for providing the facilities for holding the ninth session of the General Conference in New Delhi if the General Conference accepted India's invitation. Adequate office accommodation was available in Parliament House and sufficient accommodation would be available in commercial hotels and government hostels for the delegations and members of the Conference staff. India had extended the invitation to Unesco because it had been felt that the time had come for international organizations to carry their activities beyond their habitual frontiers. The strength of an international organization could not be measured in terms of money but rather in the inspiration it invoked in the minds of the masses. He could see no point in holding a conference in a half-completed building, and reminded the Committee that Unesco was not made of bricks and mortar but was in the hearts of the people. It was important to carry Unesco as far afield as possible. He proposed the acceptance of India's invitation.

(2) Mrs. PECSON (Executive Board) recalled that she had already given the Committee the results of the first stages of the discussion of this matter in the Executive Board. Continuing its discussion, the Board had taken cognizance of the additional sum which would be necessary if it were decided to accept the Indian invitation, and had considered the advantages accruing to Unesco in the promotion of its programme if the ninth session were held in New Delhi. It was clear that, if the General Conference met in New Delhi, direct contact would be made with the vast area of East and South East Asia. As that area was particularly in need of the work provided for in the programme, it would give an opportunity to more leaders to make contact with Unesco. Further, it had been agreed that, in the past, the holding of General Conferences away from headquarters had proved a stimulus for action in the countries where they had been held; the additional expense was worth while. The Executive Board, appreciating the generous invitation of India and in consideration of its loyalty to Unesco and faith in its programme, had agreed to recommend the acceptance of the invitation by the General Conference.

(3) The CHAIRMAN said that he had understood the representative of the Director-General to say that no extra expense would be incurred in ensuring that the conference block of the new headquarters would be ready on time in 1956, and asked if that was the case.

(4) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the question where to hold the next session of the General Conference went beyond the competence of the Secretariat, which could do no more than give technical explanations. The views of the Director-General were the following: (1) the construction of the new headquarters building could not be completed by November-December 1956; (2) it would, however, be possible by that time to use the conference building and the wing of the main building nearest to the conference rooms; (3) those premises could be completed in time without additional expense. (5) It was therefore technically possible to hold the next session of the General Conference in Paris, without exceeding the estimates quoted in the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56, and without increasing the budget for the construction of the new buildings.

(6) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) pointed out that

the General Conferences had been held five times in Europe, once in the Middle East, once in Central America, and once in Latin America. In his opinion, a General Conference should be held in Asia in order that more could be learned about it in that part of the world. He seconded the proposal by the delegate of India.

(7) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that the United States delegation was, in principle, not in favour of holding General Conferences away from headquarters. The General Conference was a business meeting, at which matters of policy and finance were discussed and, if considered as such, the only factors to be taken into account when discussing the place of meeting should be the advantages to the interests of Unesco and to the area in which it was proposed to meet. If the Committee felt that it was preferable, in the interests of Unesco, to hold a General Conference away from headquarters rather than use the additional money required for such a conference for implementing the programme, she was perfectly willing to give the matter further consideration. She hoped that her remarks would in no way be interpreted as showing a lack of appreciation for the very gracious invitation extended by India, but she could not support the proposal to accept the invitation.

(8) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) drew attention to the considerable advantages of holding sessions of the General Conference at Unesco headquarters. If he remembered rightly, it had been decided to hold every other session at headquarters, and he could see no reason why that principle should not prevail. He wished to make it clear, however, that he fully recognized the desirability of holding the General Conference in India, as no session had hitherto been held in Asia. Since, however, the extra expense was liable to upset the balance of the budget for the financial period 1955-56, he would prefer the 1956 session to be held at headquarters.

(9) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that in the past the British delegation had opposed the holding of General Conferences outside headquarters. In the present case, however, he thought that the invitation should be accepted because there were doubts about the readiness of the new headquarters building. Sooner or later a General Conference would have to be held in Asia and, in the circumstances, he thought that the General Conference would be justified in accepting with a clear conscience.

(10) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) was in favour of accepting the Indian Government's invitation, since it was desirable to make the general public everywhere familiar with Unesco's work and that aim would become more attainable if sessions of the General Conference were held in various parts of the world. Mexico was one of the countries where the work of Unesco was best known to the people, and that was unquestionably due to the fact that the General Conference had met in 1947 in Mexico City. Only the day before, in Montevideo, he had been impressed by the public's enthusiastic participation in the solemn opening ceremony of the present Conference.

(11) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the present invitation had been extended with the full support of the Government and people of India. It was not certain that the invitation would be renewed after the next general election in India.

(12) He did not agree with the United States delegate that the General Conference was merely a business meeting. Its real function was to be the nerve centre of international life.

(13) He stressed the point made by the Indonesian delegate that more should be learned about Asia, pointing out that in that area a vast section of humanity lived under conditions which needed rapid improvement. By holding its next session in Asia, the General Conference would have a better view of the problems confronting Asia. Unesco would have the opportunity of stimulating interest and of obtaining the support of governments, National Commissions and the peoples of the world.

(14) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia), in answer to the remarks made by the Belgian delegate, remarked that the General Conferences of 1951 and 1952 had been held in Paris. If the policy of holding alternative conferences in Paris was being adhered to, the balance could be rectified by accepting the invitation of India even though it meant holding two consecutive conferences outside headquarters. Secondly, he did not see that the distance to be travelled to conferences was of much consequence. Wherever conferences were held, some delegations would have to travel great distances. Thirdly, he asked how much money would be saved by the cutting down and deferring of projects until 1957-58.

(15) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) explained that he had not been referring to the expenses borne by the various delegations, but only to the costs chargeable to the Unesco budget. The new premises had been constructed in Paris with the specific aim of holding sessions of the General Conference regularly in that city, while respecting the principle of "alternation" and ensuring that the balance of the budget was maintained.

(16) Mr. CABOUAT (France) stated that his delegation also approved the principle of holding sessions away from headquarters at regular intervals, and fully agreed that one of the next sessions of the General Conference should be held in an Asian country. He could not, however, subscribe to the view that, if the next session were held in Paris, additional expenses would inevitably be incurred. The statement of the Assistant Director-General had been extremely precise, and Mr. Cabouat, for one, had no reason to doubt it in any way. Given the fact that large amounts were being spent in order to build the new premises in Paris, and that the next session of the General Conference could be held at headquarters without exceeding the present budget estimates, nothing seemed to justify abandonment of the principle of alternation on which there had so far been tacit agreement. In his opinion, every other session of the General Conference should be held at headquarters, unless some overriding factor made it necessary to depart from that rule.

(17) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked what the additional cost of holding the General Conference in India would be, if Russian were adopted as a working language.

(18) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that the additional cost of the General Conference, if held in India and if Russian were adopted as a working language, would be $141,350, whereas, if the Conference were held in Paris with Russian as a working language, the additional cost would be $100,750. If Unesco did not move to its new headquarters in 1956, there would be a saving of $30,000 on the estimate for 1956.

(19) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked for the Secretariat's comment on whether the change in time for holding the General Conference from the spring to November had created difficulties in matters of co-ordination.

(20) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the matter was entirely unrelated to the question of where to hold the ninth session of the General Conference. On the problem of co-ordinating Unesco Conferences with meetings of other United Nations agencies, the advantage of holding the General Conference in the spring would be that delegates would be informed of the results of the United Nations General Assembly held at the end of each year. On the other hand, if that were decided, it would mean that Unesco Conferences would coincide with those of the other Specialized Agencies, and their programmes and that of Unesco had several items in common. The Secretariat would therefore leave it to the General Conference to decide whether it was better for Unesco to follow its mother or its sisters.

(21) In view of the fact that it would be possible to hold the following session of the Conference at headquarters without additional expense, Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) moved that the Committee recommend that the ninth session meet in Paris, at the same time expressing the hope that the subsequent session would be held in New Delhi.

(22) Mr. CABOUAT (France) seconded that proposal.

(23) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) reminded the Committee that, according to what the Indian delegate had said, it was not certain that the Indian Government would renew its invitation to Unesco.

(24) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) drew attention to the fact that the Indian delegation's proposal was in fact an amendment to that included in the Proposed Programme and Budget for 1955-56. It should therefore be put to the vote before the Belgian proposal, which did not alter the proposed programme and budget at all.

(25) The CHAIRMAN took a vote on the proposal of the Indian delegation, seconded by Messrs. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) and SILLER (Mexico).

(26) The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

(27) It was therefore agreed to insert in the Committee's report a recommendation that the Indian Government's invitation be accepted.

(28) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that, if the invitation were accepted by the General Conference, she would like to propose that the Committee recommend that, in the future, Unesco should adopt the policy of the World Health and Food and Agriculture Organizations and only agree to holding General Conferences outside headquarters if the host country were prepared to pay for the additional cost.

(29) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) pointed out that it was important to remember, when comparing Unesco to the World Health Organization or the Food and Agriculture Organization, that the latter organizations followed a policy of regionalism. The effect for these two organizations of following that policy was the same as that which Unesco would procure by holding its General Conference in different parts of the world.

(30) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the United States proposal. He thought that the delegate of Egypt had made a very important point and suggested that, as a working party had been set up on decentralization, the Committee could refer the question of the site of the General Conferences to it and draw its attention to the possibility of developing the idea expressed by Mr. Abdel-Rahman. He did not think that it was essential to discuss the United States proposal at that stage and proposed that discussion should be deferred.

(31) The CHAIRMAN having asked whether the proposal was to allow the working party to study the matter and report directly to the Administrative Commission, Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) replied in the affirmative.

(32) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the United States proposal amounted to a proposal to change Rule 2 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference.

(33) Miss LAISE (United States of America) replied that it was not against the Rules of Procedure to establish policy.

(34) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that he entirely shared the views of the United States delegate. It would be a question of taking a general policy decision, within the terms of which the Executive Board would continue to exercise the powers granted to it under Rule 2 of the Rules of Procedure.

(35) The Committee agreed to forward the United States proposal to the working party on decentralization with a request that it should study the question and report its conclusions direct to the Administrative Commission.

(36) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) feared that the United States proposal amounted to an amendment to the Rules of Procedure and that the Administrative Commission would not be competent to make recommendations concerning it.

(37) The CHAIRMAN considered that it was clear that, even if the proposal were adopted by the Administrative Commission, it would be given the status of a policy directive to the Director-General. The Executive Board could then make recommendations in the light of that directive. In his opinion, it did not constitute a change in the Rules of Procedure. In any case, the General Conference had the power to amend the Rules of Procedure at its present session.

**ITEM 7.2 OF THE AGENDA PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56** (continued)

**EDUCATION** (continued)

International Educational Development Fund (document 8C/5, paragraphs 143-146)

(38) In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that a draft resolution had been prepared by the Secretariat on the lines requested by the United States delegation. The Secretariat had nevertheless felt that it could submit a fresh text to the Committee. During the last meeting of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, held in New York in October, the Director-General had succeeded in securing his colleagues' approval of the statement contained in the Committee's report to the Economic and Social Council. If the General Conference felt able to endorse the statement, it would certainly enhance the latter's value in the eyes of members of the Economic and Social Council. The statement contained the following points:

(1) It was recalled that both the Economic and Social Council and Unesco recognized the development of free and compulsory primary education as a priority field of action.

(2) The guiding principles of Unesco's programme in that field were set forth.

(3) Emphasis was laid on the great financial difficulties hindering the extension of free and compulsory education, and on the urgent need for international financial assistance. Such assistance presupposed concerted action by the United Nations and Specialized Agencies. It was only if such action failed to be taken that Unesco might act independently.

(39) By approving that statement, the General Conference would be defining Unesco's general policy in that field for several years to come. It would strengthen the Director-General's position in his relations with the other Specialized Agencies. Finally it would explain clearly to the general public what Unesco's opinion was on that subject.

(40) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) asked if the Secretariat would arrange for the document mentioned by the Assistant Director-General to be distributed.

(41) Mr. LEE (United States of America) wished to know if the text to which the Assistant Director-General had referred was a work plan or a draft resolution. In his opinion, it should be either a work plan or an amendment to a draft resolution, since the Secretariat could not propose new draft resolutions.

(42) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that it would be more appropriate to keep that question in the form of a resolution to guide the Director-General and that no further work plan would be needed. The proposed project could be limited to the total of $2,900 foreseen in the Department's programme.

(43) The Committee agreed to ask the Secretariat to prepare a draft for consideration by the Committee at its afternoon meeting.

DR/63: Unesco Publication on Mickiewicz

(44) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the Executive Board had not had time to study the proposal and he did not think that it anticipated being able to do so within the next day or so. Moreover, the General Committee had taken no decision in regard to it. The proposal was to issue a publication in commemoration of the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz; the Secretariat, however, had not yet been able to study the proposal or to draw up the necessary budget estimates.

(45) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked whether, under the Rules of Procedure, resolutions received after the deadline date could be considered

(46) The CHAIRMAN said that technically it was not possible under the Rules of Procedure. The General Committee, however, had allowed those in question to be accepted for consideration as an exception.

(47) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) emphasized the fact that the General Committee could not take any decision in the matter; it could only make recommendations to the appropriate organs of the Conference.

(48) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) recalled that it was always possible, during the first seven days of the session, to submit proposals unlikely to involve any large increase in the budget estimates. The point was whether the proposal concerned would involve such an increase.

(49) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions with important budgetary implications had expired on 3 November. Document 8C/DR/63 appeared to come into that category.

(50) At the CHAIRMAN's request, Mr. SKENAZI (Secretary) read out paragraphs 2 and 3 of Rule 78 of the Rules of Procedure.

(51) The Committee agreed to a proposal of the Chairman that the resolutions be considered with the second category of resolutions, namely, those having no or slight budgetary implications.

(52) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had reached certain conclusions with regard to the programme and had allocated high priority or low priority to some projects, left others without priority and suppressed some. In addition, it had recommended

the retention of certain proposed resolutions and their budgetary implications. He called upon the Assistant Director-General to inform the Committee what the total budgetary implications were under the various categories.

(53) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew up the following table of the budgetary implications of the decisions hitherto adopted by the Committee:

1. Projects given lower priority:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1955 | $206,314.-- |
| 1956 | $114,438.-- |
| Total: | $320,752.-- |

2. Activities proposed for deletion or postponement to the financial period 1957-58:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1955 | $ 99,802.-- |
| 1956 | $118,867.-- |
| Total: | $218,669.-- |

3. Activities granted high priority:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1955 | $241,059.-- |
| 1956 | $292,320.-- |
| Total: | $533,379.-- |

4. Projects recommended for implementation if sufficient funds became available. (Two such cases appeared in the minutes, but the Secretariat was not certain what the Committee's intentions really were):

| | |
|---|---|
| 1955 | $ 25,000.-- |
| 1956 | $ 26,000.-- |
| Total: | $ 51,000.-- |

5. New projects to be added to the 1955-56 programme:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1955 | $ 35,700.-- |
| 1956 | $ 63,517.-- |
| Total: | $ 99,217.-- |

6. Organization of the ninth session of the General Conference in New Delhi: $314,042.--

From that amount was to be deducted the $ 30,000 mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, leaving: $284,042.

(54) Two items were still outstanding, namely, the adoption of Russian as a working language (8C/DR/2) and the establishment of a regional office for Asia (8C/DR/14). The latter document would be referred to the working party on decentralization.

(55) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether the sum of $30,000 which would be saved if Unesco did not move to its new headquarters in 1956 should be deducted from the estimate for holding the ninth session of the General Conference in New Delhi. In her opinion, that was not the correct place to make the deduction as the sum referred to the programme of the Headquarters Committee.

(56) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) was entirely of Miss Laise's opinion. The $30,000 had nothing to do with the budget of the General Conference. The amount represented a saving made on the total budget.

(57) Mr. CABOUAT (France) pointed out that the sum would in any case eventually be spent. There was no question of any final saving.

(58) Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether the sum of $30,000 represented a net figure. There would be a sloping off of expenses in connexion with the withdrawal from the old premises but it could not be assumed that the move to the new headquarters would not take place at the end of 1956.

(59) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) replied that the $30,000 represented a net figure.

(60) Mr. CABOUAT (France) recalled that the Committee had taken note of the request of the Director of UNRWA reported to it by the Director-General. It had been proposed, if budgetary reductions permitted, to allocate a sum of $25,000 in 1955 and $26,000 in 1956 for the recruitment of the three specialists requested.

(61) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee consider that proposal at the present meeting. Funds were available from cuts in the budget and it was therefore appropriate to include those projects in the programme without an allocation of priority. The amounts allocated to the two projects would be deducted from the total amounts available from the projects which had been suppressed.

(62) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that the Committee might recommend the insertion of the two amounts in the category of new proposals, among those made by the Director-General.

(63) The CHAIRMAN said that it was not really a proposal from the Director-General, but rather a proposal from the Committee. He suggested that it should be treated in the same way as the proposal concerning the Educational Development Fund.

(64) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought that the action taken by the Committee indicated their belief that the project should be given a low priority. He proposed its transfer to the lower priority category.

(65) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that in fact the Director-General was not at present making any new proposals, although he reserved the right to do so subsequently. However, he could not overlook the fact that the Committee had recommended certain cuts.

(66) The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could not consider proposals not yet made. He thought that it would be in order to the Committee to delete the amounts of $25,000 for 1955 and $26,000 for 1956 from the totals given by Mr. Maheu.

(67) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that the Committee should not discuss the proposal at the present stage and agreed that the amounts of $25,000 and $26,000 could be deleted from the totals he had quoted to the Committee.

(68) The Committee agreed to return to the question at its afternoon meeting.

(69) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that, even so, he intended to mention the matter in his draft report, in order to avoid a further discussion when the report came up for study. He would use the following wording

"The Director-General has stated that, if funds become available as a result of reductions in the budget estimates, he reserves the right to request the General Conference to approve an appropriation of $25,000 in 1955 and of $26,000 in 1956 for the recruitment of these three specialists".

(70) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) raised the question of the proposed subvention to the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind (cf. 8C/BUD/SR.12). The Council would require help for a period after taking over from the World Braille Council, but no information had been available as to how much assistance would be required.

(71) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat had indeed received a request from the Council concerned. It was not owing to lack of information that no contract had been proposed.

(72) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked if the Secretariat could tell the Committee the amount being requested by the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind.

(73) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) replied that the Council had asked for a sum of $5,000 in 1955 and $5,000 to be given in the form of contracts for the following year.

(74) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that the sum of $2,500 be allocated for the purpose of granting a subvention to the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind.

(75) Agreed.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

# TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

*13 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1955-56 PART IV: COMMON SERVICE COSTS – 6. STAFF WELFARE AND TRAINING PROGRAMME**

(1) Mr. FARR (Chief, Bureau of Personnel and Management), invited to explain what the practice was in other Specialized Agencies with regard to the payment of salaries to the secretaries of staff associations, said that, as far as he knew, only the United Nations and Unesco paid such salaries, the United Nations providing a secretary at a senior level in the General Service category (Grade F in Unesco terminology), while Unesco provided one in Grade E. In Unesco, that had been the practice since 1948. Hitherto, the same person had acted as secretary to the Staff Association and also to the Appeals Board, since in the latter capacity she was not likely to be occupied for more than about two months in the year. In (c) on page 227 provision was made for someone to replace her as secretary to the Staff Association when she was so engaged. The Director-General was dissatisfied with the arrangement and intended to allot responsibility for the Appeals Board to a separate secretary from within the Secretariat.

(2) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) felt that, since Unesco was the only Specialized Agency to pay such salaries, it was difficult for the Committee wholeheartedly to endorse the practice. All it could do was to say in its report that, since such salaries had been paid over a period of several years, the Committee felt unable to recommend a change.

(3) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that the payment of such salaries was not in accordance with the traditions of the northern countries; the Committee should state in its report that it found the practice unusual.

(4) The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in its report, the Committee should draw attention to the fact that Unesco was the only Specialized Agency to pay such salaries, but that, since those salaries had been paid over a period of years, the Committee felt that no comments were appropriate.

(5) Miss LAISE (United States of America), agreeing with the delegate of Norway, thought that it was difficult to draw an analogy between the United Nations Staff Association and that of Unesco, and proposed that the Committee recommend deletion of the item in question.

(6) This proposal, seconded by the delegates of the German Federal Republic and of Canada, was put to the vote and adopted by 6 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

Education, paragraphs 143-146: International Educational Development Fund

(7) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) read out two draft resolutions which he submitted for the consideration of the Committee.

(8) The first related to the possible establishment of a United Nations Fund for Economic Development, from

which loans or subventions could be granted for building and equipping schools and teachers training colleges. The resolution would authorize the Director-General, if the fund were not established, to consider the possibility of Unesco's setting up a special international fund for educational development, and to that end to submit proposals to the General Conference at its ninth session.

(9) The second resolution was more general. Stating that the development of free and compulsory education had been recognized as a priority aim both by the General Conference and by the Economic and Social Council, it emphasized the need for considerable efforts at national as well as international level in order to give effect to that priority. It outlined the guiding principles which should underlie such efforts: (1) States should take all administrative and financial steps in their power to provide children with free and compulsory schooling, and should study: (a) their financial resources and means of increasing the funds allotted to education; (b) their educational theories, curricula and methods, with a view to adapting them to national requirements and cultural traditions, as well as to the development of international understanding; (c) means of using the school to help in economic and social development and in securing a higher standard of living. (2) Unesco should solicit the co-operation of the United Nations and of certain Specialized Agencies in helping States to take all necessary measures to expand free and compulsory education. (3) Assistance provided in that field should, as far as possible, be co-ordinated with that supplied by the United Nations agencies. The object of the resolution was to provide international financial aid to Member States in overcoming the main obstacle to the development of free and compulsory education, namely shortage of funds.

(10) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) doubted whether the Committee could "welcome the possibility of a special United Nations Fund for Economic Development" as stated in the first draft resolution. What likelihood was there of such a fund being created?

(11) It was agreed to resume discussion of the matter when the two draft resolutions were both available in written form.

General considerations and guiding lines on the report of the Committee

(12) Miss LAISE (United States of America), referring to a point made earlier by the delegate of Egypt, considered that the Committee's report should clear up a widespread misconception in connexion with the priority to be accorded to projects at the higher and lower budget levels. In addition, the report should emphasize that the Committee had tried to decide on the activities which would require priority in 1955-56. The Committee should express its concern at the excessively rigid structure of the Secretariat, leading to a certain top-heaviness, and at the reclassification policy. That was a matter which the Director-General had agreed to study over the next two years.

(13) The report should mention that the Committee was anxious for some reduction to be made in staff cost and overheads. In 1952, a definite proposal had been made for the size of the staff. It was not yet possible to determine what specific figure should be recommended for 1955-56, since staff numbers would depend on the decision still to be taken with regard to decentralization of activities.

(14) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) emphasized that the Committee must do its utmost to assist the Programme and Administrative Commissions. He feared that the Conference would raise the question of a limit on the budget below the high budget level in the Director-General's programme.

(15) The Committee had examined the programme and budget and had been able to recommend the saving of half a million dollars over the next two years, but that sum was very nearly offset by additional costs.

(16) Annex V to the budget document contained a table which might cause considerable concern to national treasuries. The figures given for established posts and salaries confirmed the need for a most careful scrutiny of staff costs, and items such as travel by staff and delegates, printing, communication services and subventions also required close examination. It might be well if the Committee, in its report, were to summarize that table for the benefit of the Conference.

(17) There had been some criticism of Unesco in the United Kingdom, and the Committee had to do its utmost to ensure that Unesco should not be open to attack on the score of excessive expenditure.

(18) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that Unesco was criticized not because of its budget, but because the money spent was not used to the best effect.

(19) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) agreed; it would be difficult for the Committee, at the stage now reached, to recommend any further reductions in expenditure. It was true that staff costs had given rise to much misunderstanding; possibly more caution might be shown in the classification of posts. It would be desirable for larger amounts to be devoted to programme activities.

(20) Mr. LEE (United States of America) felt that, besides providing facts and figures, the Committee had to offer certain general remarks to help the Conference. An attempt should be made to define what the Committee hoped to achieve. The report should indicate that certain activities (extension of elementary education, fundamental education, arid zone research, and perhaps the strengthening of National Commissions) deserved high priority. Although it was not possible to go very far in expressing the wishes of the Committee with regard to the activities of the Secretariat in each of those fields, the Committee might reaffirm its hope that some of those activities would be completed with all possible despatch. Stress should be laid on the Committee's desire to improve the effectiveness of the programme.

(21) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) agreed with the suggestions by the previous speaker. His country thought there was some justification for a cautious expansion of the programme, but was not prepared to accept any large increase in its contribution. Caution was required if Unesco was to escape criticism.

(22) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought it would be only too easy to obtain general agreement on the importance of the various fields of activity enumerated by the delegate of the United States of America; it was doubtful if much was to be gained that way. The report should bring out the responsibilities of individual Member States, of the National Commissions, and of the international non-governmental organizations in furthering the work of Unesco.

(23) Mr. BOW (Canada), while understanding the attitude of the delegate of India, was disappointed that more progress had not been made in the direction of further savings. The $500,000 saved were almost counterbalanced by the cost of implementing the new resolutions and of holding the next session of the General Conference in India. Nevertheless, although it might be too late to make really substantial changes, he still hoped that the Committee would succeed in submitting a helpful programme and budget to the Conference. More work was required on the question of which activities should be given the greater emphasis, as suggested by the United States delegation. It was probably too late to embark on a detailed discussion of the methods whereby Unesco set out to achieve its aims, such as the Unesco Coupon Scheme. He would suggest an additional field which urgently required priority treatment - that of cultural exchanges between East and West.

(24) The CHAIRMAN observed that the task of the Committee was to analyse the programme proposals and to check the accuracy of the estimates made. The Committee had already divided projects into three classes: high priority projects, projects on which no particular comment seemed called for, and low priority projects. That in itself was an achievement.

(25) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) noted that observations by members of the Committee referred (1) to the main types of activities on which stress should be laid, and (2) to the methods by which the Organization should implement the programme. Such considerations, arising out of the general discussion, were more suitable for insertion in the introduction and would not form the substance of the report. The Rapporteur wondered whether the Committee, instead of continuing along those lines, would not be better advised to turn its attention to two essential questions, the general balance of the programme as between the several departments, and the remodelling of the future programme. Once it had completed its study of those two points, the Committee might come back to the question of the form of its report.

(26) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) suggested that, within each main field of Unesco activities, the Committee might indicate certain priorities. Thus, in the field of the natural sciences, first priority should be given to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful ends, and a secondary priority to the popularization of science. In the field of culture, emphasis might be laid on making the cultural heritage of both East and West available to all. In the social sciences, an attempt might be made to use knowledge not just for academic ends, but for the elimination of international tensions.

(27) The delegate of the United Kingdom had alluded to the responsibilities incumbent on Member States. It was fashionable to say that States must pull their weight, but he doubted whether that really helped to solve the concrete problems with which the world was faced. The fact was that the world's resources were unevenly distributed, and it was inevitable that they should be to some extent redistributed by the international agencies. He was not in favour, at that stage, of reopening the entire question with a view to obtaining some definite budget ceiling.

(28) The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said that the report would have to be a record of the work done during the previous ten days. The introduction might contain a preamble together with the conclusions reached. It might suitably contain an exposition of the Committee's views on the higher or lower budget levels, of its decision not to take account of levels in examining original proposals, and of how the Director-General had arrived at the total budget figure. The report might go on to describe how the Committee had endeavoured to allot priorities to programmes on which the Director-General had laid no particular emphasis, and to outline the various categories of priority. It was not, in his view, within the Committee's terms of reference to recommend a budget figure.

(29) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) said that the plan suggested by the United States delegate for the introduction followed the same lines as he had himself proposed to adopt. He considered that, after ten days' discussion, it would be simple to seize upon the broad principles which had guided the work of the Committee and to summarize them in the introduction. As he had already drafted a large part of the report, leaving space for the question of the remodelling of future programmes and that of the balance of the budget, he hoped the Committee would proceed to discuss the next two items on its agenda.

(30) Requested by the CHAIRMAN for his views on the discussions, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that everything that had been done was reasonable. He felt that the introduction should serve simply as an aid to the better understanding of the body of the report; and it would seem logical to place the conclusions at the end of the report. The remarks of the United States delegate concerning the structure of the Secretariat were entirely new, and that matter did not seem to have been closely studied by the Committee. The Assistant Director-General said he would like to speak when the Committee came to take a decision on that point.

(31) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that the main body of the report might be forwarded to the Programme and Budget Commission so that the latter could start work at once. Since the Committee had examined the programme project by project, it was difficult to discuss the question of the balance of the programme. A report on remodelling of the programme might be submitted later.

(32) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed and suggested that the first report to be submitted be

called the "First Report by the Advisory Committee". As regarded the suggestions made by the United States delegation concerning priorities, an attempt had been made at the Florence Conference in 1950 to evolve a basic Unesco programme, but it had proved exceedingly difficult to define priority projects except in the most general terms. No General Conference would agree to restrict the programme to high priority items only. A more hopeful way might be to examine the main sub-sections of the programme and decide what items could be deleted.

(33) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) considered that the Committee had accomplished its task by dividing the various projects into three categories, with different priorities, and that it had no more to do in that field. He wondered whether it was really the province of the Committee to intervene in regard to the determination of the total budget figure.

(34) Mr. BOW (Canada) thought that, while the Committee had been highly successful in its examination of the programme, it had been less successful with the budget. He could not agree that the Committee should not make budgetary recommendations. It was, after all, the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(35) The CHAIRMAN observed that it was not the task of the Committee to decide on a total figure for the budget. That could only be fixed in terms of the money which Member States were prepared to provide. The Committee had gone through the estimates and tried to establish priorities which would enable the Conference to fit the programme into whatever budget was decided on. It was not the Committee's task to decide on how many projects there should be in 1955-56.

(36) Miss LAISE (United States of America) thought that enough had been said to guide the Rapporteur. As regarded the layout of the report, the conclusions were apt to escape attention if appended at the end. Better a short general discussion, followed by the conclusions reached by the Committee, with the more detailed consideration of the various items appended.

(37) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) differed from the Chairman in feeling that the Committee ought to discuss budget totals, in order to facilitate the work of the Programme and Budget Commission.

(38) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, while he had not been able to follow the work of the Committee in great detail, it was his feeling that, although the Committee was not a budget committee in the sense that it ought to recommend a level of expenditure, it had to inform the Programme and Budget Commission of the cost of implementing the recommended programme. He could promise the Committee every assistance from the Secretariat in determining the cost of carrying out the projects which the Committee considered Unesco should undertake.

(39) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested that the Committee issue its report, supplementing it with an additional report if required.

(40) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), seconded by Mr. JUNANKAR (India), proposed that the question of remodelling should not be discussed at that stage, but be dealt with in a later report.

(41) This proposal was put to the vote and adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

# TWENTY - SECOND MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**REMODELLING OF THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF UNESCO** (document 8C/PRG/13)

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that, in the last two meetings, the Committee had been able to deal with this matter only in the most general terms. It was important that the Programme and Budget Commission should have the benefit of its views.

(2) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that, in November 1953, the Executive Board had reviewed the progress made by Unesco. There had been general agreement that Unesco had not succeeded in securing the interest of Member States, nor, in some cases, of intellectuals, to an adequate degree. Nor had it made much impact on the masses. It had been agreed that Unesco could go further in regionalizing its work, not in any geographical sense, but by common treatment of countries with similar problems,

and that its projects were spread over too wide a field.

(3) At its next session (March 1954), there had been further discussion on those lines, and he had produced a short statement which had been taken into account by the Director-General in reshaping the programme for 1955-56. Thus, if the Conference rejected remodelling, it would be logical for it to reject the 1955-56 programme also.

(4) At Venice, Sir Ronald had, with the assistance of the Secretariat, produced the document now before the Committee. That document, he believed he was right in saying, had enjoyed the support of all but one of the members of the Executive Board.

(5) The first part of the document dealt with the weaknesses of Unesco and the reasons for the criticism levelled against it. The second part dealt with the structure of the programme, and there was a most important section on division of special activities into those initiated by the Organization and those undertaken at the request of Member States. Particular stress was laid on the need for concentrating on major projects. It was suggested (paragraph 58) that, to be really effective, projects should be evolved in co-ordinated fashion by all the Unesco programme departments. Fundamental education was the easiest example to take, since it was of concern to all Unesco departments. In that respect, it was to be hoped that the Conference would provide the Director-General with guidance in his task of drawing up requirements for the 1957-58 programme.

(6) The provision of technical aid to Member States, discussed in the section on activities undertaken at the request of Member States, ought not to be confused with technical assistance, for which Unesco was responsible to a limited degree only. Technical aid was of extreme importance in gaining the confidence of Member States - a fact with which he had been particularly impressed in the course of the world tour he had undertaken with the Director-General. Although such aid was available to all Member States without exception, and was not restricted to economic or social development, it would of course largely take the form of assistance to underdeveloped countries. He hoped that Member States would pay a good proportion of the funds required, so that Unesco could do more and do it more thoroughly.

(7) The CHAIRMAN thought it important to stress that the type of major project envisaged by the Board was that which would require a contribution by all the programme departments, as in the case of fundamental education. It was not possible or appropriate at that stage for the Committee to try to define precise projects, but in its report it might say that it was prepared to devote time to the matter later, with a view to submitting some general projects of the kind envisaged.

(8) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought there was little he could add to Sir Ronald Adam's remarks. Although document 8C/PRG/13 was submitted in the name of the Executive Board, which took the responsibility for it, the Secretariat had actively helped in preparing it. Accordingly, he was able, in the Director-General's name, to endorse Sir Ronald Adam's conclusions.

(9) There were, however, two points he was anxious to make.

Firstly, the document as it stood was a compromise production, for certain sections had had to be recast to secure the approval of all members. One section dealt with the need for progressive concentration on major projects; the Secretariat was most anxious for precise instructions on that point. The Conference had always called for concentration but without specifying the exact form it should take. The notion of large-scale projects in which several departments took part was most attractive but it would be dangerous to embark on that course without having considered what its effect would be on the organization of the Secretariat and the balance of the programme and budget.

Secondly, consideration should be given to how far the Secretariat could act on the ideas expressed in the document - if approved - when carrying out the programme for 1955-56. The Director-General was of the opinion that something could be done, but that it would be desirable to establish a working fund for the purpose; a sum of $300,000, for instance, might enable him to accelerate the execution of certain major projects and to study a number of new projects which he would submit to the Conference at its next session. To that end the Conference might designate the matters on which the Director-General would be asked to submit major schemes and authorize him to set aside a certain sum from the 1955-56 budget towards the preparation of those schemes. The Director-General was ready to consider any means which would assist the transition from the 1955-56 programme to the 1957-58 programme in certain priority areas.

(10) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) was glad that, in preparing its document, the Board had enjoyed the assistance of the Director-General and Assistant Director-General, to whom, in fact, the Board owed much.

(11) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that in the last few years the work of Unesco had been an inspiration to countries far removed from the main centres of civilization, and he had every confidence in the future of the Organization. There was a sense in which the document before the Committee was an act of self-criticism by the General Conference, which was responsible for electing the members of the Executive Board.

(12) A point that required special attention was the question of transition between the programme in its present form and the remodelled programme. Some secretarial reorganization might be necessary, and there might have to be a change in the relationship between Unesco and the National Commissions and between Unesco and the general public.

(13) A type of work on which he would lay great stress was what he would call "clearing house" activities. Unesco was called upon to act as a clearing house for information, to be studied and made available to the world at large. Then there were what he would call "promotional" activities, i.e. activities directed to some specific end. A division of Unesco activities into those two categories would, he felt, be helpful.

(14) As regarded B, in the section on general activities, he was worried by the possibility of continuous Unesco subsidies designed to secure intellectual collaboration between specialists. Non-governmental organizations, after an initial period, should surely stand on their own feet.

(15) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) said that his delegation was in favour of the idea of Member States' taking a larger share in the preparation of Unesco's programme but was a little disturbed at the prominence given to meeting requests for assistance from those States, and was afraid that the general activities might suffer as a result. A proper balance had to be preserved within the programme. While it was important to aid the masses and win them to Unesco's cause, the more highly educated minority who, wherever they lived, took an interest in Unesco, could not be neglected.
(16) Mr. Florkin was also disturbed by the remarks of the delegate of Egypt. The co-ordination of the work of specialists was a permanent activity and should be continued, experience had shown that appreciable results were obtainable in that domain. It would be unwise to neglect activities of that kind in favour of the provision of aid which, while undeniably useful, might come to absorb the bulk of the energies and funds available.
(17) With regard to the Assistant Director-General's suggestion that provision be made for new projects involving more than one department, the delegate of Belgium wondered whether its adoption would not lead to the creation of new departments which would be superimposed on the others and make the structure of the Secretariat more complicated; in his view, it would not be possible to plan new projects without the assistance of new specialists.

(18) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) welcomed the document as a frank recognition of past failures and as an attempt to think along new lines. The great question was whether Unesco was to be merely an agency for the exchange of information, or whether it was to give practical assistance to Member States in so far as its resources would permit. In fact, the document itself recognized that Unesco could not limit itself to activities of the former type. There must be greater activity (and the fact should be given more emphasis) by Unesco itself, by its Member States, and by the National Commissions.
(19) He himself was speaking for the underdeveloped areas of the world in affirming that the crucial task before Unesco was to ensure equal opportunities for all in the fields of science, education and culture. If Unesco failed to do that, it would fail to command confidence and respect.
(20) Concentration of resources and effort was not incompatible with the setting of definite targets. Thus, in the field of education, it was not enough to affirm that education must be free and compulsory. Special priority should be given to the introduction of free and compulsory education, with secondary priority being given to education for better international understanding. In the natural sciences, priority should be given to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; in the social sciences, to the removal of current tensions and discrimination in its various forms. In the field of culture, special attention should be given to making generally available the cultural heritage of East and West. Increased resources would be required (so much was acknowledged in the document) and should be devoted to the carrying out of specific projects designed to meet the vital needs of specific areas. Such a programme might of course involve structural changes in Unesco, but only so, he felt, could Unesco command world-wide loyalty and enthusiasm. In short, future programmes should be so devised as to meet the needs of the underdeveloped areas, and a recommendation should be made to the effect that resources be made available for specific purposes in specific parts of the world until such time as definite results had been achieved.

(21) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), welcoming the document, said it was not easy to achieve a proper balance between emphasis on resources and emphasis on activities, and he feared that the previous speaker had laid undue stress on the latter.
(22) The idea of help for the underdeveloped areas was by no means new; Unesco had launched its pilot project in Haiti long ago. In 1951, a most ambitious scheme had been proposed by the then Director-General for the eradication of world illiteracy, to cost twenty million dollars over a period of twelve years. What was new was the emphasis on concentration on particular activities, but, while concentration was an ideal to which all paid lip service, it was in practice exceedingly hard to decide what activities should be eliminated.
(23) He was not for a moment suggesting that enough had already been done, but he did feel that there was a real danger of raising excessive hopes. Problems such as the eradication of illiteracy were tremendous and the full implications of the efforts needed to solve them were not always fully grasped. It was a fallacy to think that, if Unesco did nothing, nobody else would do anything. It was also a fallacy to think that these stupendous problems would be solved if only certain people, certain privileged countries, could be prevailed upon to exert themselves a little more.
(24) Besides, it was wrong to say that the more privileged peoples had done nothing. In all history, no greater effort had been made to help the rest of the world than was being made by the United States of America. That great people deserved recognition and gratitude. The United Kingdom was a much smaller and less populous country, and had suffered severely in two world wars, but had contrived to find, the year before, some three hundred and fifty million dollars for economic development in the British Commonwealth.
(25) While economic assistance to the underdeveloped areas was vitally important, there were other forms of co-operation, not connected with economic development, which could not be covered by the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. Another point had to be borne in mind, namely, that technical assistance was a scheme which concerned other agencies besides Unesco. A really ambitious project by Unesco, such as a large-scale education drive, might well throw the whole thing out of gear.
(26) The delegate of Egypt had said how important it was that specialized organizations of experts should

not indefinitely be subsidized by Unesco. But the work done by such organizations was often of extreme value, especially to the underdeveloped areas (he was thinking of the invention and provision of antibiotics), and therefore it was not quite accurate to suggest that intellectual co-operation was carried on at the expense of actual technical aid.

(27) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) admitted to doubts about the work to be done. He thought that Sir Ronald Adam's remarks on the importance attached by the countries which the latter had visited to Unesco's technical aid programme supported the Indian delegate's argument that in the years to come the Organization should strive to meet the urgent requests of Member States.
(28) He likewise appreciated the soundness of the Belgian delegate's views on the importance of permanent and enduring co-operation between groups of intellectuals throughout the world, scientific organizations and other bodies.
(29) What previous speakers had said showed the importance of achieving an effective balance, and as logical as possible a balance, between activities designed to promote co-operation and special activities in individual countries. The difficulty lay in finding that balance, and for that reason he felt that commonsense was needed and a realistic approach to such problems as the economic limitations of Member States, legal or customs restrictions, and restrictions on movement, etc.
(30) He felt that there were also prejudices against which the Organization would have to fight. For instance, as he saw it, campaigns against racial discrimination could not be prosecuted, when, as was frequent, racial prejudice subsisted at the back of the promoters' own minds.
(31) Nor should the present psychological state of the various countries be overlooked: the cold war and international tension were positive trammels on Unesco's activities.
(32) Mr. Siller was not stressing such obstacles because he felt that Unesco should fold its arms and do nothing; on the contrary, he felt that Unesco ought to struggle against those obstacles to preserve the Organization's labours from impracticality. It was his belief, too, that, in pursuing the rationalization of Unesco's activities to achieve a proper balance in its future programme, delegates should avoid undue optimism about the support likely to be forthcoming from individual countries or other organizations.
(33) In conclusion, Unesco should act with its eyes open, calculating its means with precision and estimating the support likely to be received from the various regions, so that its efforts would not have to be wasted on the obstacles mentioned but would go directly to meeting the needs of Member States.

(34) Mr. BRICHET (France) thought document 8C/PRG/13 an excellent piece of self-criticism and hoped the Conference would take it into consideration. He wished, however, to make it clear that the French delegation did not subscribe to the recommendations in paragraphs 62 and 68 for the allocation of a larger proportion of the Organization's energies and resources to special assistance activities. In his delegation's view, it was undesirable to contrast general and special activities: the stress should, on the contrary, be put on the principle of unity which should inform both, and a balance should be established between the departments of Unesco and the activities involving Member States.
(35) Secondly, it would be dangerous to awaken hopes which might not be fulfilled; such a course might well have consequences of the utmost seriousness for Unesco's future.
(36) Lastly, the Organization should not be transformed either into a technical assistance agency or into a supra-national Ministry of Education. The part it had to play had been clearly defined at the Florence Conference: it was to co-ordinate and promote activities consonant with its programme, to develop international co-operation, to foster the growth of non-governmental organizations, and to facilitate exchanges of information and documentation. As the delegate of Belgium had pointed out, any large increase in the sums allotted to technical aid might necessitate the termination of certain of the Organization's permanent activities. The two parts of the programme were interdependent and one should not be neglected in favour of the other.
(37) Mr. Brichet also shared the uneasiness expressed by the delegate of Belgium over the plans for progressive concentration on certain major projects, which, it seemed to him, would necessarily involve the creation of new services in the Secretariat.

(38) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) could not altogether share the pessimism with which the Executive Board appeared to view the situation. Too much had been made of the fact that Unesco was not a very familiar name to the masses. Education, science and culture had never been popular with the masses, even in the highly developed countries. In fact, considering its budget, Unesco had considerable achievements to its credit.
(39) Statements had been made implying that National Commissions ought to be more effective, but at least 62 Member States had such Commissions, and the lists of membership were often very impressive. If Unesco were more active, the National Commissions would be more active too.
(40) Unesco, after all, was still a young organization, and in the fields of education, science and culture, progress was necessarily tentative and slow.
(41) He did not consider that the General Conference would be able to provide the Director-General with precise instructions. All it could do would be to define the goals to be attained, leaving the Secretariat free to devise the requisite methods of attaining them.
(42) He would suggest that, in future, three main principles be adopted. Firstly, there should be a concentration of activities in the light of the experience acquired and the resources available. Secondly, there should be increased aid to Member States. And, thirdly, co-operation between Member States at the regional level should be encouraged, by which he meant that there should be co-operation between Member States having similar problems, not necessarily between States speaking the same languages or in the same region geographically.

(43) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that, in the

opinion of his Government, Unesco was bound to devote part of its resources to assisting underdeveloped countries. But international co-operation in the various branches of knowledge must not be sacrificed to increased tec ical aid. A balance must be maintained between the various activities of Unesco, and increased technical aid should be dependent on whether additional resources were made available. Perhaps the cost of Unesco's general activities could be reduced by getting greater assistance from the non-governmental organizations.

(44) Mr. LEE (United States of America) found it possible to agree with what many of the previous speakers had said. The difficulty was that the Committee was discussing ill-defined notions such as "concentration" and "balance", on which agreement was easy as long as no attempt was made to come down to earth.

(45) The United States of America welcomed the document on remodelling, most of which it could endorse. Its National Commission had studied the matter and approved the drive for greater concentration, the strengthening of National Commissions, and increased emphasis on aid to Member States in response to their expressed needs.

(46) He was grateful to the delegate of the United Kingdom for the generous tribute paid to his country. While less pessimistic than the delegate of the United Kingdom, he was less optimistic than the delegate of Israel. There was a large area of agreement. But could they hope to evolve instructions which would assist the Director-General? Surely the Conference ought to do more than just lay down policy. The Director-General should be given guidance as regards the organization of the staff and preparation of the ground for the 1957-58 programme. The Committee might adopt a tentative recommendation for the Programme and Budget Commission, which could debate the matter and either refer it back or set up a working party to study it.

(47) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that he had not meant that international collaboration between specialists should be neglected, but that there should be definite agreement between Unesco and the non-governmental agencies concerned as to the aims to be achieved, and the necessary resources should be made available to such agencies for limited periods only. The furtherance of such collaboration came within what he had called the "promotional" activities of Unesco, its "clearing house" activities remaining fundamental.

(48) The CHAIRMAN said that there was no necessary incompatibility between the views expressed about international collaboration between experts, especially as far as Unesco was concerned. Unesco would have to foster its relations with the non-governmental agencies - that was essential for what the delegate of Egypt had called its "promotional" activities. The Committee would have to decide whether the document would enable it to assist the Conference by recommending broad projects for the 1957-58 programme. It might conceivably take up the Director-General's suggestion that machinery be devised in 1955-56 whereby, at the ninth session of the Conference, he could take immediate energetic action on a small number of main projects.

(49) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) said that document 8C/PRG/13 entirely satisfied him. He emphasized that, if improvements were asked for, it was because only what was good could be improved and because every living thing must evolve.

(50) He would, however, like the wording of paragraph 37 to be amended by the addition of the words "limited in numbers and, so far as practicable, in duration", immediately after the word "delimited".

(51) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic), while welcoming the document, spoke with some little diffidence as the representative of a country which had but lately joined Unesco. He attached particular importance to close co-operation between the Secretariat, the Executive Board and Member States, and was glad to hear that the Executive Board had received much assistance from the Assistant Director-General in producing its document. It was of great importance, he considered, to develop the National Commissions and to bring them into closer contact with the Organization over the next two years.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# TWENTY - THIRD MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**REMODELLING OF THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF UNESCO**
(document 8C/PRG/13) (continued)

(1) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that he had been very interested in the discussion at the morning meeting, and would like to reply to some points which had been made. The Executive Board, in proposing the division of the programme into two parts, had realized the importance of general activities. Paragraph 19 mentioned their intrinsic value as providing a framework and structure for international co-operation throughout the world. Taking the programme for 1955-56, 32.54% of the budget was to be used for general activities and 67.46% for other activities. That meant that two-thirds of the budget would be used for special activities. Aid to Member States accounted for 10% of the total budget.
(2) With regard to the question of regionalization, the Executive Board was of the same opinion as the delegates of India and Israel. Sir Ronald suggested that to bring Unesco to the regions, members of the Secretariat should be sent there for long periods and help to set up projects and inspect the progress made. That would be a good way of getting members of the Secretariat into the field, enabling them to get to know a Member State or a group of Member States.
(3) The Executive Board did not think of Unesco as a super-educational agency, as had been feared by the delegate of the United Kingdom, but thought of it rather as a body to stimulate interest in education.
(4) In Thailand the project for school reform was being carried out with the co-operation of Unesco. In addition, representatives of the International Labour Office, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization were working with Unesco staff in the field. That was a hopeful sign of co-operation with other agencies. It was to be hoped that each year would bring about closer co-operation with other agencies in every project.
(5) The Executive Board had carefully studied the problem of the National Commissions and had come to the conclusion that only one-third of those in existence were effective. The Board was convinced that there was only one way of carrying out the programme of Unesco and that was through governments. The governments would have to find out that they could not do the work without National Commissions.
(6) Concerning the division of the programme into two parts, the Board considered that that was the best method from an administrative point of view. Section I applied to the continuing work of Unesco and Section II to the changing work. It seemed to be the only logical division.
(7) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the real intention of the Executive Board, in drawing up its report on the remodelling of Unesco's future programme, had been to raise questions, define problems, and point to possible solutions. The Board had sought above all to provoke thought amongst the delegates, leading perhaps to positive conclusions. Whatever the outcome of the debate, Mr. Maheu believed that the changes in ideas and policy desired by the Board were already coming about.
(8) The Egyptian delegate had been right in saying that the new structure of the programme was only a beginning. In the eyes of the Director-General and the Executive Board, the change in presentation was certainly not the most important aspect of the remodelling of the programme. It had been adopted merely as the best approach to the problem.
(9) On the other hand, Mr. Maheu agreed with the Canadian delegate that it might prove desirable to adopt a different plan, and above all, different wording. The terms used were the outcome of lengthy discussions in theBoard, but they were certainly not the only possible ones, nor necessarily the best. He thought, however, that the Committee should not, in its turn, become involved in a long debate on a question of secondary importance. Nor was the Canadian delegate wrong in thinking that there was no basic difference between planned activities and activities undertaken at the request of Member States. Mr. Maheu again hoped that problems of mere presentation would not blind the delegates to basic questions of substance.
(10) The ideas set out in the document under consideration were not perhaps entirely original, but they nevertheless raised new problems. Carried to extremes, they might involve considerable, even radical transformations for Unesco. Mr. Maheu did not believe, however, that the Executive Board wanted such basic changes introduced immediately.
(11) The document drawn up by the Executive Board raised three problems of prime importance: the structure of the programme, administrative reorganization, and Unesco's relations with Member States.
(12) Several delegates had spoken on the structure of the programme, giving their views on its balance and the relations that should exist between its different parts. Mr. Maheu considered that the two major sections of the programme should be balanced. Nothing would be more risky than to try to develop one at the expense of the other. The Chairman of the Executive Board had given details regarding the division of appropriations between the two halves of the programme in the budget for 1955-56. Henceforth, it was for the Conference to decide whether it intended to change those percentages or leave them as they were.

But it would be a catastrophe if that division took on political significance and if the point of balance were determined by the relative importance of votes of any given group of States. Mr. Maheu, therefore, felt bound to ask each delegation to rise above its particular national interests and ways of thought and to consider the balance of the programme from an international and universal point of view.

(13) In the opinion of the Director-General, it was not true that the first part of the programme concerned only the industrialized countries, and the second part only the underdeveloped countries.

(14) The underdeveloped countries had as much need as the others of international intellectual co-operation. It was in their interests to watch it expand through Unesco's efforts and to take an increasingly active part in it. Nor, on the other hand, was any country so advanced that it could not profit from the collaboration of all Unesco's Member States. The idea of assistance to Member States included all the countries belonging to Unesco, whatever their degree of development. Therefore, no political significance should be attached to the division of the programme into two parts. They were inseparable, and the second could not operate unless it mobilized systematic co-operation in the efforts made under the first part. Similarly, that first part would be useless if it were to benefit only a few specialists and international intellectual co-operation were not employed for the execution of practical projects.

(15) Unesco's action could, moreover, take different forms. For the carrying out of some projects a whole series of methods of action might be employed from international intellectual co-operation via planned activities to technical aid to Member States.

(16) If a revised programme were to be prepared for 1957-58, the Director-General would certainly have to face a problem of administrative reorganization. It was important for the Conference to realize what administrative repercussions its decisions might have. The Director-General considered, however, that the Conference could not expect him as yet to give it a definite answer as to the nature of those repercussions. He could not study them until he had received general directives from the Conference, but he thought that it would be illogical to allow them to become a determining factor in taking decisions on future programmes.

(17) That being the case, Mr. Maheu could not answer the questions put by the delegates of Belgium and France. He could, however, foresee two possibilities. The concentration of the programme might be operated in respect of one particular field, such as fundamental education, for instance. Fundamental education was a field, not a project, and the two concepts should not be confused. The Committee itself had singled out the various fundamental education projects in order to obtain an overall view of them. It was a conception of concentration according to which it would simply be a question of co-ordinating the activities of the various departments within one field - and that could be done by the Office of the Director-General. That was the type of concentration foreseen in the draft programme and budget for 1955-56. In it there were specialized departments, separate but not isolated, and a system of co-ordinating their activities administratively in given fields.

(18) The Conference might, however, wish to go a step further and consider that the concentration of the programme should take the form of joint projects in which different disciplines co-operated. In that case, the problem would be how to devise a suitable system of administration. If, for example, it were decided to carry out a fundamental education project in a certain place for a certain length of time, it would mean forming a team of specialists of several disciplines. That was not an entirely new idea and the Director-General was quite ready to put it into practice, but he would not venture on that course unless the Conference made it clear that in some cases at least it adopted that stricter conception of concentration - a concentration by integration and not merely by co-ordination.

(19) There was no reason to suppose that such a system would raise major difficulties. There was some mistaken fear that new administrative functions, grafted on to the present administrative structure, would result in a complicated and top heavy system. On the contrary, if new functions were introduced, the existing structure might well be lightened. The Director-General thought that the administration should be subordinate to the programme and modelled upon it. In consequence, administrative problems should not constitute essential factors in discussing the remodelling of the programme.

(20) The big projects already mentioned should relate to problems and not to fields. An attempt would be made, for example, to carry out some practical project in fundamental education, rather than to improve fundamental education in general. There was nothing to prevent such planned activities from being undertaken. In several countries, in addition to ministries specializing in given disciplines, administrative bodies had been set up to implement co-ordinated plans calling for inter-ministerial co-operation. Nothing prevented the same system in an international agency.

(21) The aim of such projects was to achieve practical results, that is, to change the situation of a Member State in one particular respect. Here the third big problem arose, namely that of Unesco's relations with Member States. More concrete action by Unesco was necessary if such results were to be achieved. At present, Unesco acted largely in an indirect way, through the general progress of education, science and culture.

(22) True, several delegates had rightly warned the Committee against expecting too much from direct aid. The Organization should aim at making well-considered and realistic decisions, taking account of the wishes and means of Member States. It would be wrong to think that the practical problems of Member States could be solved by big projects undertaken by Unesco alone. The Organization had neither the constitutional authority nor the necessary resources. The Conference's faith in voluntary contributions, expressed at an earlier session, had turned out to be misplaced, and Unesco's budget would never be large enough to allow for the implementation of big projects financed solely by the Organization.

(23) However, as certain delegates had already pointed out, some Member States were carrying out

assistance programmes on a very substantial scale. If they decided to co-ordinate those programmes with Unesco's activities, enormous progress would be achieved. Thus, Unesco's programme would affect not only experts and intellectual leaders, but would combine with action taken by governments, and Unesco would be able to mobilize available resources for specific purposes and achieve practical results. Such a change in Unesco's methods of work seemed as necessary as the revision of the programme and the reorganization of the Secretariat.

(24) The CHAIRMAN thanked the Assistant Director-General for his admirable statement, which he thought provided a transition from the morning's debate to the reaching of conclusions. He suggested that the Committee should proceed to an examination, section by section, of document 8C/PRG/13 and, when that had been completed, consider the elements for inclusion in its report.

(25) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) pointed out that, when he had voiced certain objections on behalf of his delegation, he had had no intention of denying that it was important to meet the needs of Member States. If the Chairman of the Executive Board estimated that special activities already took up the major part of the budget (67.5%), it seemed rash to recommend in paragraph 62 of document 8C/PRG/13 "that, in future, a greater part of the ordinary budget be set aside to provide such services to Member States", and in paragraph 68 to hope "that the major part of the Organization's resources and energies will be devoted to the special activities".

(26) The CHAIRMAN then opened discussion of the different paragraphs of document 8C/PRG/13.

Structure of the programme: paragraphs 11-15

(27) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) referred to the remarks he had made earlier on this section (cf. 8C/BUD/SR.22).

(28) No further comments.

Order of the programme: paragraphs 16-22

(29) No comments.

General Activities: paragraphs 23-36

(30) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) referred to the remarks he had made earlier with regard to sub-section B of this section (cf. 8C/BUD/SR.22).

(31) No further comments.

Special activities: paragraphs 37-43

(32) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) asked how the criteria were to be settled for the division of the programme into two parts.

(33) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) replied that the General Conference would decide the first category of special activities, and plans of work would be arranged with the Member States involved. With regard to the second category of special activities, Member States would ask for an activity to be undertaken and the General Conference would decide on the allocation of funds.

(34) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) thought that the special activities should be planned and carried out on a regional basis, so that they would benefit, not one country alone, but a whole region; that remark applied alike to activities requested by Member States and to those initiated by the Secretariat. The regional offices could play an important part in that respect. Technical aid should not be the responsibility of Unesco alone; for every sum contributed by the Organization, a corresponding amount should be paid by the Member States or States benefiting from the project. Thus, if such activities were organized on a regional basis, it would be much easier to finance them, because many Member States would be helping to carry them out.

(35) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), referring to the emphasis which the delegate of Mexico had put on the fact that the programme should serve the general needs of the various regions, thought that it was desirable to mention that special activities were directed to broad targets. Unesco should concentrate on reaching those targets.

(36) Mr COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that this section was weak, because no examples were given as to the nature of the special activities referred to. The Executive Board had left the decisions to the General Conference and, in his opinion, it would be extremely difficult for the General Conference to make those decisions. He thought the matter of sufficient importance to suggest the setting up of a working party to study the problem more carefully. Unless a careful study were made, the General Conference would make vague decisions which would not provide sufficient guidance to the Director-General in planning the programme for 1957-58.

(37) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the remarks made by the delegate of the United Kingdom. He doubted whether the General Conference was competent to provide sufficiently concrete guidance for the Director-General. Referring to the problem of regionalism, he recalled that a working party had been set up to study the problems arising out of decentralization. The Committee should decide what it wanted. Regionalism covered some of the problems which had arisen but not all of them. The arid zone scheme, for example, was a special project which dealt with problems met in many areas. Flexibility was essential. He asked whether the Committee was prepared to set up a procedure for selecting the activities for Section II of the programme and to set up a time-table for carrying out those activities.

(38) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the difference between activities undertaken on Unesco's initiative and those undertaken at the request of Member States might be illustrated by an example. For five years Unesco had been carrying out a pilot project concerning the Delhi Public Library,

with the consent and co-operation of the Indian Government. That experiment had been undertaken at Unesco's proposal, while the Organization had received requests from several Member States for help in developing their public libraries.

(39) With regard to the Mexican delegate's suggestions, Mr. Maheu did not think it essential to take the criterion of regionalism as a basis in defining activities undertaken on Unesco's initiative. It would even be regrettable if that were the sole criterion. Sometimes Unesco attacked universal problems - cancer, for example - and if regional projects only were to be retained, many activities would have to be eliminated, especially in the scientific field. Besides, certain Member States were as large as whole regions so that a project undertaken there on a national scale would be typical enough to have a regional interest and to be transposed to other countries of the same category.

(40) The Secretariat preferred the idea of category of country rather than of region. There were problems common to countries of different regions - arid zone problems, for instance. It might happen that countries belonging to a certain category from the point of view of a particular problem were situated in the same region, but that was not a general or necessary rule.

(41) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) thought there was some misunderstanding of the meaning of "regional approach". No universal problem could be localized and no local problem could be made universal. It was impossible to deal with all problems on a regional basis. Unesco's programme emphasized the activities suitable for and important to particular regions, and should secure a balance between the special activities and a suitable programme in the various parts of the world. A regional programme need not necessarily meet the requirements of the region as such, as long as it implemented the overall aspirations of the region. The implementation of a project in any region should not detract from the universality of the problem which had necessitated its undertaking.

(42) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) had been keenly interested by the remarks of the delegate of India, but he thought it best not to generalize too much. Even examples might be misleading; cancer was perhaps an unfortunate choice. It was obvious that a problem like that of the arid zones was of no interest whatever to certain countries and regions. On the other hand, Mr. Panneton noticed that fairly detailed explanations were given on the subject of general activities (paragraphs 23 et seq.), whereas there was very little information on special activities. He was afraid that the Conference might blame the Committee for having failed to give the necessary details on that point.

(43) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) wished to clarify his earlier remarks. As far as activities requested by Member States were concerned, he was of opinion that priority should be given to those of benefit to several Member States. He agreed with the remarks made by the Assistant Director-General, because it was obvious that there were projects, such as those relating to cancer and oceanography, which could not considered regional ones. Unesco's funds were limited and they should be spent, as far as possible, on projects from which several Member States would benefit. Moreover, in that way, international co-operation would be advanced.

(44) The CHAIRMAN wondered whether it would be proper to include examples in the report. The draft had originally included examples and the Executive Board had decided to delete them. If the Committee thought that it was advisable to include examples, now was the time to do so.

(45) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that only a body representative of all the Member States was competent to deal with the plan contemplated in document 8C/PRG/13. He proposed that the Committee should in its report to the Programme Commission express its opinion that the General Conference should indicate to the Director-General, with a model, how the programme should work and suggest activities which should be undertaken. The Committee should point out to the Programme Commission the need for amplification of its discussion.

(46) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought that the guiding principle for clarification by the General Conference should be to see what was meant by the two categories of special activities. Once that was clarified, it would be easier to settle on criteria.

(47) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that there was in each chapter of the draft programme a clear distinction between the two main sections. In Section II, moreover, activities under the heading of "Technical Aid to Member States" were always covered by a special resolution.

Special activities initiated by the Organization: paragraphs 44-47

(48) No comments.

Need for progressive concentration on major projects: paragraphs 48-60

(49) No comments.

(50) The CHAIRMAN thought that, if the Committee agreed to recommend this document to the General Conference, it would be appropriate to mention various points brought out in the discussion. In the first place, the Committee conceived the projects, not as specialized, but as continuing through the programme. Secondly, such projects should allow for specific planning by the Secretariat with regard to timing, place and results. Thirdly, such projects should be of a nature to permit the achieving of practical results within a given time in a given area. The Committee would have to decide to what extent it should help the Programme Commission in outlining the procedure whereby the contemplated subjects were to be included in the programme for 1957-58. The Committee could not do that itself, but could suggest that the Programme Commission undertake the work or refer it back to the Committee after discussion or that a special

working party be set up to study the problems involved.

(51) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought it would be worth mentioning in the Committee's report that attention had been paid to the choice of big projects. He did not think it necessary, however, for the Committee to make any definite suggestion to the General Conference on that point. The Committee was too small a body, and its proposals might incur the disapproval of delegations not represented on it.
(52) With regard to paragraphs 53, 57 and 60 of the document, it would perhaps be good to emphasize the Committee's interest in the possibility of establishing a United Nations Educational Development Fund. The existence of such a fund would certainly solve many problems. The financial limits imposed on the Organization should, however, be made perfectly clear.

(53) The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that no decision had been taken on that subject (see 8C/BUD/SR.21).

(54) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) thought that the suggestion made by the French delegate - that the attention of the Programme Commission should be drawn to the United Nations Education Fund and other funds - was interesting and he thought that reference might also be made to the assistance some Member States had extended to other countries. In his opinion, while such assistance was useful, assistance through the United Nations was preferable, as no conditions would be attached, and there would be no political issues raised. He hoped that, in the future, international organizations would take over increasingly the task of channelling international assistance and that Unesco would be able to draw on international funds for its requirements.

(55) Mr. LEE (United States of America) had hoped that the question of financing would not be raised because the Committee was not in a position to do much about it. He suggested that the Committee could approve the report as contained in document 8C/PRG/13 irrespective of whether there was an increase in funds or not and could make a decision on what to report to the Programme and Administrative Commissions. He disagreed with the delegate of France that recommendations should be made as to how the Commissions should proceed. He proposed that the Committee report on the following lines:

"The Advisory Committee has examined the report of the Executive Board on the remodelling of the future programme (document 8C/PRG/13). The Committee wishes to commend the spirit of the report, approve the direction of the changes there proposed, and recommend to the Commissions of the Conference that they formulate and adopt the necessary measures to implement the principles of the report at the earliest possible date. The Committee recommends that the Commissions, either through working parties of their own or through the Advisory Committee, establish procedures, criteria and schedules whereby major projects can be selected. The Committee further recommends that,using the same mechanism, the Commissions formulate appropriate instructions to the Director-General in order that he may draw up definite plans in 1955-56. Finally, in the same way, the Commissions should prepare budget and programme instructions which will authorize the Director-General to present a remodelled programme for 1957-58".
(56) He thought that, by making such a recommendation, the Committee would not only express the fact that the report had been examined and approved in general terms, but would indicate that it was aware of problems with regard to the selection and planning of projects which it was not competent to decide.

(57) The CHAIRMAN thanked the delegate of the United States of America for his helpful suggestion and suggested that, in its report, the Committee could perhaps reproduce the general discussion which had taken place, giving an indication of what it considered should be the criteria for selecting projects and ending up along the lines proposed by the delegate of the United States of America.

(58) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the plan of action proposed by the Chairman. The Committee was endorsing the main principles of the document without endorsing every detail it contained. He asked whether it would be possible for the Committee to hold another meeting to consider its report.

Paragraphs 62 and 68

(59) Mr. CABOUAT (France) wanted particularly to to back to paragraphs 62 and 68, on which several delegates had spoken. He recalled that Mr. Maheu had insisted on the fundamental unity of the two broad categories of activities, while pointing out the danger of setting one up against the other. The two paragraphs in question might, however, cause some confusion. Mr. Cabouat thought that it would be difficult to recommend a priori that the funds reserved for the second category should always be appreciably larger than those reserved for the first. The percentages given were valid for the budget as a whole, but, when examining the programme in detail,projects might be found requiring more than one-third of the funds for permanent services. It was, therefore, impossible to recommend "that, in future, a greater part of the ordinary budget be set aside" for activities of the second category. It would be better to leave it to the Director-General to decide what proportion to allow in each particular case.

(60) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) suggested that the last sentence of paragraph 62 be amended as follows: "..... recommends that, in future, larger sums be set aside to provide such services to Member States".

(61) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought that the Committee should endorse the contents of the document in general terms. It was not competent to discuss it in detail.

(62) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Executive Board had been of the same opinion. He pointed out that the proportional sum was not definite. He hoped, however, that the continuing activities would not require more money,

and that the special activities would benefit from any money left over. If the proportion were altered, the effect would be to take away money from the special activities.

(63) Mr. LEE (United States of America) remarked that the figures in the report reflected the situation in 1955-56. If that proportion were accepted, the figures would guide the Director-General in planning the programme for 1957-58. In his opinion, the continuing activities would not suffer much unless more stringent proportions were adopted. He would agree to recommend the report to the General Conference in general terms.

(64) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) supported the Belgian proposal. By inserting a condition, it would mean that, if the budget were increased, then the greater part of the increase would be used for special activities.

(65) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that special activities did not necessarily mean aid to Member States. The Chairman of the Executive Board had said that only 10% of the total budget was used for that purpose. He thought that the paragraphs were mild and would involve no change.

(66) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the Director-General at present interpreted the sentence to mean that the budget of Section I would be stabilized at the existing level, if the budget could be increased, any additional funds would be allotted to Section II, whether for activities undertaken on Unesco's initiative, or for technical aid to Member States.

(67) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) asked whether the Committee foresaw no changes in continuing activities, but only for special activities. Had the Committee decided that this division should be made?

(68) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee agreed that Unesco's programme for special activities should have augmented resources.

(69) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) did not think that the Committee was implying that Section I of the programme should be fixed. If there were a cut in the budget, did the Committee intend that the cut should be spread over the two Sections?

(70) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Board had been anxious that as little money as possible should be spent inside Unesco and as much as possible on outside activities in the future.

(71) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed out that, if continuing activities diminished, money would be set free. If the Belgian proposal were adopted, Unesco would be forced to spend that money on similar activities, and not on special activities.

(72) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) explained that the purpose of his amendment, which applied to the programme for 1957-58, was to avoid a reduction in general activities in favour of special activities, and at the same time to clarify the remarks made by the Chairman of the Executive Board.

(73) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) pointed out that the Committee was considering remodelling the programme, and it must, therefore, decide to devote more money to Section II. At the present stage, 10% of the total budget was being used in direct aid to Member States and it had been felt that Unesco should spend more, directly and indirectly, on Member States. The Belgian amendment would destroy the purpose for which the programme was being remodelled.

(74) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) wished to point out that the whole purpose of Section II of the programme, which represented 67.5% of the budget, was to provide services to Member States. To take an example, it was obvious that the Delhi Public Library project, though initiated by Unesco, was nevertheless to India's advantage. The aforesaid 10% merely represented activities undertaken at the request of Member States.

(75) Mr. LEE (United States of America) remarked that the Committee was not discussing a constitutional document but a report, and suggested that the spirit of the report was such that no one would wish to cripple the continuing activities in such a way that aid to Member States would be affected. He was prepared to leave the text as it stood.

(76) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) supported the United States delegate. He thought that, once the Belgian amendment was accepted, the figures contained in the report would be fixed. It was important to leave those figures flexible in order to have freedom of action.

(77) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) thought that the text under discussion merely drew attention to the present state of affairs.

(78) Mr. CABOUAT (France) observed that, according to a previous statement by the Director-General, the present continuing services were in a position to develop special activities without being expanded. The French delegation was against including any idea of stabilizing the permanent services in the directives which the Conference was to give the Director-General; his hands should not be tied by placing, in advance, a limit on the funds to be expended for the permanent services.

(79) With regard to paragraph 62, the French delegation hoped that the distinction between appropriations for Section I of the programme and those for Section II would not be drawn too sharply.

(80) The CHAIRMAN put the amendment of the delegate of Belgium, seconded by Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway), to the vote.

(81) The motion was rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

(82) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that, after the Director-General had remodelled the programme, improvements in the methods of implementing it should be studied.

(83) The CHAIRMAN asked whether Mr. Abdel-Rahman would raise this matter in the Programme Commission, as that Commission was in a position to give directives.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

# TWENTY - FOURTH MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 9 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET** (document 8C/BUD/1 (prov.))

(1) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) referred to the final report of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding (document 8C/DIV/80) and regretted that it had not been available to the Committee during its examination of the programme and budget. The Expert Committee, which had been attended by important Unesco officials, had discussed the programme in detail and made valuable suggestions, and it would be unfortunate if no use were made of its work.

(2) The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had explained that it had not been possible to issue the report in time for submission to the Committee. It would be difficult at the present juncture to examine the report in detail, but the Norwegian delegate could propose that it be mentioned under the section on education.

(3) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) pointed out that the report had a bearing on other departments as well as the Department of Education.

(4) It was agreed that appropriate references should be made under the relevant sections of the Committee's report.

(5) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the document just referred to by the Norwegian delegate was being translated and reproduced at the moment; without expressing a definite opinion the Committee might, in the introduction to the report, draw the Commission's attention to it after the paragraph dealing with fundamental education; he assured Mr. Sommerfelt that the excellent work that had been done in Paris would not be shelved.

(6) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur), submitting the draft report, pointed out that it had been drawn up in great haste, and that, owing to lack of time, it had not been revised as thoroughly and attentively as could be desired. He craved the Committee's indulgence for a number of mistakes which had occurred as a result. He wished to thank the Secretariat publicly for their invaluable help in completing his work.

(7) Mr. Cabouat had sought to produce a comprehensive report, including all the Committee's recommendations and comments. In the introduction, he had explained the Committee's working methods, and its interpretation of priorities, the higher budgetary level, and the present budgetary level. A definition of the four categories into which the projects had been grouped was given on page 3. The Committee's recommendations regarding the draft resolutions put forward by Member States were shown at the end of the relevant chapters. The Chairman of the Committee intended to suggest to the Programme Commission that it might be advisable to adopt a similar method when discussing those draft resolutions. The recommendations concerning fundamental education had been placed immediately after the chapter on education. Chapter 7 contained the general resolutions, and was followed by a chapter on the Documents and Publications Service. General Administration was dealt with in Part III and Common Service Costs in Part IV. The Conclusion contained general comments and the results of the Committee's proceedings, together with the figures that its recommendations would represent. The Report then stated that the Committee felt that the proposed programme and budget submitted by the Director-General formed, as a whole, a well-balanced body of activities, and fulfilled the double requisite of maintaining the continuity of the Organization's activities and satisfying the wish, repeatedly expressed by the General Conference, for a gradual concentration of those activities. There followed a number of comments on the administrative organization of the Secretariat and, finally, two recommendations to the Programme and Budget Commission, suggesting that the Commission, at the outset of its work, set up two working parties, to consider the administrative structure of the Department of Mass Communication and all problems connected with the decentralization of the Organization's activities.

(8) The CHAIRMAN invited comment on the Introduction.

(9) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), referring to page 3, suggested that it would be simpler to refer to the projects in category 3 as being of low priority.

(10) The CHAIRMAN explained that in formulating category 3 it had been necessary to find a phrase suitable for both the French and English texts. It was difficult to find a French equivalent for "low priority".

(11) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) maintained his suggestion, which applied also to other parts of both the Introduction and the Conclusion.

(12) It was agreed that the Committee should take note of the Egyptian delegate's remarks.

(13) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that category 3 evidently referred to items which would have been excluded from the normal programme, if the budget had been divided into an ordinary and a higher level, as had originally been intended. He agreed with the views of the Egyptian delegate.
(14) With regard to category 4, he proposed that projects should be sub-divided into two categories: those to be rejected and those that were referred to the Director-General to be considered for the 1957-58 programme.

(15) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur), referring to the Egyptian delegate's first remark, said he had difficulty in grasping the distinction between the idea of "low priority", and that contained in the explanation of category 3, covering projects which could be approved only in so far as the funds made available to the Organization exceeded the appropriations required to operate the first two categories of projects.
(16) With reference to the United Kingdom delegate's comment on category 4, provision had been made for the Committee to recommend that the Director-General consider certain projects for the 1957-58 programme.

(17) The CHAIRMAN said that, if he interpreted correctly the remarks of the United Kingdom delegate, they implied that, had the Director-General divided projects into present and higher level, those under category 3 would have appeared in the higher level, and the existing description of category 3 projects covered the situation adequately.

(18) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) understood that the Committee's work had been complicated by the fact that no tentative priorities had been assigned in the documents which it had to examine. In accordance with views expressed by his own and other delegations, he proposed that the following statement should be included in the Committee's report:

"The Committee recommends that, when the 1957-58 programme and budget is prepared, tentative priorities should be allocated to each project and each activity in the programme in order that the next General Conference may be in a better position to evaluate the programme in terms of the funds available for its implementation".

(19) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal.

(20) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) felt that the proposal was so important that he wondered whether the Introduction to the report was really the place for it. He considered that it would be better placed in a special document, for adoption by the General Conference, dealing with the preparation of the 1957-58 programme, or at least in the Conclusion to the report, so as to draw the Commission's attention to its importance. He also thought that the Director-General would find some difficulty in acting on the substance of the proposal, since the term "priority" had no meaning except in a budgetary context. In view of the extent of Unesco's responsibilities and the order of priorities adopted by the Economic and Social Council and the General Conference itself, the Director-General might, thinking purely in terms of the programme, devise an entirely "priority" programme. If the . the General Conference wished to act on that proposal, it should give some indication of the budgetary framework it wanted; it was because the notion of higher and present budgetary levels had not been defined that the Director-General had been unable to work out a system of priorities in the present draft programme.

(21) The CHAIRMAN assumed that the delegate of Canada did not share the views of the Assistant Director-General, but was proposing that the Director-General should start by setting up projects which he considered desirable under the existing budgetary level, and then list in decreasing grades of priority projects whose implementation would be within Unesco's programme policy at various potential levels of increased budget. There would thus be high priority projects under the present budget level and projects of decreasing priority at progressively higher budget levels.

(22) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) said that the Chairman had correctly interpreted his proposal. He did not see how the Committee, with only ten days in which to accomplish its work, could assign priorities where the Secretariat had been unable to do so in a period of six months or a year.

(23) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) opposed the Canadian delegate's proposal. In his view, the Secretariat, when preparing the programme, ought only to include the important items; lower priorities should not appear at all. Instead of presenting the Conference with a programme divided into a part which could be implemented under the anticipated budget and a part, equally important, which could be implemented if additional funds were provided, the Secretariat should submit a complete programme of important projects and leave it to the Conference to assign priorities if the budget voted were not adequate for the whole.

(24) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should concentrate on preparing a satisfactory report of its work during the past two weeks and avoid as far as possible reopening questions which had already been settled. There had been much discussion of priorities and dissatisfaction about the presentation of high and low levels. It would be reasonable to indicate in the report that there had been considerable dissatisfaction over the lack of a system of priorities: that, he understood, was the gist of the Canadian delegate's proposal.

(25) Mr. PANNETON (Canada), in reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, said that he maintained his proposal but would not object to it being modified.

(26) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that,

unless there were a distinction between projects, there would be no point in having a budget at two levels.

(27) The CHAIRMAN said that such a comment could only be addressed to the Director-General.

(28) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the Israeli delegate's remark was in line with his own ideas. The Director-General's attitude might not be the only one possible, but it was perfectly justifiable: with ten million dollars, he could draw up a good programme, but the same held good for a fourteen-million dollar programme, without implying that whatever was added in the second case would necessarily be less good. Equally well-devised programmes might be based on different budgets. The Assistant Director-General thought, however, that there was no point in reopening a question which the Committee had discussed at great length when it had first set to work, and he asked the Canadian delegate if his purpose would not be better served by a resolution looking forward to the future, and giving the Director-General clear directives, rather than by one deprecating the past, which might very possibly create an atmosphere inimical to constructive debate.

(29) The CHAIRMAN agreed with the Assistant Director-General that the report should be directed to the future rather than to the past, but did not understand the suggestion that projects under the higher budgetary level were of less value than those under the normal level.

(30) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) said that his proposal did refer to the future. Its object was to facilitate the work of the Committee at future conferences.

(31) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the Canadian delegate's proposal assumed that there would be two budgetary levels, whereas the Committee had rejected that procedure. The Committee had to decide on the priorities of projects presented to it and, judging from experience over the past ten days, the proposal would not help the Committee in its work.

(32) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee would agree to discuss the proposal when the Appropriation Resolution came up for consideration. It would be a suitable time, since approval of that resolution involved a decision on the form of the future budget.

(33) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) supported the suggestion.

(34) Agreeing with that suggestion, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the Canadian delegate's proposal might even appear in the Conclusion to the report, as a recommendation that the Commission give some indication of priorities when deciding on the form of the draft programme and budget for 1957-58.

(35) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed out that, unless action of the kind proposed by the delegate of Canada were taken, future conferences would be faced with the same difficulty as past ones, namely the task of rearranging the budget at the last minute to meet a reduced budgetary ceiling. The Canadian delegate's proposal was intended to avoid such a situation, but there were other methods of achieving the same end. Governmental representation on the Executive Board, for example, would no doubt go a long way towards solving difficulties. A decision would have to be taken on the form of the budget, but he was willing to see it postponed to a later stage in the discussion.

(36) The CHAIRMAN asked for a decision at the present juncture: either to vote on the Canadian delegate's proposal or to accept the Assistant Director-General's suggestion that an additional paragraph be inserted in the report giving the substance of that proposal and asking the Programme and Budget Commission to bear it in mind when preparing the Appropriation Resolution for 1955-56 on the form of the future programme and budget.

(37) The proposal of the delegate of Canada was put to the vote and rejected by 4 votes to 6 with no abstentions.

(38) In reply to the delegate of the United Kingdom, who wished to see the vote included in the report, the CHAIRMAN said that it could only be included with the Committee's approval.

(39) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of the Introduction did not, to her understanding, correctly describe what had taken place in the Committee. They implied that the Committee had accepted the Director-General's interpretation of "higher budgetary level" and "present budgetary level" and they made no mention of the divergence of opinion among delegates.

(40) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the United States delegate would agree to the addition, possibly after paragraph 9, of a statement to the effect that the Committee had considered the question of interpretation in relation to future programmes and budgets and of a record of the vote on the Canadian delegate's proposal.

(41) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that mention should be made of the difference of opinion regarding the presentation of the programme and budget.

(42) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the United States delegate's request that mention be made, in paragraph 9, of the divergence of opinion among the members of the Committee, was justified, providing that it was added that, as the views of the dissentient members were not shared by the majority, the Committee had not felt obliged to set out any views other than the majority views.

(43) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) remarked that it was not customary to mention in a Committee's report views which had not been accepted by the majority; it would, however, be possible to insert a paragraph covering the point in the supplementary report on the remodelling of the Organization's future programme, mentioned in the last paragraph of the Conclusion.

(44) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 referred to the examination of the programme and budget for 1955-56, which involved the question of priorities, whereas the Canadian delegate's proposal related to the period 1957-58, for which priorities had been rejected. A record of the proposal under paragraph 9 would therefore be inappropriate.

(45) Following an explanatory remark by the CHAIRMAN, Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that her delegation was not concerned with the discussion of the interpretation of higher and present budgetary levels. What she wished to see in the report was an indication that, since the Director-General saw the programme as a whole, attaching equal importance to projects under both levels, the Committee considered that it had the responsibility of reviewing the programme and, in order to facilitate the work of the Conference, of expressing an opinion on priorities wherever possible.

(46) The CHAIRMAN proposed in order to meet the wishes of the United States delegate, to place paragraphs 7 and 8 after paragraph 9.

(47) It was so agreed.

(48) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) suggested inserting a brief reference to budgetary standards in paragraph 4, since the Committee had observed improvement in that respect and thought that, as a whole, budgetary implications had been much better calculated than in the past.

(49) The suggestion was approved.

(50) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed the deletion of the words: "but without, in most cases, making any definite suggestion for amendment" in paragraph 10.

(51) The CHAIRMAN read out the French text, which was clearer than the English. He recalled that the Committee had tried to avoid redrafting proposals submitted by Member States.

(52) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) gave several instances where the Committee had recommended the non-adoption of proposals and said that rejection of a proposal was a drastic form of amendment.

(53) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) explained that, in his view, the phrase should be taken to mean that the Committee had concentrated on the substance rather than the form of projects; he added that there had been few amendments to proposals put forward, since as a rule the Committee had proposed either that the projects submitted be adopted or that they be rejected or inserted in future programmes.

(54) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the phrase in question be amended to read: "without in most cases attempting to modify the substance of or redraft the proposals".

(55) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that some change in the phraseology was necessary. He was also dissatisfied with the words "accompanied by an explanatory statement" in the same paragraph as being too vague.

(56) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the difficulty was due to translation, which had been done under great pressure of time.

(57) It was agreed that the words would be redrafted by the Rapporteur.

(58) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 13, said that according to his recollection the Committee had made a specific recommendation on the time limit for receipt of proposals from Member Governments for presentation to the General Conference.

(59) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the suggestion had been his own, and he had had in mind a time limit of not less than six weeks in advance of the opening of the General Conference.

(60) It was agreed that the paragraph should be amended.

(61) Miss LAISE (United States of America) thought that paragraph 4 should be drafted in more restrained terms, and proposed that the second half of the second sentence should be amended to read: ".... document 8C/5 was an improvement on reports of previous years because of the concise and lucid way in which it had been drafted", and omit the last sentence.

(62) With regard to paragraph 5, a substantive point had been omitted and she proposed that the following phrase should be added to the end: "but taking into account the Executive Board's recommendation for a remodelled programme and the fact that the proposals of the Director-General constitute a transition towards such a programme".

(63) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Secretariat agreed that all superlatives should be deleted, especially any unsolicited testimonials to its work.

(64) Mr. Maheu asked whether the delegate of the United States of America desired an addition to paragraph 5 or an additional separate paragraph.

(65) On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN it was agreed to include the substance of the United States delegate's proposal in an additional paragraph.

(66) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that, from the drafting point of view, it would be better to embody the United States delegate's proposal in a separate paragraph. Paragraph 5 was strictly concerned with the budget, whereas her suggestion concerned the preparation of the future programme, which was to be dealt with by the Committee in a supplementary report; a new paragraph should accordingly be inserted.

(67) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) referred to the first remark of the delegate of the United States of America, recalling that the Committee had unanimously agreed that the new arrangement of the programme was a substantial improvement. He did not think that he had gone further than what had been said in the meeting, but was quite prepared to delete the superlatives.

(68) With regard to paragraph 5, he considered that a further sentence might more appropriately be added to paragraph 7 of the Conclusion, which mentioned the trend towards a better balance and concentration of the programme. Miss Laise's comment might also be inserted in the Committee's supplementary report, instead of after paragraph 5 in the Introduction.

(69) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that the words which she wished inserted represented not a conclusion of the Committee, but the underlying assumption on which it had undertaken the review of the programme and budget. She would therefore prefer to see them in the Introduction.

(70) The proposal was seconded by the United Kingdom delegate and adopted.

(71) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed that the reference to the Final Report of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation, requested by the delegate of Norway, should be included after paragraph 6.

(72) Agreed.

PART I – GENERAL POLICY

CHAPTER 1 – GENERAL CONFERENCE

(73) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that, although it was stated in Chapter I that the Committee had taken no decision on the seat of the ninth session of the Conference, a decision was recorded in the Conclusion.

(74) It was agreed that the report would be suitably amended.

(75) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) pointed out that two different questions were involved. There was a recommendation that the General Conference accept India's invitation to hold its ninth session at New Delhi (a question of principle), but the reference in Chapter I was simply to a detailed examination of the budget estimates, which the Committee had felt to be useless until the General Conference had decided on the principle.

(76) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed a reference in the report to the effect that, while the Committee had decided to recommend in principle that the seat of the next General Conference should be New Delhi, it had not been possible, for the reasons stated, to examine the details.

(77) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) remarked that paragraph 6 of the Conclusion contained a recommendation by the Committee that the General Conference accept the Indian Government's invitation, coupled with a statement of the financial implications. He thought the Israeli delegate's proposal was justified and it might be advisable to transfer those remarks to Part I, Chapter 1 (General Conference), since, although the appropriations proposed by the Director-General had not been examined in detail, the proposal that the ninth session be held in India would involve considerably more expenditure.

(78) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) concurred, provided that the statements in paragraph 6 of the Conclusion were allowed to stand as part of the general summing up.

PART II – PROGRAMME OPERATIONS AND SERVICES

CHAPTER 1 – EDUCATION

(79) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that there should be a reference to the emphasis on the extension of education which had emerged from the discussions.

(80) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that he had had the same thought. He proposed that the second paragraph should be amended to read:

"Projects concerning fundamental education and the extension of school education are and should remain at the very core of the Organization's work in connexion with education and should be oriented towards improving international understanding".

(81) It was so agreed.

(82) On the proposal of Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), it was agreed to change the word "teachers" in paragraph (137), line 4, to "educators".

(83) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that paragraph (137) gave the impression that the major part of the Conference on Public Education had been devoted to reports, whereas the Committee's criticism had been that reports took a long time to deal with. It had been explained that much time would be saved in future by the use of simultaneous interpretation.

(84) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that his understanding of the Committee's views

was that, although the major part of the time in the past had been devoted to reports, it was hoped that in future any increase in time would be given to educational problems rather than to reports.

(85) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked for an explanation of paragraph (143): International Educational Development Fund.

(86) The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been agreed to postpone the item until two recommendations had been prepared and distributed by the Director-General. The proposals were now before the Committee and a substantive discussion was necessary before the paragraph could be approved.

(87) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the Secretariat had prepared two draft resolutions, one of a restricted, the other of a more general character, defining the Organization's policy on the question. In the third section of the draft resolution, the Secretariat had endeavoured to draw the attention of the General Conference to the financial difficulties confronting certain Member States in the promotion of free and compulsory primary education. The Secretariat was asking for authority to take up the problem for later consideration, if certain projects submitted to the United Nations failed to materialize. The last part of the draft resolution easily gives rise to protracted discussions and, in any case, the question would be very fully covered by the Programme Commission. Moreover, the proposal referred to in the third section was at the moment under discussion by the United Nations General Assembly; after two weeks of debate, a number of delegations had agreed on a comprehensive text, which was just about to be put to the vote by the General Assembly. For all those reasons, although it was not withdrawing its draft, the Secretariat thought it would be better for the delegations to take the initiative of presenting it, and that the Committee would accordingly deem it advisable not to take a decision on the third section, but merely to point out to the Conference how important the problem was. In conclusion, the Assistant Director-General proposed that the third section of the draft resolution be separated from the rest; the Committee might, if necessary, adopt the first two sections.

(88) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee would agree to limit discussion to the first and second paragraphs in an effort to approve them for transmission to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(89) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported the Chairman's proposal but asked for the inclusion of a statement to the effect that the Committee suggested that the Programme and Budget Commission should adopt a suitable resolution on the subject.

(90) The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could, if it desired, recommend the adoption of the resolution (paragraph 2 of (143)) by the Programme and Budget Commission, but it would be unwise to do so without first studying the resolution.

(91) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed substituting the following phrase for the first three words of line 3 of the second paragraph: "a suitable resolution".

(92) The CHAIRMAN insisted that there must be a substantive discussion if the Committee wished to make any recommendation.

(93) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the Chairman and proposed that discussion be deferred.

(94) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) supported the two previous speakers.

(95) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) agreed with the views of the United Kingdom delegate, but suggested that the phrase "in underdeveloped areas" be deleted from paragraph (143); the rest should stand, as it summed up the idea which had suggested the creation of the Fund.

(96) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that his proposal was not substantive. A decision would have to be taken, but it could be left to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(97) It was agreed to refer the item to the Programme and Budget Commission for appropriate action.

(98) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) could not understand the connexion between the two parts of the second sentence of paragraph (147) or the significance of the initial word "Although".

(99) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) said that the idea behind the second sentence in that paragraph was that, after discussing the advisability of holding a regional Conference on free and compulsory education, the Committee had decided to let the Director-General's proposal for a Conference in 1956 stand, while at the same time emphasizing the need to bear in mind the financial difficulties facing the Member States in question, and consequently not to divorce the study of the technical aspects of the problem from that of the financial aspects.

(100) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), after an explanation by the CHAIRMAN, still considered the sentence confusing and proposed that it be divided into two.

(101) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked for a clarification of the action which had been decided in respect of paragraph (143).

(102) The CHAIRMAN explained that the Committee, realizing that paragraph (143) had wider implications than the establishment of an International Educational Development Fund, had asked the Director-General to draft an appropriate

resolution. That resolution was now being referred to the Programme and Budget Commission with a recommendation that the Commission should take appropriate action.

(103) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested preceding the title of project (143) (International Educational Development Fund) by a more general title, such as "Policy for the development of free and compulsory education"; that could be followed by the first two sections of the draft resolution, then by the first paragraph appearing in the report under (143), followed again by a further paragraph to the effect that, in view of the importance of the question, the Committee referred it to the Programme Commission for such action as the latter might deem fit.

(104) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that a reference should be made to the Director-General's statement to the United Nations.

(105) The CHAIRMAN said that the point would be included in the Committee's report.

(106) Mr. LEE (United States of America) expressed himself satisfied with the Assistant Director-General's explanation.
(107) He said that paragraph (147) did not adequately cover the discussions that had taken place in the Committee, in particular the need for activities by Unesco to enable Member States to help themselves.

(108) It was agreed that a suitable reference would be included in the report.

(109) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) considered that paragraph (147) did not summarize the discussions in 8C/BUD/SR.3, in which mention was made of his own suggestion that Regional Conferences should not be held at such short intervals: it had been agreed that reference should be made in the Committee's report to the views of the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States of America on the type of conference to be held, and also to the United Kingdom proposal.

(110) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Summary Record did not contain a decision to postpone the 1956 Regional Conference.

(111) After further discussion between the Chairman and the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, it was agreed to draw the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission to the United Kingdom delegate's reservation that no further Regional Meetings should be held until the results of the previous ones were fully known. The action was in accordance with the summary record.

(112) The CHAIRMAN invited discussion on paragraph (217): Project 1.22 - Emergency educational assistance.

(113) No comment.

Draft Resolutions

(114) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked that the wording of the last sentence under DR/28 should be modified to conform to the customary wording.

(115) Agreed.

CHAPTER 2 – NATURAL SCIENCES

(116) In reply to a question from the United Kingdom delegate, the CHAIRMAN confirmed that the omission of any reference to the General Assembly of the International Union of Biochemistry (paragraph 33 of the Natural Sciences Chapter) implied that the project was left at the present budgetary level.

(117) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that priority had been accorded only to the International Geophysical Year.
(118) Referring to the draft resolution in document DR/18, Mr. Auger pointed out that there appeared to be a mistake in the report; special attention should have been drawn to the sixth paragraph, which had nothing to do with the preceding paragraph, and should have its own sub-heading; his impression was, moreover, that the Committee had recommended its adoption.

(119) The CHAIRMAN, referring to paragraph (101), recalled that it had been agreed to alter the title of the project on Cancer and to omit the word "campaign".

(120) Mr. LEE (United States of America) saw no need to alter the title, which was only intended to facilitate reference. He proposed the addition of an explanatory sentence.

(121) It was agreed to adopt the United States delegate's suggestion.

(122) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received a letter from the Director-General of WHO, which was reproduced in document 8C/PRG/20, Add.1. He considered that it would be courteous for the Committee to refer to it in its report, and that such a gesture would be appreciated; he also thought the title already adopted should be retained. Reverting to the passage in the report dealing with the arid zone, he proposed to omit the word "highest" in the expression "highest priority".

Draft Resolutions

(123) At the Chairman's request, Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) read the Summary Record concerning paragraph 6 of DR/18. He recalled his statement that a loan to the Preparatory Committee of the International Computation Centre could only be made out of the Working Capital Fund, and Mr. Auger's explanation on the preferability of a contract to a loan.

(124) Referring to draft resolution DR/29, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural

Sciences) made the point that it was extremely difficult to grant a loan to a temporary organization which would cease to exist once the Centre was set up and could hardly pass on its liabilities; he saw no point in entering into legal complications for such a small sum ($3,000).

(125) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) saw no objection to a loan being given: since it was an intergovernmental agency, recovery of the loan would be assured. Unesco itself had received advances from the United Kingdom Government in its initial stages.

(126) After further discussion, it was agreed to insert the words "from the Working Capital Fund" after the word "loan" in the last paragraph under DR/29.

(127) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that DRs 35, 54 and 60 were missing.

(128) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) said that they had received the same commentary as DRs 42 and 58.

(129) It was agreed that the three resolutions should be included in the report.

(130) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) recalled the discussion on Impact and said that a definite proposal on a lower priority had been made.

(131) It was pointed out by Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) and the CHAIRMAN that no definite conclusion had been reached on the proposal.

### CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL SCIENCES DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

(132) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed to the use of the words "high", "higher" and "highest" in respect of priority.

(133) It was agreed that the Rapporteur should standardize the terminology.

(134) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) asked if the last sentence of DR/55 could be redrafted since it referred to programme as well as budgetary considerations.

(135) On the proposal of the delegate of Israel, it was agreed to amend the words after "deferred" to read: "until a later period".

(136) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked if a more precise wording could be provided for DR/13.

(137) Agreed.

(138) It was also agreed to improve the wording under DR/21 (b) and to delete the words "very much" in the first line under DR/21.

### CHAPTER 4 – CULTURAL ACTIVITIES: DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

(139) Mr. KIRPAL (Department of Cultural Activities) suggested that the word "unnecessary" would be preferable to the word "pointless" at the end of DR/30.

(140) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that his recollection was that both the World Culture Week and the Unesco Award had been rejected.

(141) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) explained that different decisions had been taken on the two items. The Committee had, by 10 votes with one abstention, rejected the motion to recommend adopting the first part of the resolution (World Culture Week), but it had, by the same number of votes, suggested that the item referred to in the second part of the resolution (Unesco Awards) merely be postponed. That difference in attitude was made clear in the report.

(142) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked why there was no decision under DR/49.

(143) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had been unable to take any action and had decided to refer the item to the delegation which had submitted it.

### CHAPTER 5 – MASS COMMUNICATION

(144) The CHAIRMAN asked the reason for the heading "Higher Budgetary Level" before paragraph (72).

(145) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) explained that it had been thought well to draw attention to paragraph 72 in the typescript; any other heading, such as "Production of a Film", would serve the purpose.

(146) The suggestion was approved.

(147) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) thought that the information given under paragraph (154) should be more precise; the reader was referred to the chapter on Cultural Activities, in which the joint project was not even mentioned. It should appear between paragraphs (148) and (312), under Cultural Activities.

Draft Resolutions

(148) With regard to DR/16, Mr. Desjardins thought the report contained a mistake; he was under the impression that the Committee had accepted the Executive Board's recommendation and the corresponding appropriation; further, he pointed out that DR/22 called for an appropriation of $30,000; the sum of $6,000 had already been granted so that the amount involved was $24,000.

(149) The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Rao to explain the budgetary considerations concerning DR/22.

(150) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) read the relative section of the Summary Records, and it was recalled that DR/16 had been rejected by a casting vote from the Chairman.

(151) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) requested that the drafting of the comment on DR/22 should be amended to conform with the customary wording.

CHAPTER 6 – EXCHANGE OF PERSONS: DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

(152) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) drew attention to two typing mistakes in the French text under DR/24: the word "devrait" should read "devant" and the semi-colon after "ensemble" should be changed to a comma.

CHAPTER 7 – GENERAL RESOLUTIONS

(153) On the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, it was agreed to insert the words "by the Programme and Budget Commission" after the words "set up" in the third line under paragraph (22).

CHAPTER 8 – DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS SERVICE

(154) Miss LAISE (United States of America) introduced a resolution submitted by her delegation, which had already been distributed in typewritten form. She would welcome any comments or amendments to the language.

(155) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) expressed his appreciation of the United States delegate's purpose; her draft resolution dealt with an important question and would receive careful attention from the Secretariat; it might perhaps be well to revise the wording, which should leave no room for ambiguity. In the first paragraph of the resolution, it would be better to speak of "documents", instead of "documentation". With regard to paragraph 2, it would be normal to follow the customs of Unesco procedure.

(156) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the word "Organization" in the third line of paragraph (1) should be changed to "Secretariat", since Member Governments were in fact the Organization.

(157) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought the last paragraph would be improved if it were more precise. Either it was addressed to Member States collectively, i.e. to the General Conference, or it was addressed to Member States individually, in which case it was hard to see what action they could take; the most they could do would be to reduce the number of copies of Unesco documents they requested.

(158) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the objects of the resolution were commendable, but he was not sure that it was correct to present it in the form of a Conference resolution. He proposed that it should be submitted for the attention of the Director-General.

(159) The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in order to avoid the form of a draft resolution, the Committee could draw the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission to the need for examining the problem with a view to action which would reduce the volume of documents.

(160) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported the proposal.

(161) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) recalled the Director-General's statement on the internal publications Board, which was already exercising some control. It might be useful to indicate specific documents which were considered unnecessary, and to keep the quality of documents under review. Member States and the Director-General were equally victims of excessive documentation. He asked whether roneographed documents were subject to internal review.

(162) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed the insertion of a fresh paragraph after the first paragraph, in which the Committee would ask the Programme Commission to recommend that the Director-General introduce measures with regard to documents similar to those already provided for in the case of publications, so as to reduce their numbers and make them shorter; and that, if necessary, he seek instructions from the higher authorities of the Organization.

(163) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that she would have no objection to calling the attention of Member Governments to the need to restrict their requests for numbers of certain types of documents. She asked whether the proposal would be submitted to the Administrative or to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(164) The CHAIRMAN said that the question would not arise at the present juncture, since the Committee's report was submitted to both Commissions.

(165) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) asked whether the second draft resolution submitted by the Secretariat was also being dropped. He remarked, further, that the draft resolutions appearing on the next page in the draft programme should come after Chapter 7 (General Resolutions). Lastly, Part IV should include some mention of the Committee's recommendation that the salary of the Secretary of the Staff Association cease to be paid by the Organization.

(166) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) recalled that, in reply to a question by the United States delegate, the Director-General had promised to prepare a paper for submission to the Administrative Commission.

(167) Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that mention ought to be made that the Committee had approved the proposal of the Director-General

to eliminate the post of Deputy Director-General and to create two posts of Assistant Director-General.

(168) With regard to the Bureau of Personnel and Management, she would like some mention of the discussions on reclassifications and the proposal of the United States delegation that the budgetary provision under staff costs should be reduced by $23,000.

(169) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the situation regarding the Director-General's Office could not be made clearer in the report.

(170) It was agreed that it should be.

(171) With regard to the reference to reclassifications, the CHAIRMAN asked whether a reference in the conclusion would meet the wishes of the United States delegate.

(172) Miss LAISE (United States of America), while agreeing that a reference might appropriately be made in the Conclusion, regretted that the recommendation for a reduction of $23,000 was still not dealt with. It was essential for a reference to the decision on reclassifications to be included in the body of the report.

(173) It was agreed that the Rapporteur should include a suitable reference under Chapter 3.

PART IV – COMMON SERVICE COSTS

(174) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) asked why no reference was included to the decision to delete the budgetary provisions in 1955 and 1956 for the salary and allowances for a Secretary to the Staff Association.

(175) The CHAIRMAN asked for inclusion of a reference to the amount of $14,000 in respect of failure to move the Secretariat to the new Headquarters before the end of 1956.

(176) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) proposed that the following statement be included: "The Committee noted that, if the Secretariat did not move to the new Headquarters building during 1956, certain savings would be possible in the budget for 1956".

(177) Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed the following alternative wording: "The Committee was informed that it would not be possible to move the Secretariat before the end of 1956 and as a consequence there would be suppression of certain sums connected with the move". The approximate amount should be stated.

Miscellaneous draft resolutions submitted by Member States

(178) The CHAIRMAN read the amended text of the recommendation on DR/4, which was approved subject to a minor drafting alteration.

(179) With regard to DR/50, Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that the word "Deputy" in the title should be "Assistant".

(180) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to 39 EX/5, asked whether an estimate of the cost should be given.

(181) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the Committee that it had already been decided to deal with the subject in the section entitled "General Conference", and to refer the reader to the Conclusion (paragraph 6).

(182) The CHAIRMAN could not understand why the final draft resolutions gave no indications of budgetary implications. Inclusion of such information would help the work of the Programme and Budget Commission.

(183) The CHAIRMAN asked whether a statement had been included with regard to DR/2 (Adoption of Russian as a working language of Unesco).

(184) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) referred to paragraph 14 of the Introduction.

(185) The CHAIRMAN proposed that reference should be made to the fact that clarification was still awaited from the Soviet delegate on one point.

(186) A discussion ensued on the wording of paragraph 14, the CHAIRMAN pointing out that the impression should not be given that the Committee had been prevented from completing its study merely through lack of time.

(187) It was finally agreed to amend the end of line 3 of paragraph 14 to read: "on which the Secretariat was requested to supply".

Conclusion

(188) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed the inclusion of the following words after "activities" in the sixth line of paragraph (11): "and administration".

(189) Agreed.

(190) Miss LAISE (United States of America), referring to the last page of the Conclusion, proposed that the language should be more concise and factual.

(191) At the request of Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) it was agreed to insert "the period 1954-55" in paragraph 7 in connexion with the reduction of the number of projects.

(192) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) asked whether paragraph (11) should include a reference to the non-governmental organizations.

(193) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) felt that, at a time when the General Conference, at every session, urged the desirability of broadening the membership of international

non-governmental organizations, it would be inconsistent to treat them as regional units. He proposed, moreover, that the suggestions of the United States delegate be put into practice immediately, and that, in order to help in reducing the volume of Unesco documents, the Committee's supplementary report be dropped.

The meeting rose at 12.20 a.m.

# TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

*17 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (PART II)**

**REMODELLING OF THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF UNESCO**
(unnumbered document)

(1) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked that mention should be made in the document of the following three points, all of which had received support during the Committee's discussions: targets for the concentration of the programme in different fields; the need for decentralization of the programme and activities to meet the needs of different regions; the provision of funds for action programmes in Member States.

(2) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed deletion of the last sentence of paragraph 9 on the grounds that the Committee's decision and the explanations given by the Chairman of the Executive Board rendered it superfluous.

(3) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) drew attention to a contradiction between paragraphs 7 and 9. In the first, the Committee was opposed to apportioning funds between the two parts of the programme, and in the second it advised that a decision should be taken on the balance to be established in the programme. He assumed that the word balance referred to the division of funds.

(4) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate: paragraph 7 explained the difficulties in reaching a decision on the balance between continued and special activities, while paragraph 9 said that a decision should be taken. While appreciating that there were difficulties in apportioning the programme between the two types of activity, it was his recollection that the Committee had approved the directive in the report on remodelling of the future programme of Unesco (document 8C/PRG/13) to the effect that the major portion should apply to special activities.

(5) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) pointed out that, in the report under discussion, it was recommended that a larger proportion of the ordinary budget be in future reserved for the special activities requested by Member States.

(6) The CHAIRMAN, referring to the Belgian delegate's remark, said that the sentence in paragraph 68 referring to the greater part of the budget did not concern only Member States. In reply to a further question from the delegate of Belgium, he confirmed that paragraph 68 referred to Member States.

(7) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the second sentence of paragraph 68 contained an idea similar to that in paragraph 62, mentioned by Mr. Florkin. However, paragraph 68 referred to special activities as a whole and was therefore wider in scope.

(8) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) entirely agreed with the Assistant Director-General's interpretation, but recalled that, according to the information previously supplied by the Chairman of the Executive Board, the proportion of the budget reserved for special activities was already greater than that allowed for general activites.

(9) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that, although in the document paragraphs 62 and 68 both came under the heading "Activities undertaken at the request of Member States", paragraph 68 referred to the whole programme.

(10) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) agreed with the United States delegate, but wished to emphasize that the hope expressed in paragraph 68 had already been fulfilled. In any case the paragraph in question could only mean that the percentage of the budget allotted to special activities should be further increased.

(11) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) realized that a problem of interpretation might arise, and that there might be uncertainty whether a larger proportion was to be devoted to special activities than to other activities, or a larger

proportion than was at present allocated to them.

(12) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) thought that the wording meant the major portion of the budget and not a larger part of the budget.

(13) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the gist of the discussion was that, if any additional funds should become available, they should be applied first to the part of the programme concerning projects in Member States. The Committee had also discussed the Director-General's suggestion that part of future budgets should be earmarked for those activities.

(14) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had approved the suggestion, after hearing statements by the Director-General and the representative of the Executive Board to the effect that at the present time the greater part of the budget was devoted to special activities. The object of the paragraph in question was to apply that practice to future years and to stress the desirability of more funds being provided for such activities. It was also agreed that there would be no diminution of funds for normal activities.

(15) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), referring to the Chairman's last point, said that it had been agreed as a policy directive that, whenever it was possible, through concentration of the programme, more funds should be applied to special activities, provided it were not at the expense of normal activities.

(16) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the discussions had been useful and would be of value to the Programme and Budget Commission. He proposed that a reference should be made in the report to the difficulty of interpreting the two paragraphs, with possible quotations from them, and the Committee's comments. The Chairman of the Executive Board might assist in the wording.

(17) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) was anxious for the Board not to intervene in the drafting of the report. He would, however, deal with the matter fully when presenting the Executive Board's report to the Programme and Budget Commission. He agreed that the wording might be considered ambiguous.

(18) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed a statement on the following lines: "It is the opinion of the Advisory Committee that the general or continuing activities in 1956-57 should not be raised above the level envisaged in our review of the programme and planning for 1957-58. A major part of the Organization's resources and funds should be devoted to special activities and greater emphasis in this area should be given to the needs of Member States".

(19) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) drew attention to the reference in paragraph 7 to the interdependence between the permanent services and the services supplying direct aid to Member States, and also to the request for a decision on balance contained in paragraph 9. Recalling the comments at the beginning of the meeting on a contradiction between the two paragraphs, if paragraph 7 were considered as referring to the organic interdependence between parts of the whole programme, and paragraph 9 as referring to the balance from an executive or administrative point of view, the second paragraph would follow logically from the first and there would be no contradiction.

(20) Mr. SEDES (France) considered it impossible to speak of a budgetary balance between one part of the programme and another if the programme had no unity. The Egyptian delegate was perfectly right in that respect.

(21) There was also the question of what would happen if the expansion of special activities entailed an increase in general activities. Such a possibility could not be excluded automatically.

(22) With regard to the comments by the United Kingdom delegate Mr. Sedes thought that the word "balance" could equally well apply to the apportionment of activities or of funds. It was essential to preserve some unity throughout the programme and to draw up a balanced budget for such a consolidated programme.

(23) The CHAIRMAN agreed with the interpretation given by the delegate of Egypt and supported by the delegate of France.

(24) He considered the United States delegate's proposal out of order as it went beyond the Committee's decisions. He assumed that it was intended to refer to 1955-56 and not 1956-57.

(25) Mr. LEE (United States of America) accepted the Chairman's view, but pointed out that he had made his proposal in the interests of clarifying the draft report. The Committee had reached a clear decision to endorse the report on remodelling.

(26) The CHAIRMAN asked the United Kingdom delegate to restate his proposal in the light of that of the United States delegate.

(27) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thanked the delegate of Egypt for his clarification. In the interests of removing ambiguities before presenting the report to the Programme and Budget Commission, he proposed that paragraphs 7 and 9 should be redrafted to express the distinction made by the delegate of Egypt, and that there should be a reference to, or a quotation from, the paragraphs in the Executive Board's report giving the reasons for rejecting the artificial distinction between the two categories of activity.

(28) With regard to the proposal of the United States delegate, while he too did not wish to see activities raised above the 1955-56 level, it was possible that it touched on the prohibited question of the budget ceiling. He did not see how it could be related to his own proposal.

(29) The CHAIRMAN explained that the United Kingdom delegate's proposal was an endeavour to clarify the apparent contradiction between paragraphs 7 and 9.

(30) Mr. CABOUAT (France) saw nothing contradictory between the two paragraphs. He even thought that the two main ideas which they contained could be combined in a single sentence: "The Committee therefore considers that the General Conference should decide upon the balance which it wishes to see maintained in the programme, it being understood that the apportionment of funds between the two parts of the programme should not be based on an artificial distinction between the two types of Member States". The idea was to prevent the programme from being given a dangerous political slant and to emphasize its fundamental unity. He did not believe that there was any ambiguity in the wording which he had proposed.

(31) The CHAIRMAN said that the delegate of the United Kingdom was aware that there was no real contradiction between the two paragraphs. He proposed that a new draft should be prepared by the delegates of the United Kingdom and Egypt and the Rapporteur and submitted to the next meeting.

(32) It was so agreed.

(33) In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that he would prefer to see the new draft before reformulating his earlier proposal. His remarks had not concerned the relationship between continued and special activities, but the fact that certain directives to the Director-General agreed on by the Committee had not been included in the report.

(34) Turning to paragraph 6, he said that, in guiding the Director-General, attention had to be given to the time schedule as well as to criteria and methods in securing concentration of activities. He proposed that the word "timing" be inserted after "methods" in the first line of paragraph 6.

(35) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) objected to the addition. It was difficult to stipulate dates in a process that was continuous.

(36) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that he would not insist on the word "timing" as long as guidance were given to the Director-General on the timing for achieving certain goals.

(37) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) supported the proposal.

(38) Mr. SEDES (France) enquired the exact meaning of the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America.

(39) The CHAIRMAN understood that the proposal was to add the idea of timing to those of criteria and procedures which were already included in the paragraph.

(40) If it were a question of introducing the idea of concentration by stages into paragraph 6, Mr. SEDES (France) had no objection to the proposal.

(41) The CHAIRMAN put the proposal of the United States delegate to the vote and it was adopted by 12 votes to 1.

(42) Mr. CABOUAT (France) pointed out that the word "balance", which appeared several times in the draft report, was not very apt as it generally implied some idea of equality, whereas, in the present case, it was more a question of proportion. Also, any change in the "balance" might be considered as a step towards an "unbalanced" programme, a somewhat detrimental idea. He therefore wondered whether the French text should not be revised with a view to improving the wording.

(43) That suggestion was unanimously approved.

(44) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), after receiving an assurance from the Chairman that funds for general activities would not be blocked under paragraph 9, restated his proposal to delete the last sentence of the paragraph.

(45) The proposal was adopted by 6 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

(46) Mr. SEDES (France) expressed surprise at the decision to delete the sentence concerned since the whole Committee was agreed on its substance. He would have expected members to vote for, rather than against, its retention.

(47) The CHAIRMAN thought that, if the Committee agreed with the French delegate, it would be impossible to keep the words "certain delegations" at the beginning of the sentence.

(48) Mr. SEDES (France) considered that the last sentence of paragraph 9 should be retained. The words "certain delegations" accorded with the facts; but he attached most importance to the words "have clearly indicated", which emphasized a certain aspect of the Committee's work.

(49) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) wished to delete the sentence precisely because of the words "Certain delegations have clearly indicated". In point of fact nobody knew whether that was a minority or majority opinion.

(50) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that he had not voted on the proposal because he had not understood the reasons for it. It was clear from paragraph 7 that neither part of the programme was stabilized.

(51) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that he had made his proposal because it was not correct to include individual points of view in a report.

(52) Speaking as Rapporteur, Mr. CABOUAT (France) reminded the Committee that in the first part of its report it had several times mentioned opinions expressed by one or more delegations. Those were minority opinions which had not been the subject of a vote, had raised no opposition and had seemed worth mentioning because of their particular interest.

(53) The CHAIRMAN took a vote on the proposal by the delegate of Egypt, seconded by the delegate of Canada, that the last sentence of paragraph 9 be deleted. The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 2.

(54) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) wished to know whether the words "these funds will have to be raised by appealing to Member States", which appeared in the third sentence of paragraph 11, should be interpreted as a hope that Unesco's budget would be increased.

(55) The CHAIRMAN did not consider that the sentence under discussion implied an increase in the Organization's budget, but rather that expenditure of the Organization's funds should be co-ordinated with Members' activities.

(56) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the idea underlying the Executive Board's report was that more funds would be needed; where they would come from was a separate question.

(57) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the Executive Board's report indicated that additional funds were desirable, but that some remodelling could be effected without them; the Committee felt that approval of a higher budget was necessary for a remodelled programme. The Committee must either approve the Executive Board's report or state that "such activities will doubtless be enhanced if considerably greater funds are available".

(58) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the views of the United States delegate but considered that his suggestion went beyond what was required of the Committee. The programme under consideration was that for 1955-56 and it was not necessary to comment on future funds. If, however, the Committee wished to do so, it must be made clear that the paragraph calling on Member States to provide more funds was not being endorsed. He proposed the revision of the paragraph to remove any forecast of future needs.

(59) Mr. LEE (United States of America) was willing to accept the proposal provided his own amendment were included.

(60) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the Committee had previously agreed that such activities would need more funds, but not from what source those funds might be forthcoming.

(61) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that there were two levels of funds; those for the fixed budget and those for additional activities. He proposed the following addition to the paragraph after the first sentence: "Such activities will doubtless require funds considerably greater than those that can be provided within the budget of the Organization".

(62) The proposal was seconded by Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium).

(63) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) objected to any implied fixing of future budgets: the budget for any period was fixed by the Conference immediately preceding it.

(64) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) reiterated his opinion that the Committee was exceeding its terms of reference.

(65) Mr. SEDES (France) pointed out that Member States had given such financial support to some of Unesco's undertakings, for instance, the Institutes in the German Federal Republic. He proposed that the sentence be amended to read: "these funds will have to be raised by appealing to Member States, as in the case of previous undertakings". It was important to make it clear that Unesco already had some experience in the matter.

(66) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that his amendment provided clarification. It would not be binding on future budgets, since funds from other sources did not relate to future budgets.

(67) The CHAIRMAN asked for comment on the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate.

(68) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) objected to the proposal on the grounds that the Committee had already agreed that additional funds would be needed.

(69) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that the two sentences should be retained.

(70) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the delegate of India, but nevertheless considered that it was often necessary to refresh the memory of the Conference.

(71) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no vote had ever been taken on the subject; it was only a question of reporting the Committee's opinion.

(72) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that no decision had been reached on the need for additional funds. He did not wish to tie remodelling of the programme to a budget level.

(73) Mr. CABOUAT (France) pointed out that it was mainly a question of defining the large projects mentioned in the Executive Board's report. The Committee had not anticipated that such projects would be carried out entirely at the Organization's expense. If Unesco were to be required to initiate large, planned projects, the Conference's attention should be drawn to the consequences of such a policy.

(74) Mr. SEDES (France) thought that, if the end of paragraph 11 were deleted, the first sentence would have little weight. The Director-General would be greatly hampered in drawing up the future programme unless the Conference agreed on the principle of seeking additional funds. Such a policy fully deserved the Committee's approval; it was right that Member States should be able to make special contributions to Unesco's activities and

that policy in no way involved the idea of a budget level.

(75) The CHAIRMAN took a vote on the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by the delegate of the United States of America; it was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

(76) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) referred to paragraphs 57 and 70 of the Executive Board's report, which implied that larger funds must come from Unesco's budget and proposed that a reference should be made to them in the report.

(77) It was agreed to insert the following words at the beginning of the sentence proposed by the Egyptian delegate: "As indicated by the Executive Board".

(78) The proposal of the delegate of Egypt, seconded by the delegate of Belgium, was adopted by 10 votes to nil with no abstentions.

DR/2 - Draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the USSR

8C/DIV/78 - Note by the Secretariat on budget estimates and related information for use of Russian as a working language of Unesco, as proposed by the USSR

(79) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) recalled that the Committee had asked the Secretariat to get in touch with the USSR delegation, in order to obtain some additional information about its proposal. The USSR delegation had stated that the main point of its draft resolution was contained in paragraph 2 of document 8C/DR/2. It hoped that Russian would be adopted by Unesco as a working language on the same footing as English and French, and asked that the reference to Spanish in the first paragraph be ignored. The USSR delegation did not intend to request that Russian be used for every class of document listed in Note 8C/DIV/78. The delegation's main concern for the time being was to have Russian accepted as a working language of the General Conference and the Executive Board. All the possible financial implications of the draft resolution were set out in document 8C/DIV/78. Members of the Committee would also find therein information about the practice followed with regard to Russian in the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

(80) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the Executive Board's recommendation on document 8C/ADM/7 on the adoption of Spanish as a working language had not been approved by the Committee owing to its budgetary implications.

(81) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) said that, as the proposal not to accept Spanish as a working language of the Executive Board had been adopted at a meeting which he had been unable to attend, he wished to reserve his vote on that point in order to return to it when it was dealt with by the appropriate organ of the Conference.

(82) The CHAIRMAN and Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the adoption of Spanish as a working language would come up for discussion when the Executive Board's report was presented to the Administrative Commission that afternoon.

(83) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) asked whether, in view of the Soviet delegation's communication to the Assistant Director-General, discussion could be limited to the use of Russian for the Conference and the Executive Board. He proposed that a separate vote be taken in each case and opposed its use at the Executive Board for the time being, for reasons of economy.

(84) Replying to a question from Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) explained that the expression "official language" (document 8C/DIV/78) had not the same meaning in all the United Nations Agencies. A list of the official languages of Unesco was given in Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. Rule 56 explained how those official languages were to be used. With regard to working languages, a distinction should be drawn between those used for all Unesco documents and those used by the General Conference. Since the Florence session of the General Conference, Spanish had been added to the working languages of the Conference, which had previously consisted of English and French only.

(85) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked if the Secretariat could make a more detailed statement on the implications under Item 1 of document 8C/DIV/78. It would be useful to know to what extent Russian would be used, for example, in simultaneous interpretation, and in verbatim and summary records, as a guide to voting.

(86) Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) replied that the funds provided for interpretation covered simultaneous interpretation for all meetings where that system was used, and consecutive interpretation for working parties. Verbatim records were made only of plenary meetings. Speeches in Russian would be recorded and then transcribed, so that the verbatim records would be in four languages.

(87) With regard to summary records, the figures allowed for three meetings every morning and afternoon. Henceforth, those records would be drawn up in four languages.

(88) Preparatory documents were all those sent to delegations before the Conference opened, while publications included the Report of the Director-General, the Draft Programme and Budget, Reports of Member States, the Conference Handbook and Journal, and its resolutions and proceedings. Information on that subject would be found in paragraph 10 of the chapter on the General Conference in the Draft Programme and Budget for 1955-56.

(89) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) asked whether it would be possible to consider items separately

or whether a vote would have to be taken on the subject as a whole.

(90) The CHAIRMAN confirmed that proposals could be made on individual categories in document 8C/DIV/78.

(91) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked which resolution authorized the use of Russian at plenary meetings.

(92) Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) explained that the use of Russian as an auxiliary language had been approved by the General Conference in plenary meeting on the recommendation of the General Committee. That was a temporary measure.

(93) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that an amount of $40,596 appearing in note (1) of 8C/DIV/78 would now have to be added to the total of $100,754 for the Conference, since it had been recommended to hold the next Conference in India.

(94) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the implications of item 1 of the document were not reflected in the wording of the resolution.

(95) In reply to a question from Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the expenditure entailed by the use of Russian at the Conference had been estimated as exactly equal to that entailed by the use of Spanish.

(96) Mr. SEDES (France) asked for information on the steps actually taken with regard to Russian.

(97) Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) replied that partial measures only had been taken, providing for interpretation during the debates and for the recording and transcribing of Russian speeches in the verbatim records.

(98) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) did not remember any clause limiting the working languages of Unesco's Secretariat to French and English. He hoped that the Director-General would enlighten him if such limitations existed in the Constitution.

(99) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the Constitution was drawn up in French and English, both languages being equally authoritative. Section X of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference contained the Rules governing the use of languages. Rule 52 stipulated that: "English, French and Spanish are the working languages of the General Conference".

(100) The CHAIRMAN said that that would exclude use of the Russian language anywhere else than in the General Conference.

(101) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that he had proposed that discussion be limited to its use at the Conference.

(102) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) pointed out that some of Unesco's work was done in a language which might to a certain extent be a working language, like Spanish. Thus it frequently happened that Unesco replied in Spanish to letters addressed to it in that language. Therefore, if the General Conference adopted Russian as a working language, certain activities or work would inevitably be carried out in that new language. His proposal would be that Russian be adopted as a working language of the General Conference, but, as the Norwegian delegate had said, its use as a working language would be limited to sessions of the General Conference and so, like Spanish, it would not affect the ordinary work of the Secretariat to any great extent.

(103) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) seconded the Mexican delegate's proposal.

(104) Mr. SEDES (France) thought that, after the decisions taken in plenary session, it would be difficult for the Committee to oppose the adoption of Russian as a working language of the General Conference. From the financial angle, however, it might perhaps be better to limit the number of documents for translation into Russian.

(105) In reply to a question from the Chairman, he explained that his suggestion was not an amendment to the Mexican delegate's proposal. In his opinion, Russian should be placed on the same footing as Spanish, but it was wise to bear in mind the sum available for the next Conference and to make recommendations in keeping with it.

(106) It was agreed that a separate vote should be taken on each item of expenditure.

Interpretation

(107) The budget estimates for interpretation were approved by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

(108) Mr. LEE (United States of America) assumed that the foregoing vote had been for the purpose of clarifying views on the individual items, but that a substantive vote would be taken on the question of principle.

Verbatim Records

(109) Mr. DELAVENAY (Chief, Documents and Publications Service) explained that the verbatim records were obtained by transcribing recordings made during plenary meetings. They therefore reproduced the original speeches in each language, and if Russian were adopted as a working language from the point of view of interpretation, it would be difficult to imagine the absence of speeches in Russian in the verbatim records.

(110) The estimates for verbatim records were approved by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Summary Records and Reports

(111) The relevant estimates were approved by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Preparatory Documents

(112) The estimates were approved by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Publications

(113) The estimates were approved by 10 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

(114) Finally, the Committee agreed, by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, to recommend the adoption of Russian as a working language of the General Conference, having due regard to the budget estimates contained in document 8C/DIV/78, together with the additional estimates for organizing the next session of the Conference in New Delhi.

(115) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) proposed that for the time being the Committee should not recommend the use of Russian for the Executive Board.

(116) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of France and adopted by 10 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

(117) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the preceding vote implied that the Committee should proceed no further.

(118) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that one reason for the vote was that the Soviet Union was not at present represented on the Executive Board.

(119) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that present decisions regarding Russian were being taken on the basis of the existing situation and of information so far available and that, if new facts should be brought to their notice, delegates would naturally be free to take those facts into account.

(120) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) pointed out that the Committee should not exclude the possibility that in future Unesco might publish some periodicals in Russian, for one of the services which Unesco should render to a country which had joined it was to issue some publications in the language of that country.

(121) The CHAIRMAN said that the appropriate place for the Soviet delegation to raise the question of publications and periodicals would be in the Programme and Budget Commission.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

# TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

*17 November 1954 at 4 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway)

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (PART II)**

**REMODELLING OF THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF UNESCO**
(continued)

(1) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) read out paragraphs 6, 7 and 9 of Part II of the draft report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, dealing with the remodelling of the future programme of Unesco, as amended by the Drafting Committee.

(2) Paragraphs 6, 7 and 9 were adopted without discussion.

(3) The Rapporteur added that paragraph 12 in the draft report would be followed immediately by paragraph 15, and that the transferred paragraphs 13 and 14 would be replaced by the text of the motion submitted on 15 November by the delegate of the United States of America, omitting the first sentence of that motion, which was already included in the draft report (cf. document 8C/BUD/SR.23).

(4) The proposed drafting was adopted without discussion.

(5) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought the word "precise" in the last sentence of paragraph 10 laid too heavy a burden on the General Conference and proposed, in the interests of greater flexibility, that it be deleted.

(6) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed to an anomaly in the words: "For several years" at the beginning of the paragraph and the words: "It is now becoming necessary..." in the last sentence of the paragraph.

(7) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed, in order to meet those objections, that the beginning of the last sentence of the paragraph be altered to

read: "It is necessary that the Director-General receive instructions which will enable him..."

(8) Mr. SEDES (France), also referring to paragraph 10, did not think the Director-General could be given "precise instructions" for the concentration of Unesco's activities in drawing up the 1957-58 programme. He asked what precise instructions the Committee or the General Conference could give without first knowing what proposals the Director-General intended to put forward for the 1957-58 programme. The French delegate would rather go back to the original wording of paragraph 10.

(9) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), while fully appreciating the point of view of the French delegate, thought it was difficult to give more than a very general recommendation in the Advisory Committee's report. He would oppose the retention of the original text on account of the drafting anomalies it contained and proposed that the paragraph be adopted as amended by the delegate of the United States of America.

(10) It was so agreed.

(11) Turning to paragraph 11 of the draft report, Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought it should contain a reference to the principle of concentration of activities and proposed that the first two sentences of the paragraph should be altered to read as follows:

"The Conference should in particular, decide whether, as has been proposed by the Executive Board, the future programme should be concentrated by giving priority to a small number of major activities carried out for the purpose of contributing towards a practical solution of specific problems. Such activities will doubtless require funds considerably greater than those normally at the Organization's disposal".

(12) Paragraph 11 as amended was adopted.
(13) Part II of the Draft Report of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget as a whole was adopted.

DR/62: Study preliminary to the establishment of a training centre for international civil servants

(14) Called upon by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the draft resolution submitted by the Iranian delegation showed a just appreciation of the importance of training international civil servants. He interpreted it as a request to the Director-General to undertake a preliminary study of the possibility of setting up a training centre for such officials, with the object of submitting proposals to the General Conference at its ninth session.
(15) He would rather that the term "report" were not used; so that the Director-General might be at liberty not to prepare a formal report if he considered that the question was not yet ripe.

(16) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) asked whether the draft resolution was not affected by Rule 78(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference: "Proposals containing new programme resolutions or amendments to the draft programme involving new activities or increasing substantially the budget estimates shall reach the Director-General in writing at least ten days before the opening of the session".
(17) The Canadian delegate wondered whether the draft resolution did not involve a new activity which, even though it had no budgetary implications, should be closely examined before any decision was taken.

(18) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that the General Committee had taken the view that the draft resolution could be examined under the terms of Rule 78 (3) of the Rules of Procedure. In his opinion, the proposal did not, properly speaking, involve a new activity and had no appreciable budgetary implications.

(19) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) believed that centres already existed where such training was provided, and wondered if the studies proposed by the delegation of Iran were justified.

(20) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought that the Director-General did not require any special authority to investigate the matter, but that the Advisory Committee would need to have more information about the project before it could authorize him to do more than investigate it. He proposed that the question be referred to the Secretariat, which would decide on the desirability of incorporating it in the programme of activities for 1957.

(21) Mr. SEDES (France) seconded the proposal of the delegate of the United States of America. He thought it behoved the Committee to recognize the importance of training international civil servants, but that did not necessarily entail a formal resolution; a general instruction to the Secretariat would be enough.

(22) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) said the question raised by the delegation of Iran was of considerable importance to many countries and he would support the proposal contained in the draft resolution.

(23) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) was anxious to see the ten-day rule applied so that delegations had an opportunity of studying the draft resolutions submitted to the General Conference. He also wondered whether there was in fact a link between the draft resolution proposed by Iran and an activity already mentioned in the draft programme.

(24) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought the points of view of the Indonesian and United States delegations were not incompatible and both might be satisfied if the matter were referred to the Secretariat for submission of a proposal at the next session of the General Conference.

(25) It was so agreed.

DR/63: Unesco publication on Mickiewicz

(26) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that the draft resolution had budgetary implications, and accordingly came under the ten-day rule. Nevertheless, the General Committee had thought fit to make an exception and had accordingly requested the Committee to consider it.

(27) Mr. KIRPAL (Deputy Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the cost of the project would amount to $6,400 for 1955. That sum would cover the publication of 10 contributions by interested persons in book form (250 pp., 2,000 copies) on the lines of those already published by Unesco in homage to Goethe and Balzac.

(28) Mr. LEE (United States of America) requested that the draft resolution be considered out of order as it had not been submitted in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

(29) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that, since the works of the great Polish poet were still insufficiently known outside Poland, it would be more valuable to secure interest in their translation under the auspices of Unesco, rather than issue a separate publication to commemorate his death. If the latter course were followed, many more countries might be induced to submit similar requests for publications.

(30) Mr. SEDES (France) asked whether the works of the Polish poet did not include passages particularly in keeping with the work and aims of Unesco. Such excerpts should be chosen for publication in preference to others, more general in character. He further suggested that, instead of embarking on a special publication, Unesco might publish some of Mickiewicz' work in the Courier so as to bring it to the notice of the regular readers of that paper. In his opinion, $6,400 should not be spent on a project which was not directly connected with Unesco's programme activities until all other possibilities had been exhausted, or at least explored.

(31) Mr. KIRPAL (Deputy Director, Department of Cultural Activities) feared that the adoption of the United Kingdom proposal might jeopardize the Organization's present translation programme, where emphasis was laid primarily on the translation of the literature of Asian countries.

(32) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that no action be recommended on the draft resolution under consideration, just as it had been agreed to recommend no action on the draft resolution of the Italian delegation requesting Unesco to convene a conference to study the work and influence of the architect Palladio (document 8C/DR/27).

(33) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that an adequate tribute might be paid to Poland without undue additional expense if a feature were devoted to the poet Mickiewicz in the Unesco Courier or in any other of the Organization's current publications.

(34) Mr. SEDES (France) put forward, as a formal proposal, his previous suggestion that a number of poems by Adam Mickiewicz, preceded by a biography of the poet, be published in the Unesco Courier.

(35) The French delegation's proposal was put to the vote, and adopted by 6 votes, with 1 abstention.

DR/64: The social sciences and problems of social development

(36) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) submitted the proposal by virtue of another exception allowed by the General Committee. The French proposal entailed expenditure to the extent of $4,000 in 1955; on the other hand it fitted logically into the Unesco programme, without either necessitating any fundamental change, or constituting a "new activity".

(37) With the tacit approval of the Chairman, the Assistant Director-General asked the French delegation whether it wished to maintain its draft resolution, since it would not be impossible to combine it with the draft resolution of the Uruguayan delegation on "Teaching about human rights" (document 8C/DR/55), which seemed to stem from the same considerations, and which the Committee had recommended to the General Conference; it had also recommended approval of a contract with the International Political Science Association.

(38) Mr. SEDES (France), feeling that there had been repeated evidence of the failure of democratic political development to keep pace with economic and social development in the world, wished to maintain his proposal, and hoped that it would be adopted by the Committee. He did not know how the Uruguayan proposal would fare.

(39) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) was in favour of requesting the International Political Science Association to discuss the matter at its Congress in Stockholm in 1955, or, if that did not prove possible, later - in 1957.

(40) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) stated that he had two reasons for invoking Rule 78 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. In the first place, the French draft resolution did, in his opinion, involve a "new activity". Secondly, in his view, it should be regarded as "increasing substantially the budget estimates". The Canadian delegate considered that any expenditure of over one thousand dollars entailed by a project should be regarded as a substantial increase.

(41) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that it was not merely a question of adding an item to the agenda of IPSA. A round-table conference could be organized, but a certain amount of expenditure, entailing a subvention from Unesco, would be inevitable.

(42) The CHAIRMAN, supported by the representative

of the United Kingdom, proposed that the Committee adopt the suggestion of the representative of Israel that IPSA should be requested to study the matter in 1957.

(43) The proposal was put to the vote and adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
(document 8C/5, Annex VIII)

(44) Mr. ADISESHIAH (Director, Department of Technical Assistance) outlined the salient points of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and said that the Advisory Committee had to assist the General Conference to review technical assistance activities over the past two years as well as the technical aspects of the programmes.
(45) For the programme of 1955 the Director-General had submitted to the Technical Assistance Board allocations of 2.7 and 3.2 million dollars for the first and second categories respectively. Those minimum and maximum figures included a sum of 390,000 dollars to cover Headquarters costs. It was interesting to note that in the new programme two-thirds of the budgetary allocations were intended for education, while only one-third was earmarked for scientific development; that proportion reflected the flow and the nature of the requests for assistance which had been received. On the whole the new programme showed a strong element of continuity, since 72 per cent of the activities it embodied were already under way and had been for some time, while only 28 per cent were entirely new. That was due to the fact that the limited financial resources of the Organization had made it necessary to give priority to long-term, continuing projects and also to the fact that the very nature of work in science and education required patience and continuity of effort. In the course of 1955 completely new ground would be broken in Nicaragua, Chile and Paraguay. On the whole, technical assistance would continue to operate in the same major fields as before: primary and secondary education, for which the largest funds had been allocated; fundamental education, which had dropped to second place; technical education, which retained the same degree of priority as before, and special documentation. In all those aspects the Expanded Technical Assistance Programme was closely related to the regular programme. Moreover, all departments of the Organization played an important part in the development of the technical assistance projects, and close collaboration had been ensured between Unesco and the other Specialized Agencies. Important work was being done on a regional basis, particularly in Latin America, where three educational and training centres had been opened, and it was expected that 28 more projects would be completed before the end of the year.
(46) The technical assistance given by Unesco was of three types: experts, scholarships and equipment, and the need for one or the other varied considerably according to countries.

(47) With regard to Headquarters staff, allocations for 1955 totalled 390,000 dollars. The strictest economy had been advocated in that sphere by the Economic and Social Council, and the Director-General, who had been compelled to reduce Headquarters staff in 1954 by 20 per cent compared with 1953, had serious doubts about his being able to carry on technical assistance work in those conditions. He hoped that the Advisory Committee would give that problem its most careful consideration.

(48) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom was most satisfied with the information contained in the report. He thought, however that the latter was perhaps not in all cases sufficiently critical of shortcomings. There was also insufficient information about the work of teams engaged in the evaluation of projects. His delegation was satisfied with the draft resolutions contained on pages 5 and 6 of the report (8C/5, Annex VIII), subject to deletion in the preamble of part D of the word "reduced", which added little to the meaning and could be misunderstood.

(49) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought that there was still room for closer collaboration between the Technical Assistance Department and the other departments of Unesco. Methods of evaluating projects needed to be improved, as they could lead to greater efficiency and more economy. Consultations with the interested parties should precede any attempt to modify the methods of allocating technical assistance to various countries and, finally, more information should be made available about the experts employed on technical assistance projects, their nationality and the type of work they did.

(50) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) paid tribute to the way in which Mr. Adiseshiah had presented the report, and in which the United Kingdom and Egyptian delegates had commented on it. He thought that in no other field was the Unesco budget better allocated.
(51) He recalled, however, that the Technical Assistance Board had asked organizations to reduce their expenditure; the equipment made available for technical assistance projects was used only for demonstration purposes, but he had read that, in one case, the cost of equipment amounted to 40% and in another to 57% of the total cost of the projects.
(52) While he was satisfied with the expenditure as a whole, and would not ask for details, the Canadian delegate found that fact surprising, and wondered whether it would not be possible to economize to some extent, and to use the sums thus made available for objects more in keeping with the Constitution and the spirit of Unesco.

(53) Mr. SEDES (France) joined in congratulating Unesco's Technical Assistance Department, and was glad to note that the technical assistance programme had been expanded. He stressed the degree of co-operation established between the various Specialized Agencies, and added a number of general remarks.

(54) i. With regard to the experts whom governments and National Commissions were entitled to appoint, he thought that Unesco should give those authorities earlier information about proposed missions and their destination. Such missions were generally composed of teachers and research workers, who could not always get away easily.
(55) ii. There should be continuity in the efforts of Unesco and the other Specialized Agencies in such matters as fundamental education. So far as fundamental education was concerned, the experimental period was over, and the time had come to launch, not experiments, but genuine campaigns for its promotion. Continuity of effort was essential to success.
(56) iii. Thirdly, in order to establish continuity at least in certain fields of technical assistance, a period of assessment was necessary. It was clear that such assessment could not be made without due consideration and that often it took a very long time. Evaluation of results was, however, essential for the success of technical assistance, and, in particular, for fundamental education.
(57) Mr. Sedes said he would be happy to support the proposal of the United Kingdom delegate, if the latter would agree not to delete the word "reduced" in the preamble to draft resolution 8.52 (Resolutions, part D). As the funds available for technical assistance were "reduced", Unesco was seeking means of replacing them by asking for help from Member States and for voluntary contributions. It would be very harsh to say to Member States: "Unesco helps those who help themselves", as if the Organization were applying the hard rule of "God helps those who help themselves". To delete "reduced" was to do violence to the sense of the passage.

(58) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that the following paragraph be inserted in the report:

"The Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, having considered Annex VIII of the proposed programme and budget and having taken into account the oral commentary and explanations provided on behalf of the Director-General, commends the document to the General Conference as a useful and lucid summary of Unesco's technical assistance activities, whose main trends appear to the Committee to be satisfactory.

The Committee approves the draft resolutions contained in the report and recommends their adoption by the General Conference with the slight reservation that the word 'reduced' be replaced by 'limited' in the preamble to draft resolution 8.52".

(59) No objections having been raised, the proposal of the delegate of the United Kingdom was adopted.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

# TWENTY - SEVENTH MEETING

*23 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF THE EXPERT COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND CO-OPERATION** (document 8C/DIV/80)

(1) Mr. CABOUAT (Rapporteur) asked the Committee to release him from his duties as rapporteur. When he had agreed to assume those duties he had thought that the meetings of the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget would be about over when the General Conference opened. Contrary to expectations, however, the Committee still had to consider the important question of priorities, referred to it by the Programme Commission. He could not combine his functions as rapporteur with those he was called upon to exercise for his delegation.

(2) After some discussion, it was decided that the French delegation would supply a new rapporteur for the Committee. Mr. Caboiat was accordingly replaced by Mr. Sedes.

(3) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation) introduced the report prepared by that Committee (document 8C/DIV/80).
(4) The document, he explained, began with a history of the Committee, which had been invited to give its views on the draft programme for 1955-56, as it related to education for international understanding and co-operation. On page 2 an index of the contents of the document was given. Mr. Duering drew attention to the first point dealt with, terminology. The Committee had not been satisfied with the expression education for living in a world community" which gave the impression of rosy dreams, and preferred the more modest title: "education for international understanding and co-operation".
(5) The first chapter of the report dealt with general principles. It was an attempt to formulate precise criteria for particular fields of action, which it hoped the present Committee could now examine and recommend. The criteria, Mr. Duering said, were no more than a selection.
(6) Chapter II contained detailed recommendations on projects related to international understanding, including some budgetary recommendations.
Chapter III dealt with future programmes.
Mr. Duering drew attention to Section A of that Chapter, on Administration, which the experts had considered to be particularly important. Two ways had been proposed of dealing with the lack of co-ordination that had been found in the Secretariat in that field: a panel of experts from outside the Organization, or a co-ordinating committee within it. The speaker concluded with a brief description of the Annexes.

(7) At the suggestion of the delegate of Canada, the meeting was adjourned for twenty minutes, to allow for study and informal discussion of the document.

(8) The CHAIRMAN then thanked the Committee of Experts for their excellent and rapidly produced report, and opened the discussion on 8C/DIV/80).

(9) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the introduction and first chapter had taken as much as two years' thinking over, and it would be difficult to analyse it in detail. He proposed that the Committee pass immediately to the consideration of Chapters II and III, as the recommendations contained in them could be compared to those already put forward by the Advisory Committee and necessary adjustments made at once.

(10) The CHAIRMAN thought that the Programme Commission expected a general recommendation from the Advisory Committee on the whole report.

(11) Mr. FRANCOIS (France)said that in his opinion the Committee would be acting irresponsibly if it attempted to pass a final judgment on the work of the Committee of Experts, which had been sitting for two years and had been meeting for several days past in order to draw up its final report. He recalled that members of the Advisory Committee had had approximately twenty minutes in which to read this final report.
(12) He thought therefore that the Committee's rôle should be more restricted. It should be confined to considering whether, in the light of its present discussions, the Committee ought to forward to the Programme Commission new recommendations, different from those contained in its report on the programme and budget.

(13) That view was shared by the Canadian delegate.

(14) The delegate of the German Federal Republic supported the Israeli delegate's proposal, which was then adopted without further discussion.

CHAPTER II: EDUCATION

Paragraphs 55-62

(15) The Advisory Committee had previously recommended that the Director-General should be asked to submit a report to the next session containing a detailed study of the work done by the Unesco Institutes in Germany.

(16) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that sub-paragraph (a) involved a decision on whether the word international should be interpreted here as extending to the whole world or as meaning increasingly European. With sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) the Director-General could agree in principle.

(17) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that the criterion his Committee had had in mind was that which was used for Unesco subventions, namely, that the institute should be "truly international in character". It was better not to be too rigid over the interpretation of the word international.

(18) Mr. SHAHANE (India) said that an institute of that character could not be international in the sense in which the word was generally used in international organizations. That applied to both sub-paragraphs (a) and (b). It was not easy to make the staff fully international. He suggested to the Committee to recommend bringing it to the notice of the Director of the Institute that it was desirable to pay more attention to making the institute really significant in non-Western parts of the world. Sub-paragraph (c) probably had that point in view.

(19) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) referred to his comments in that direction made at the time when the institutes were being discussed by the Advisory Committee. He had been disappointed to find that the emphasis he had wished for was lacking in the report of the Advisory Committee. He supported the Indian delegate's remarks.

(20) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) agreed with the delegate of India. He considered also that the comment on the institutes in the report of the Advisory Committee (document 8C/BUD/1) covered the proposed recommendation.

(21) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that, as soon as an institute like those of Unesco in Germany showed itself to be European, it could be regarded as international. He recalled the view, often put forward by the French delegation, that even those West European countries which were normally considered the most advanced could with advantage refresh their knowledge of the principles and methods of education and international co-operation.

(22) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) said that in actual fact the attitude of the Advisory Committee, which had expressed doubt of the value of the work carried out by the institute, was the same as that of the Expert Committee, although it might be differently expressed. He thought the proposal should be reconsidered in order to put the point more clearly, and supported the proposal of the Indian delegate.

(23) Mr. SHAHANE (India) explained that his delegation was satisfied by the international character of the institute, which was needed in the area where it had been placed. He suggested that a mere indication should be given to its Director that his responsibilities extended beyond a particular area.

(24) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the Committee should be conservative about the details with which it would burden the Programme Commission. He moved that no change be made to the Advisory Committee's report on that point.

(25) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) said that, in considering the report of the Committee of Experts, the Advisory Committee should take note of what, in the report, agreed with its previous conclusions, and should not hesitate to pass judgment on what did not.

(26) The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said that there were two proposals before the Committee. If the first, made by the delegate of the German Federal Republic, to include the comments of the Expert Committee in the Advisory Committee's new report, were adopted, the proposal by the United States of America that the report should stand as it was would automatically fall.

(27) The proposal of the German delegate was then put to the vote and carried by 7 in favour 3 against and 2 abstentions.

(28) The Chairman asked the Rapporteur to formulate the addition in his report.

Paragraphs 176-178:

(29) No comments.

Paragraphs 179-185:

(30) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked for the comments of the Director-General on the necessity for holding two conferences, which was questioned by the Expert Committee.

(31) The meeting, the CHAIRMAN said, had rejected a proposal to alter that item in the draft programme.

(32) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) gave the reason for the Expert Committee's recommendation: his country had a good deal of experience of work on textbooks. It was very slow. The purpose of the remark was to slow down the activities under that heading.

(33) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that the difficulty in discussing the question earlier had been over which of the two conferences would be rejected.

(34) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) replied that the Committee had considered it would be premature to hold the conference in the Far East.

(35) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the Advisory Committee heed the judgment of the experts and slow down the work on the project by eliminating one of the conferences, without specifying which.

(36) Supported by the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(37) Mr. SHAHANE (India) also supported the proposal, adding his appreciation of the work done in East and Central Africa by the companies which had created textbooks in the African language and had tried to spread knowledge of other territories outside the British Empire.

(38) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) remarked that the Secretariat would certainly propose dropping the Asian conference, if either.

(39) The proposal formulated by the delegate of the United States of America was put to the vote and adopted by 12 in favour, none against and 1 abstention.

Paragraphs 186-192 (No previous comment by the Advisory Committee)

(40) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) proposed that the advice of the Expert Committee should be followed, and that paragraph 189 be deleted.

(41) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that since the fifth session of the General Conference, Unesco had had an unfulfilled obligation to encourage teaching about the United Nations and Human Rights in universities as well as in schools. An effort had been made to do that here. The Expert Committee's objection was that the sum proposed was too small, but it was felt that sometimes a pilot course of lectures that caught the interest of a university might have a considerably wider influence eventually.

(42) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the proposal by the delegate of Norway that the project be abandoned but without comment on the destination of the amount to be left unused.

(43) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that, in the course of the detailed study of the budget, it would be possible to work out the amounts which might be devoted to the project, which he considered particularly worth while. What section of the population counted for more in Unesco's work than the younger generation? It was between the ages of 18 and 23 that people realized what they wished to devote their lives to and took their most important decisions. As the Director of the Education Department had said, Unesco had over a period of years accumulated unfulfilled obligations which constituted a virtual contract in respect of university teaching, and a pilot course of lectures sometimes yielded remarkable results. Unesco should take the initiative and do pioneer work, for otherwise no other quarter would undertake to show the way.

(44) The proposal made by the delegate of Norway and seconded by the delegate of the United Kingdom was put to the vote. There were 4 votes in favour, 4 against and 4 abstentions. The Chairman therefore cast his vote, which was that there should be no change in the Committee's previous report.

Paragraphs 193-6

(45) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) informed the meeting that the scheme had developed considerably since the draft had been prepared. If there were more funds, there would be a case for recommending the expansion of an existing activity.

(46) It was agreed to make no change in the report of the Advisory Committee.

Paragraphs 214-6

(47) It was agreed to refer the comments of the Expert Committee to the Director-General, as there was no difficulty in their acceptance.

Paragraphs 323-331, 337 and 338, 340-350, 372-378, 379 and 380 were adopted without comments.

(48) It was suggested at this stage that examination be made of the comments of the Expert Committee on page 19 on the establishment of an international school in Paris.

(49) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document 8C/PRG/1, where the proposal to establish an international school in Paris was explained in detail by Mr. Elvin.

(50) Page 3 of the document, he pointed out, contained the comments of experts whose opinions had been collected. It was thought possible that the school might be made self-supporting, if two or three of the relevant countries made the services of teachers available for a certain period. The voting on that question by the Executive Board had been complicated. The motion to send the proposal forward to the Conference with a favourable comment had been defeated. On sending it forward with an unfavourable comment, the voting had been equal.

(51) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed the adoption of the view expressed on the question by the Expert Committee.

(52) Mr. SHAHANE (India) seconded the proposal. Many civil servants were content to place their children in schools that were not specially created for them, and the delegate of India saw no necessity for the project.

(53) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that many Unesco parents would be glad of the opportunity of sending their children to a school

that was free of nationalist and sectarian prejudices. Neither French nor American parents (the United States of America had a school of their own) would be much concerned, and England was not too far away, but difficulties existed for other language groups. A realistic estimate, however, of the degree to which parents could feel the need of such a school would be difficult to give.

(54) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) was surprised at the proposal to set up an international school in Paris. It was not for Unesco to establish a school, even if such a school were essential to international civil servants. In what language would the pupils be taught? Might not the problem equally well arise in Montevideo, Brussels or, for that matter, Ottawa? After that the Organization could go on to found an international hospital, and so forth; it would be difficult to set a limit, once the principle had been agreed to. The Canadian delegate moved that the project be abandoned.

(55) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) repeated his proposal that the Advisory Committee adopt the recommendation made by the Expert Committee as it stood.

(56) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) thought that the only way of combating the prejudices Mr. Elvin had mentioned was by arranging for the children of foreigners to live a school life together with those of nationals. He therefore considered that the view expressed by the experts should be accepted unchanged.

(57) The proposal of the Israeli delegate was adopted by 11 votes, with one abstention.

NATURAL SCIENCES

Paragraph 34

(58) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that the announcement of the International Geophysical Year had aroused considerable interest throughout the world. The best way for science to contribute to international co-operation was by organizing work in which scientists from all over the world could share.
(59) He recalled that, under existing projects, Unesco was to provide a permanent secretariat for the Geophysical Year (document 8C/5, Natural Sciences, paragraphs 34-36). A subvention of $8,000 was planned for 1955 and of $12,000 for 1956. Those amounts were insufficient. The International Council of Scientific Unions had asked for an extra $15,000, to be spread over the two years, while the Expert Committee had recommended a 20% increase in the subventions contemplated. Mr. Auger considered that it would be well to recommend an increase in the present estimates, even if the Advisory Committee did not feel able to sanction the maximum requested.

(60) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it was in a position to make any recommendation it wished, although, beyond attaching priority to specific items, no actual budgetary recommendations had been made.

(61) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee), in reply to a question by the delegate of Israel, explained that the figure 20% was an arbitrary one and that the intention of the Expert Committee, in mentioning it, had been merely to express its desire that the subventions should be increased.

(62) Mr. LEE (United States of America) moved that the Committee make no change in its decision but merely draw the attention of the Programme Commission to the fact that a figure had been mentioned in the Expert Committee's report.

(63) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), on the understanding that 20% was not a binding figure, seconded the proposal, which was adopted.

Paragraphs 107 and 108 and 112

(64) No comments.

Paragraphs 116 and 117

(65) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that in his view the Expert Committee's comment on Travelling Science Exhibitions was very apposite. Such exhibitions were a very good way of bringing home to the public the international character of modern science, for today no important discovery could be regarded as national; it represented the sum total of research carried out in different countries.

(66) It was decided, without discussion, that the recommendation be referred to the Director-General as a directive on which to base subsequent projects.

Paragraph 119

(67) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) reminded the Committee that it had accepted this project. The Expert Committee had further recommended that a conference be shortly arranged in Asia to spread a public understanding of science. The recommendation could be referred to the Director-General as a directive to be used in drawing up the proposed programme and budget for 1957-58.

(68) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) pointed out that the conference mentioned in paragraphs 132-4 had been discussed at the same time as that proposed in paragraph 119 of the draft programme and budget. The Expert Committee had thought it possible that the Conference on the Public Understanding of Science might take place in Asia and the one on Science Teaching in Latin America. But that was a question for the Programme Commission to settle.

(69) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that the activity should be linked with that of other

Specialized Agencies concerned with bringing the results of science into the lives of millions of people. The Expert Committee had recommended co-ordination between the various departments of the Secretariat. Should a reference to that aspect of co-ordination be made in the report?

(70) In reply to Mr. Cowell, Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that the non-governmental organizations and Specialized Agencies relied on Unesco to collaborate with them in spreading scientific knowledge connected with their own particular fields of interest. Unesco worked in permanent collaboration with WHO and FAO.

(71) The Committee decided, without discussion, to refer the recommendation to the Director-General as it stood.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Paragraphs 148-160

(72) The Committee recommended assigning the whole of this project to Category 2, with the exception of paragraphs 152-156, for which Category 3 was recommended.

(73) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) suggested that the Advisory Committee maintain the view it had already expressed with regard to the Study of factors which hinder and which encourage international understanding.

(74) It was decided accordingly, without discussion.

Paragraphs 174-180

(75) This proposal had been recommended for Category 1 by the Advisory Committee and, relative to it, draft resolution No. 8 was approved with a budget of $19,192.

(76) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that, as the two committees had concurred without consulting each other, no change should be made in the Advisory Committee's report.

(77) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) supported that proposal, which was adopted.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Paragraphs 153-160

(78) The Expert Committee commented favourably on these paragraphs. The Advisory Committee, on the other hand, with the exception of Section D, paragraphs 165-171, had classed these activities in Category 3.

(79) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) was of opinion that the Committee should use the expression "contemporary cultures", instead of "contemporary culture"; the latter term he failed to understand.

(80) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) confessed that this was a branch of his Department's activity which he had been sorry to see classed in a lower category. He stressed the ever important rôle of the classical humanities, from whatever country they stemmed.
(81) He had been somewhat surprised at the Committee's decision, and urged that the subject be given at least the same priority as the rest of the project. Unesco's decisions in the matter had a great effect in cultural congresses which could give Unesco voluntary assistance, and it was important not to discourage potential co-operation of that kind.

(82) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) shared the views of Mr. Thomas. The project as it had stood at first was a more equitable distribution of the sum available for activities referring to different parts of the world.

(83) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that the discussion was only on Sections A and B, since D had been recommended by both committees and C left out by both.

(84) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) moved that the Advisory Committee should maintain its attitude in respect of Sections A and B.

(85) The proposal was supported by the delegate of the United States of America, and adopted by 6 in favour, 4 against and no abstentions.

(86) Paragraphs 186-201, 212-232, 244-262, 287-300, 304-311, 302 and 303, 319-325, 327-336 and 346-350 were referred to the Director-General without comments.

Paragraphs 376-392

(87) The Advisory Committee had recommended adoption of the paragraph on Index Translationum in the corrigendum to document 8C/5 and also the adoption of draft resolution DR/26 on the same subject. That met with the Expert Committee's recommendation. Other remarks made by that Committee were of a general character and could be referred to the Director-General for his guidance.

(88) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) was sceptical of the need for including not too widely spoken European languages. The task was a vast one, and ought to be limited.

(89) Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that the remark made at point 3 referred in particular to paragraph 390 (document 8C/5, Chapter on Cultural Activities). It was hoped moreover that the establishment of an International Federation of Translators would have the effect of improving the quality of translations.

(90) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) favoured the principle of economy. In his view, Member States' money could often be better employed otherwise

than in issuing publications. That did not however apply to the Index Translationum, which was of undoubted value.

(91) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) supported the proposal of the Norwegian delegate that the Advisory Committee should draw attention, in its report to the Programme Commission, to the fact that it doubted the value of issuing translations in other European languages.

(92) It was decided accordingly by 9 votes, with 3 abstentions.

(93) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) added that he would have liked the proposal in sub-paragraph 3 of the Expert Committee's comments on paragraphs 376-392 recommended, with the suppression of the last words "by raising the status of translators".

(94) The Advisory Committee's report was, however, left as it stood.

MASS COMMUNICATION

Paragraphs 25-28

(95) The recommendation of the Advisory Committee on this project (that the appropriation be reduced to $10,000 for the two years, and that the entire project be placed in Category 3) was in direct contradiction to that of the Expert Committee.

(96) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) explained that the Expert Committee had been divided but, on the whole, favourable.

(97) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was sympathetic to the proposal but proposed that no change be made in the report of the Advisory Committee.

(98) Agreed.

Paragraphs 37-76

(99) There was some disagreement on these activities between the two committees. At the suggestion of the delegate of the United States of America, the Advisory Committee made no change in its previous report on the subject.

Paragraphs 137-159

(100) The Advisory Committee had felt there was some duplication here with the activities carried out by Member States at a national level, and had accordingly voted a lower priority to the project contained in paragraphs 143 and 144, as well as 154. The Expert Committee had recommended those activities.

(101) Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) drew attention to a new document (8C/5 Corr. 3), which gave complementary information on those activities.

(102) The fact was noted and the project referred to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Paragraphs 205-221

(103) The Advisory Committee's comment on this subject came under the general remarks made on voluntary international assistance. It had expressed the hope that emphasis would be laid on the educational aspects of project 5.7.

(104) Mr. ZUCKERMAN (Department of Mass Communication) explained that the difficulties over supplies had all been settled. The recommendation of the Expert Committee would entail the loss of $40,000 in the first year and $50,000 a year after that.

(105) It was agreed to draw the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission to the whole question.

Paragraphs 219 and 220

(106) No comment.

The meeting rose at 7.5 p.m.

# TWENTY - EIGHTH MEETING

*24 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE EXPERT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND CO-OPERATION** (document 8C/DIV/80) (continued)

**CHAPTER III (GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON FUTURE PROGRAMMES)** (page 19):

(1) The CHAIRMAN stated that in Section A, the Expert Committee had suggested two procedures for co-ordination, namely, that it should either be effected by an inter-departmental committee or that the Director-General should be able to call on outside assistance.

(2) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that the two suggestions made in paragraphs (a) and (b) of Section A were not mutually exclusive. The idea in (b) was that, since the Executive Board was to become a body of government representatives, it would be useful if the Director-General could call on experts from outside. A committee of such experts might meet once a year to discuss general policy and advise the Director-General. That, of course, would have budgetary implications.

(3) The CHAIRMAN referred to the introductory remarks under Education, on page 13. There had been some question of making work in connexion with international understanding the responsibility of some definite division within the Secretariat.

(4) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought it obvious that the Department of Education had the chief part to play in all activities connected with education for international understanding and co-operation. It might be argued that that Department should provide the impetus for the work of co-ordination. He suggested, however, that such co-ordination should be initiated from above, and urged that an immediate representative of the Director-General would command greater authority. Mr. François thought that both procedures were defensible, since in fact everything would depend on the kind of person made responsible for the work. It would certainly be best to leave the Director-General and his assistants to choose that person.

(5) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) did not think that the remarks of the French delegate were at all incompatible with the paragraph in question, since the Director-General would in any case be responsible.

(6) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Director-General fully understood the need for further steps to co-ordinate work on international understanding. No dogmatic statement about the machinery required was needed. The obvious method was to set up an inter-departmental committee, possibly with the Director-General in the Chair.

(7) The Director-General, he added, felt that experience with outside experts had been acquired during the previous two years, and that it would be better to rely on internal machinery to implement the suggestions in the report, leaving the possibility of reverting to outside assistance later

(8) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) had grave doubts about the need for the machinery suggested. The activities in question constituted the main work of Unesco, and some co-ordination was required in any case. He agreed that there was no call for committees of experts external to the Organization. Co-ordination could well be left to the existing machinery.

(9) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate. He reminded the meeting that one of the arguments in favour of the new structure of the Executive Board had been that it would enable the Organization to have broad contacts with a large number of experts. He therefore did not think that a new committee of experts was needed.

(10) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the delegate of France that a great deal depended on who was personally responsible for the co-ordination in question. At the same time, while education for international understanding was the main business of Unesco, the Secretariat was made up of people with varying interests and skills. The field was a new one, offering much opportunity for experiment, and some co-ordination at a high level was needed. The machinery in question might be associated with that which would be required to remodel the programme. For example, a small planning unit might be set up, responsible to the Director-General, and within that unit, one person might be made primarily responsible for education for international understanding.

(11) He was somewhat disappointed that more space had not been devoted in the report to major projects to be considered by the Secretariat in connexion with the remodelling envisaged by the Executive Board.

(12) Generally speaking, he felt that the Committee should recommend adoption of the suggestions made by the Expert Committee in paragraphs (a) and (b).

(13) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that Section A on page 19 started off by stressing the need for concentration and co-ordination. Was not that enough? The Director-General should be left free to take such action as he saw fit over the next two years.
(14) Chapter III was entitled General Recommendations on Future Programmes. Would it not be better to head it simply General Recommendations?

(15) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that the Committee had made its recommendations with an eye to the 1957-58 programme, and had not intended paragraph (b) to apply to the programme for 1955-56.
(16) The Committee had been of opinion that, although steps had been taken to co-ordinate the 1955-56 programme, not enough had been done in that direction; hence paragraph (a).

(17) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that paragraph (a) was merely stating the obvious, and, in so far as it might be taken to imply criticism of the Director-General, should be deleted.

(18) The United Kingdom proposal, supported by Belgium and Israel, to the effect that the Committee should not endorse Section A, (a) and (b), so that the Director-General should be free to take such action as he might see fit, was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

(19) It was agreed to consider Section B when discussing the future programme.

Chapter I - Unesco's methods of action

(20) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that most of the comments under that heading held good for all Unesco departments. Perhaps it would be well to concentrate attention on the few specific suggestions bearing on education for international understanding.

(21) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) called attention to the second sentence in the second paragraph of the preamble: "While it (the Committee) directed its attention to those methods as they relate specifically to education for international understanding and co-operation, it believes that some of its recommendations and suggestions have or may have broader validity for Unesco." It was true that Sections I and II were very general in nature, stressing as they did the need for flexibility and empiricism.

(22) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that it would be best to decide whether there were any points in the report likely to affect the Committee's recommendations on remodelling, or requiring consideration by the Conference, and to refer the report to the Programme and Budget Commission.
(23) Chapter I, as far as he could see, appeared entirely consistent with the Advisory Committee's previous recommendations.

(24) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that in Chapter I the Expert Committee seemed to have done more justice to certain methods of action (fellowships and exhibitions) than to others.
(25) At the fifth session of the General Conference, in Florence, a document had been evolved laying down the basic programme and suggesting methods of action. Had that document been used by the Expert Committee?
(26) Unesco as a whole needed a generally accepted statement of methods (perhaps a revised version of the fifth session document he had alluded to). In general, he felt that the report by the Expert Committee provided a valuable basis for a revision of methods.
(27) He welcomed Section II, paragraph (2), to the effect that the selection of methods must be based largely on empirical grounds.
(28) In general, he agreed with the delegate of the United States of America. Nothing in the report had any implications for the budget. Hence the document could merely be referred to the Programme and Budget Commission for study.

(29) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) agreed with the previous speaker and with the delegate of the United States of America.

(30) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that the Committee had had the basic programme of Unesco as a working document in Paris.
(31) In connexion with three methods (international seminars, fellowships, and exhibitions), the Committee had made important recommendations. It had hoped that those recommendations would be endorsed by the Programme and Budget Commission and adopted, provisionally, for the next two years.

Section I: Direct and Indirect Action, and Annex on page 24

(32) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph (d) on page 25, asked whether the Expert Committee's comments on the preparation of manuscripts implied any belief on the part of the Committee that the Secretariat would have to be strengthened to cope with that particular task.

(33) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that the section in question had been very cautiously worded.

(34) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said the point was a somewhat delicate one. A distinguished expert, called in to prepare a manuscript, might be insensitive to diplomatic requirements.
(35) There were staff members in the Secretariat with expert knowledge, although an expert called upon to write on a controversial subject on which he held strong views might tend to forget that he was also an international civil servant. Thus there were difficulties either way. The point which the Expert Committee was trying to make, as he understood it, was that while, in many cases, an expert member of the Secretariat could prepare a

manuscript more quickly and more economically than an outside expert, recourse to the Secretariat would necessarily have budgetary implications, since to prepare a difficult text a member of the Secretariat would have to be freed from his normal duties.

(36) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that a writer's personality was bound to leave its mark on his writing, and, in some cases, readers in certain countries might be disconcerted thereby. Unesco could circumvent that obstacle, and prosecute its aim of offering the world a wide range of international opinion, if it were to entrust the drafting of manuscripts to a group instead of to a single expert. That method had already been tried by Unesco; certain publications on Western and Oriental ways of life and thought provided examples of its use.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that a reference might suitably be made to the possibility of having recourse to non-governmental organizations active in the fields concerned. Such organizations might well charge lower fees, and hence money would be saved.

(38) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) thought that the point had been adequately covered in paragraph (b) on page 24 (Contracts with non-governmental organizations).

(39) The CHAIRMAN felt that the sense of the Committee was that expert knowledge existed in the Secretariat which could sometimes suitably be drawn upon for the preparation of manuscripts. The points made would be included in the report.

Section II - Methods in general

(40) Mr. FRANCOIS (France), referring to item (4), pointed out that great caution was needed.
(41) It sometimes took a long while for results to become apparent and they should not be expected to be sensational. The times were difficult and Unesco had in many instances to struggle against the tide; in such cases, the paucity of immediate results would not be a reason for giving up but on the contrary for persevering.
(42) Referring to item (5), Mr. François remarked that the last part of the paragraph in French frankly astonished him: "découvrir dans les diverses cultures les grands facteurs qui, pendant les cinq premières années de l'existence, contribuent essentiellement à l'adoption d'une saine attitude envers les peuples appartenant à d'autres cultures."
(43) Although some educational psychologists regarded even the pre-natal months as being of decisive importance in the formation of a child's mind, Mr. François was convinced that until the age of 5, and even after, culture meant very little to children. The most important years in a person's life were those from 11 to 18, as it was then that he moulded his personality, amidst the difficulties and stresses of the adult world he was entering. Were there not cases of children who had been brought up in an environment utterly unconcerned with moral considerations but, having passed their adolescence in a good educational atmosphere, had become outstanding men and women?

(44) The French delegate concluded by stating that the paragraph as it stood seemed to him unsuitable for inclusion in a Unesco document.

(45) The CHAIRMAN said that he, too, had been much worried about the point raised by the delegate of France. The Secretariat must not lose heart if the results of its surveys were negative. The work it did was necessarily long-term.
(46) As regarded the strong views expressed by the delegate of France in connexion with paragraph (5) on page 8, he had listened with sympathy. The English text seemed to bear very little resemblance to the French.

(47) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) explained that there were indeed discrepancies between the English and French texts. The section alluded to by the delegate of France in his statement on paragraph (5) had been transferred in a modified form to the Annex to Chapter III (page 29), under the heading: Research in Child Psychology.

(48) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the evaluation which the Expert Committee had had in mind was of the ordinary common-sense kind, and was not evaluation as used by sociologists in a technical sense. It was no more than common sense for the Secretariat to ask itself whether its activities had produced the results expected of them.

(49) It was agreed that the French text of Section V of the Annex to Chapter III (Research in Child Psychology) should be endorsed and that a statement should be included in the report for that purpose.

Section III (page 8) - Specific methods of action

Sub-section A

(50) No comments.

Sub-section B - International seminars

(51) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) thought that three weeks was quite long enough for a seminar, and proposed that the recommendation made in paragraph (3) (a) be altered accordingly.

(52) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that the paragraph represented a compromise. While agreeing that in some cases three weeks would be enough, the Committee had felt that the first week was always necessary for participants to get to know each other and discuss their problems.

(53) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was very critical of the system of seminars, which, in the opinion of the French delegation, did not produce results commensurate with the very large sums spent on them. At their best, they benefited no more than a handful of educators, among the millions in the world; at the same time they monopolized the services of Unesco officials for weeks on end. He

himself had attended five seminars, and did not feel that Unesco had derived any appreciable advantage from any of them; they had not issued any worthwhile documents. The Organization had not the means to indulge in that kind of luxury at the present time and should give up the method in favour of that described in paragraph 4.

(54) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Secretariat was grateful to the Expert Committee for setting out what seminars could be expected to do. Seminars were a means of higher education. They were not meant to do research or produce original documents. The most successful were those with clearly defined subjects of study. As an example, he would refer to a seminar held two years ago, in Ceylon, on the teaching of modern languages. If a seminar was to be successful, another essential condition was that the participants be most carefully chosen.
(55) There was a great deal to be said for the alternative mentioned in paragraph (4) (c), namely, that National Commissions should organize seminars for their own nations, who would all enjoy a common background, and that Unesco should add an international flavour by sending a few staff members or persons from other parts of the world.

(56) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) thought that the section of the report concerned was most constructive and that, in adopting it, emphasis should be laid on its special claims to attention.

(57) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) wished to make a reservation about paragraph (4) (b). It would be difficult to find writers of the highest possible quality and their services would be costly.

(58) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) thought that the Secretariat should be most careful in choosing participants when such international seminars were organized. He asked for clarification of the last sentence in paragraph (4) (a) as he could not see why, if Unesco selected participants, it should necessarily have to pay their travelling expenses.

(59) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Committee meant that, if the Director-General chose to invite participants from different States, he would presumably have to pay their travel costs.
(60) As regarded the point made by the delegate of Mexico, the practice was for the Secretariat to write to States asking them to nominate participants. It could not veto their choice. The only way it could help was to indicate clearly the type of qualifications such persons ought to possess.
(61) Some highly successful national seminars had been held of the kind mentioned in paragraph (4) (c) - for example, a seminar in Italy on adult education. He hoped there would be more.

(62) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) found a discrepancy between Mr. François' severe criticisms of the seminars and Mr. Elvin's opinion that some of them had been successful, and felt that further information was necessary.

(63) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that some of the seminars organized by his Department had not justified the money spent on them. On the other hand, the seminar in Ceylon, although it might be considered more a meeting of experts than a meeting for the higher education of participants, had been outstandingly successful. Some seminars were good, some bad, and some indifferent. The seminar as a method should not be condemned outright.

(64) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) asked Mr. Elvin whether a seminar devoted to a single closely defined subject would be a study meeting or an educational meeting.
(65) He remarked that a number of seminars had failed to enhance Unesco's reputation even in the minds of some of those taking part, since all they felt they owed the Organization was an opportunity to travel - an attitude implying little real respect for Unesco's achievements.

(66) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) thought that paragraph (3) (a) should satisfy the Indonesian delegate, since it specified four weeks as the maximum length of a seminar.

(67) The CHAIRMAN observed that there was a grave discrepancy between the English and French texts of paragraph (3) (a). Perhaps, if the English text were brought into line with the French, which specified that seminars should not last more than four weeks, the point raised by the delegate of Indonesia would be taken care of.

(68) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that seminars seemed to be held chiefly by the Cultural Activities Department, and it might be well to hear from that Department before taking a decision. He was under the impression they had achieved some success, for example, in the organization of libraries in the underdeveloped countries.
(69) While recognizing that some seminars were valuable, he was inclined to share the doubts of the delegate of France whether their value was in proportion to their high cost.

(70) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether it was the general practice for Unesco to pay the travelling expenses of those attending international seminars or whether part of the cost was borne by the individual States.

(71) Mr. KIRPAL (Deputy Director, Department of Cultural Activities) confirmed what the delegate of the United Kingdom had said. His Department had much experience in organizing seminars on the rôle of museums and libraries, and of art in education.
(72) The seminars organized by his Department were more than educational meetings. Often they were meetings of experts and were followed by concrete action, such as the creation of an international association to continue work begun at the seminar.
(73) A seminar had been held in Tokyo only two months before, on the rôle of arts and crafts in

education, with particular reference to community development. It had been restricted to Southern Asia and the Far East. He understood that in general the seminar had proved a very great success.
(74) Replying to the point made by the delegate of Mexico, Mr. Kirpal said that Unesco did not pay travel costs. It merely paid the cost of providing interpreters, document services, etc. Board and lodging were paid for by Unesco in co-operation with the host country.

(75) The CHAIRMAN observed that an important point had been raised. If seminars were just a method of higher education, could Unesco appropriately organize them?

(76) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was convinced that the seminar on museums and education, for instance, would have lasted a week instead of a month if it had not been held in Athens.
(77) He proposed the following resolution: "The Advisory Committee considers that, in view of the Organization's present limited resources, the expenditure on seminars is too high for the results obtained."

(78) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) feared, from the various statements he had heard, that the seminars were far more successful from the participants' point of view than from that of Unesco itself.
(79) Accordingly, considering the moderate terms of the resolution and the desire for economy behind it, he felt inclined to give it the support of the Canadian delegation, not in order to abolish the seminar system altogether but to emphasize the need for the most careful choice of subjects, participants and place of meeting.

(80) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that the Committee was obviously very critical of seminars as an institution, and it was its duty to make that view known to the General Conference.

(81) The CHAIRMAN, agreeing, said that it would be a pity if the Committee were to condemn all seminars in all circumstances.

(82) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) pointed out that the delegate of France had been criticizing seminars as they used to be held. But all would agree that expert meetings, as mentioned in paragraph (4) (a), were valuable.

(83) The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee seemed to share the Expert Committee's doubts about the value of seminars for higher education. It could, he felt, endorse the Expert Committee's recommendations, subject to the comments already made about payment of travel costs and the engagement of writers.
(84) He asked whether the Expert Committee was advocating a change of policy in regard to travel costs.

(85) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that if, as suggested in paragraph (4) (a), Unesco made the final choice of participants, it would probably have to meet their travel costs.

(86) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the practice was to indicate to Member States the number of participants in the seminar and the qualifications expected of them. Then the Member States made their nominations. The Director-General had no right of veto.

(87) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was in favour of keeping the present system, whereby the States sending participants were required to pay travel costs.
(88) It was most important that National Commissions should be consulted in the choice of participants.

(89) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) seconded the United Kingdom delegate's suggestion, as he considered that, if the individual States had to pay the travel expenses of the participants, the choice of those to attend international seminars was likely to be better.

(90) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the delegate of Mexico was not quite right. It did, unhappily, sometimes happen that distant States nominated persons with doubtful qualifications who for some reason happened to be in or near the country where the seminar was to be held.
(91) It was expressly stated in paragraph (4) that the suggestions made were to be regarded as experimental.

(92) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested the adoption of paragraph (4) (a) as it stood.

(93) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) agreed that the poor results of some seminars had been partly due to differences in the qualifications of the participants, which had been so great that, intellectually, they did not speak the same language and therefore could not combine to accomplish anything constructive.
(94) He therefore thought it essential that Unesco should have the final decision on the choice of members of the seminars, after consultation with National Commissions.

(95) Mr. SOEBROTO (Indonesia) thought it reasonable to suggest, as the delegate of the United Kingdom had done, that Member States should continue to pay travel costs, if the seminar were on a subject of regional interest only. But if the seminar were on a matter of universal significance and of general importance to Unesco as a whole, it would be unreasonable to expect a distant State to bear such expenses.

(96) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom in attaching considerable importance to consultation with National Commissions before participants were chosen.

(97) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) agreed with the delegate of Indonesia. If a seminar were of genuinely international interest, the persons chosen by Unesco could not be asked to pay their travel costs.

(98) The CHAIRMAN put paragraph (4) (a) to the vote, it being understood to mean that the Expert Committee was recommending payment of travel costs by Unesco as an experiment, providing it could make the final choice of participants.

(99) Paragraph (4) (a) was endorsed by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph (4) (b):

(100) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that that recommendation was unnecessary, since in every seminar there were suitably qualified members of the Secretariat available.

(101) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that, in the view of the Expert Committee, there was a need for attractive publicity, and not just factual reports. It might be possible to engage a journalist of standing to produce the material the Committee had had in mind.

(102) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the experiment had been tried and proved a moderate success.

(103) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested that the Committee merely draw the attention of the Secretariat to the need for better publicity.

(104) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested that the Committee should merely call attention to the point in its report and refer the matter to the Working Party on Mass Media.

(105) This suggestion, put in the form of a motion, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Sub-Section C: Fellowships (page 9):

(106) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) thought that paragraph (5) (d) was too rigid. It was sometimes better to let a person stay a considerable time in his host country.

(107) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that the points made in the Expert Committee's report represented the significant facts of the experience acquired by Unesco. The problem had been given expert study.
(108) The problem mentioned by the delegate of Norway existed in the case of fellowships, administered by the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies, for older students sent abroad for intensive training. The application form to be filled in by the candidate was designed to ensure that only the right kind of person was successful. In the case of junior students the problem did not exist.

(109) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) agreed with Mr. Sommerfelt. Paragraph (5) (d) imposed needless restrictions, and might in certain instances preclude a highly desirable development - namely, a tour of several countries by the same fellowship-holder, or a long stay in one country.

(110) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) agreed with paragraph (1) and the first line and a half of paragraph (2). What was meant by a fellowship completely failing to promote the growth of international understanding? He disagreed with the second half of paragraph (2) and with paragraphs (3) and (4). Nor could he agree with the recommendations made about study and evaluation. Ten or fifteen years would be required before the results of the measures outlined in paragraph (5) could be assessed.

(111) Mrs. DOUGLAS (Canada) said that all with experience of international fellowships would agree that it was a very important part of Unesco's activities. Great care was needed in selecting the fellows. She entirely agreed with paragraph (5) (a), urging care in so doing. It was particularly important that the fellow should have an adequate knowledge of the language of his host country.

(112) Mr. DUERING (Vice-Chairman of the Expert Committee) said that the point raised by the delegate of Israel, in connexion with the second part of paragraph (2), was more fully developed in paragraph (5) (a).

(113) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) thought the wording of paragraph (5) (f) was presumptuous, for there was no warrant for supposing that a fellowship-holder from an underdeveloped country who spent two or three months in a highly developed country would end by despising his own land. He added that in his view, paragraph (5) (g), which referred to the selection of members of groups of students, underlined still more the importance of the problems already raised in connexion with international seminars and committees of experts.

(114) Mr. ANGELL (United States of America) was familiar with research in that particular field, and could not agree with the delegate of Israel. In the United States of America much had been learnt from a close study of what had happened to fellows after their return home. The least Unesco could do would be to correlate such studies with an eye to a better selection of fellows.
(115) As regarded the point made by the delegate of Mexico, it had recently been found, on investigation, that in a certain case most of the fellows had returned to their host country. It was important to ensure that fellows did in fact return home and put their knowledge to good use there. Fellowships should not encourage emigration.

(116) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) spoke as representative of a country which was greatly dependent on the more highly developed countries. He had been in close contact with many cases in which the fellow had not been made happier and had not proved useful to his country. He therefore agreed with the delegate of the United States of America.

(117) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) did not agree with the criticisms made by the delegate of Mexico. The paragraph in question had undoubtedly been difficult to draft, but thanks were due to the Expert Committee for having laid emphasis on a very

important aspect of the question, since it had been found that fellowship-holders very often lost contact with their own country. It would be better, however, not to use the term "denationalizing", which would be inappropriate in the case of citizens from countries which ranked as part of the metropolitan territory. He recommended that the paragraph be redrafted to make it more flexible and wider in scope.

(118) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) was satisfied with the explanations given about paragraph (2). As regarded paragraphs (3) and (4), he still thought it was too early for Unesco to assess results.

(119) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that Unesco was always studying its working methods with a view to achieving better results. It was part of Unesco's routine duties to ascertain whether the knowledge acquired by fellowship-holders had been of advantage both to them and to their countries.

(120) The CHAIRMAN said that such studies were already going on and needed no particular emphasis.

(121) It was agreed that paragraph (5) (d) should be understood to refer exclusively to persons receiving technical training, and not to young people.

(122) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the Committee endorse paragraph (5) (f).

(123) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) again urged that the proposal in paragraph (5) (f) was too strongly worded and bore little relation to the facts; he suggested that the Committee should therefore state that there had been disagreement on the point.

(124) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) supported the United States proposal.

(125) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) objected to the word "denationalizing" and suggested "alienating" instead.

(126) Mr. W. CARTER (Chief, Exchange of Persons Service) said that paragraphs (f), (h) and (i) all dealt with the same problem - the adjustment of the fellow to his host country and his readjustment on return home. They were simply a statement of the problem.

(127) The Committee then endorsed, by 10 votes to 1, the recommendations appearing under C. Fellowships, subject to the comments made in the course of the discussion.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

# TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

*24 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE EXPERT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND CO-OPERATION (document 8C/DIV/80) (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to continue its examination of document 8C/DIV/80 from Sub-Section D on page 11.

D. Advisory Committees

(2) No comments.

E. International Conferences

(3) No comments.

F. Pilot Projects

(4) No comments.

G. Exhibitions

(5) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium), alluding to the second paragraph of Section G, where it was stated that, "For example, it might be shown how the same themes have been treated by artists or schools of artists in different countries", remarked that the proposal might be dangerous. What counted in such exhibitions was not so much the theme as the feeling behind its treatment: international affinities could be brought out by showing that the same type of feeling had informed work in different countries. Mr. Florkin would be very sorry to see Unesco arranging exhibitions on particular themes, such as The Last Judgment, etc.

(6) As delegate of Australia, the CHAIRMAN fully supported the remarks of the delegate of Belgium. He asked the Committee if it wished to refer to the point in its report.

(7) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that some reference should indeed be made to the point in the Committee's report.

(8) On the general subject of exhibitions, he was of opinion that the three following points should be borne in mind:

(1) Exhibitions, as a technique, were normally very expensive;
(2) The results of exhibitions were usually very hard to evaluate;
(3) There was need for further research into the value of exhibitions and visual presentation generally.
(9) The last point might be more appropriately placed in the section on mass media of communication, but he would be sorry to see it confined to that section. Research should be undertaken, for example, on the value of attempts to give statistical material in pictorial form, and also on the wider use of diagrams. He hoped that reference would be made to the three points he had mentioned in the Committee's report.

(10) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) assured the delegate of the United Kingdom that the value of visual aids had already been the subject of inter-departmental discussions within the Secretariat. It was true that an emotional aura of unreflecting approval surrounded visual aids in some circles. His own opinion was that a great deal depended upon the educational efforts which accompanied them. It was certainly a very important question, as, unless results were properly evaluated, Unesco would be in danger of wasting money.

(11) Mr. FRANCOIS (France), who had been much interested in the United Kingdom delegate's observations, recalled that when he was in Belgrade in 1952 he had had an opportunity of seeing for himself how interested workers and students were in the exhibition of colour reproductions arranged by Unesco. Such exhibitions were not only of educational value, but served as propaganda for Unesco. In France, museums and trade fairs frequently asked for exhibitions dealing with Unesco. Combined with films and lectures, they were of great help both in popular education and in spreading knowledge of Unesco's work.

(12) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) observed that not all exhibitions were costly. Unesco's exhibitions of art reproductions, for example, were very reasonable.

(13) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked how many of the art reproductions had been sold.

(14) Mr. KIRPAL (Deputy Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that 8 Member States had bought 12 sets of reproductions as a result of travelling exhibitions of colour reproductions organized in 1949; as a result of further exhibitions, various sets of reproductions had been bought by 7 Member States in 1951 and by 10 Member States in 1952.

(15) Sub-Section G was approved, subject to the comments which had been made by members of the Advisory Committee.

H. Mass media of communication

(16) Referring to the first sentence of the second paragraph, Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that the Committee mention in its report that it shared the views of the Expert Committee on the term mass media.

(17) Agreed.

(18) The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to turn back to the introduction to document 8C/DIV/80 on page 4.

Terminology and Introduction

(19) Mr. AL-KOUSSI (Egypt) drew attention to the important statement contained in the fourth sentence of paragraph (2) - Principles of action - beginning: "Since tensions, and the attitudes which cause them. ...". That statement connected up with the last paragraph of the section entitled Terminology and raised a point which he wished to mention. He did not agree with the view expressed that morning by the delegate of France that education during the later years of childhood was more important than during the earlier years. In his opinion, the foundations of the main attitudes were really laid in early childhood. Instead, therefore, of extending co-ordinated experimental activities in education for international understanding and co-operation to teacher training institutions and making it a major project, as suggested on page 14 of document 8C/DIV/80, he would prefer to see more attention devoted in Unesco's programme to education for international understanding and co-operation in early childhood. He proposed that such a recommendation be included in the Committee's report.

(20) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) admitted that the Egyptian delegate's remarks were very pertinent, but reminded the Committee that it had already agreed to the point he had raised when considering Section V of the Annex to Chapter III (Research in Child Psychology).
(21) As for the Introduction, it expressed the philosophy of the Expert Committee, which had there set forth its views in general before particularizing in its study of the programme resolutions. If the Advisory Committee launched into a discussion of the philosophy of the Expert Committee, Mr. Florkin would be obliged to make reservations on almost every line; some of the views expressed in the Introduction seemed to him to be very much open to dispute, and he thought the entire responsibility for them should rest with the Expert Committee.

(22) While agreeing that it was not desirable to go into the philosophy of the Expert Committee's report, the CHAIRMAN reminded members that they had to give some sort of guidance to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(23) Mr. FRANCOIS (France), replying to the Egyptian delegate's remarks, did not think that children should be left without education for international understanding until the age of 10 or 12 - it was never too late or too early for education. He had simply wished to record a protest against the

undue importance attributed to the first five years of childhood, which, though they should not be neglected, did not seem to him to be decisive.
(24) With regard to the Introduction, he agreed with the Belgian delegate. The general tone seemed over-emphatic, and there was at once too much optimism and too much pessimism. A document issued by Unesco should have a more sober approach. The first sentence of the Introduction might raise a smile, and the philosophical statements of views on man's destiny might lead to endless discussions. Summing up, Mr. François recognized the practical value of the report of the Expert Committee, but thought that entire responsibility for its philosophy should be borne by its authors.

(25) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) agreed with previous speakers that the Introduction left a great deal to be desired. Experts naturally had a tendency to see things from only one point of view and he thought it an exaggeration to say that it was Unesco's prime purpose to promote education for international understanding and co-operation. The fight against ignorance and illiteracy was undoubtedly equally important.

(26) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) had doubts regarding terminology: one educated people, but one did not educate them for things: when trying to produce specific attitudes, it would be more correct to use the word train. Education was the development of the human spirit.

(27) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) reminded the Advisory Committee that the report was the outcome of a meeting of an expert committee convened to give the Director-General advice, so that there was no need to consider it as a Conference document, every word of which had to be approved or amended. The Director-General had asked the experts to consider the draft programme for 1955-56, but the rest of the report was for general interest. The Advisory Committee could therefore merely take note of the Introduction. If, however, it wished to consider the substance, it could select a few of the main ideas for discussion; it could then draw attention to those ideas in its report, adding, if it wished, that it did not entirely approve the general tone and emphasis.

(28) Mr. FRANCOIS agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom that the prime purpose of education should be to develop the human spirit, and hoped that the last sentence of the section on terminology would be amended by introducing that idea. He moved the following amendment: "The word 'education' in the proposed formula is not limited to the schools, but should be broadly interpreted, to cover all that makes for men and women who will be free and responsible citizens".
(29) He thought it would be unwise to endorse the Israeli delegate's views unreservedly; Unesco might be drawn on to deal with all educational problems, whereas its main task should be to see that curricula in all countries made some allowance for developing international understanding and co-operation. That was Unesco's individual and unique contribution. It could never become a supernational Ministry of Education - no budget could possibly finance such a heavy task.

(30) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Committee would agree to denote general approval of the report, subject to the reservations expressed by members in respect of individual items; it could say that the Introduction embodied the attitude of the experts, but that the Advisory Committee had not felt it necessary to go into the philosophy of the report. He suggested that it be left to the Rapporteur to draft a statement on those lines for inclusion in the Advisory Committee's report.

(31) Agreed.

Annex to Chapter II (pages 26 and 27)

(32) Referring to the example of a Unesco Week programme, paragraph (f), Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) remarked that the words suitable arrangements were somewhat vague. By way of guidance for the Director-General, he said that a model conference had been arranged by university students in the United Kingdom, with the aim of repeating in miniature what was going on at the present time in Montevideo.

(33) At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion, it was agreed to refer the proposals in the Annex to Chapter II to the Director-General, who would have an opportunity to study them during 1955 and 1956 and to include them either in the current work plans or in those for 1957-58.

Annex to Chapter III (pages 28-30)

(34) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee follow the same procedure as for the Annex to Chapter II.

(35) Referring to materials for teachers, Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked if someone in the Secretariat would be entrusted with the task of writing the small 100-page pamphlet on the great civilizations of the world.

(36) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) made some comments on the projects listed in the Annex to Chapter III. To condense the history of The Great Civilizations of the World into 100 pages would be a feat for which he would not care to be made responsible. It would be interesting to have some details about the size of the edition and the cost of such a publication. The idea of bringing out a small pamphlet on the great religions of the world also seemed dubious: it was an extremely delicate subject, and Unesco might provoke reactions which would be unfortunate for the Organization. It was questionable whether Unesco should properly engage in the preparation of such textbooks when libraries were full of adequate works. Unesco could make better use of its time and resources.

(37) The CHAIRMAN observed that those were ideas

put forward by individual members of the Expert Committee; the Committee as a whole had not had time to examine them in detail. He thought that it would be better for the Advisory Committee not to discuss them but to refer them to the Director-General for possible inclusion in the work plans for 1957-58.

(38) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) thought that that was a rather dangerous policy, for the usual tendency was to assume that silence on the part of a conference meant assent.

(39) Mr. LEE (United States of America) understood that the ideas under consideration had been put forward in connexion with the remodelling of Unesco's future programme. He therefore suggested that they be considered when that item was taken.

(40) The CHAIRMAN agreed, but hoped that the Committee would not go into their substance, as they did not concern the programme for 1955-56.

(41) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that the various themes be referred to the Director-General for study during the next two years.

(42) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that the Committee should at least give the Director-General some guidance. Personally, he would be in favour of discouraging the Director-General from undertaking some of the projects listed.

(43) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that the various projects would, in any case, go through the usual stern, critical process within the Secretariat.

(44) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) remarked that, if the Committee considered that it was too early to examine and discuss the report, it would also seem to have been too early to submit it. The Annex to Chapter III was part of the report and could not be separated from it.

(45) The CHAIRMAN observed that the introductory statement made it clear that the proposals in the Annex were of a different character from those in the report itself; the latter had been approved by the Expert Committee as a whole, but the former had not.

(46) Mr. LEE (United States of America) did not think that it was within the Committee's assignment or competence to discuss the substance of the proposals at the present time.

(47) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked how it was, then, that the Advisory Committee had been competent to discuss the substance of some seventy draft resolutions.

(48) The CHAIRMAN explained that the draft resolutions had been referred to the Advisory Committee for advice on whether or not they should be included in the draft programme and budget for 1955-56. The proposals at present under discussion only concerned the programme for 1957-58.

(49) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) nevertheless considered that the Committee was competent to say whether, in its opinion, the Director-General should study certain of the proposals or not.

(50) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) pointed out that the introductory paragraph in the Annex to Chapter III was quite clear in that respect. It stated, in fact, that "Time did not permit the Committee to make a detailed study of proposals put forward by several of its members during the meeting." The Annex therefore did not express the opinion of the Expert Committee and, in the circumstances, Mr. Florkin did not see any necessity for the Advisory Committee to take a decision on it.

(51) The CHAIRMAN regretted that he had not been able to convince the delegate of the United Kingdom.

(52) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) replied that he would accept the procedure suggested, provided that the Chairman's remarks were included in the Committee's report.

(53) It was agreed to refer the proposals in the Annex to Chapter III to the Director-General for study, and to include the explanations given by the Chairman in the Committee's report.

(54) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of document 8C/DIV/80.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.

# THIRTIETH MEETING

*25 November 1954 at 12 noon*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (PART IV): EXAMINATION OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE EXPERT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND CO-OPERATION**
(document 8C/BUD/3 (prov.))

(1) The French text of document 8C/BUD/3 (prov.) being the only one available at the beginning of the meeting, the Committee agreed to begin by considering the French text, the English and Spanish-speaking members being free to submit their comments on the drafting of the English and Spanish translations later.

(2) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) mentioned that, in writing his report, he had been guided by two considerations: to give a faithful account of the Advisory Committee's deliberations, and to provide the Programme and Budget Commission with the reference document it expected.
(3) For the sake of clarity and logic, he had not repeated certain details of the discussion, which would appear in the minutes of the various meetings, and he had made a few changes in the order of items.

(4) The introductory remarks on page 1 were adopted without comment.

Education (page 2 of provisional English text)

(5) Referring to paragraphs 186-192, Teaching about the United Nations, Mr. GUITON (representing the Director-General) said that several contracts had been proposed.

(6) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) pointed out that the members of the Secretariat who had attended the meeting had mentioned only one - the contract with the International Association of Universities.

(7) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the very useful word "notamment" be included in the French text ("(notamment le contrat avec l'Association internationale des Universités)") English - "(for instance, a contract with the International Association of Universities)".

(8) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that it would be well if the Committee's previous attitude, mentioned in the last line, were to be briefly outlined.

(9) In answer to a question from Mr. PANNETON (Canada) concerning the previous paragraph, Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) said that the words to leave it to rightly reflected the Committee's desire to leave the choice of the necessary measures to the discretion of the Director-General and his colleagues.

(10) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the words Secrétariat général" in the second and third lines of the same paragraph headed Paragraphs 179-185: Textbooks and Teaching Materials (French text) should read simply "Secrétariat".

(11) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to the same paragraph, said he had been under the impression that, by a vote of 12 in favour, with one abstention, the Committee had supported the idea of holding only one conference.

(12) The SECRETARY read out the experts' recommendation on the matter (document 8C/DIV/80, page 13): "The Committee strongly supports the plan for textbook studies which focuses attention on the problems of promoting understanding between peoples of widely different cultural traditions. It questions, however, whether two conferences should be held in successive years, 1955 and 1956, in view of the slow tempo of such studies".

(13) The CHAIRMAN said that, if he remembered rightly, the Committee had strongly endorsed the experts' view. Perhaps the Rapporteur would be able to convey that in his report.
(14) Mr. Duering had expressed the opinion that the vote taken would involve abandonment of the conference which would have been held in South East Asia.

Natural Sciences

Paragraph 34. International Geophysical Year

(15) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the Committee had not decided, by vote, to reject the experts' recommendation for a 20% increase in subventions.

(16) The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had agreed to include in its report a statement to the effect that 20% was a purely arbitrary figure.

(17) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) then explained that the Committee had noted that the 20% increase proposed by the experts was not based on any very exact estimates, and had wished to stress that the figure was merely a suggestion.

(18) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that the words a titre indicatif be inserted in the French text.

Social Sciences

Paragraphs 174-180: Information campaign on race problems

(19) The CHAIRMAN said that precise figures should be given instead of the $20,000 mentioned as the additional credit proposed for the wider distribution of Unesco publications.

Cultural Activities

(20) No comments.

Mass Communication

Paragraphs 205-221: Unesco Coupon Scheme

(21) The CHAIRMAN said it would be well if the former attitude of the Committee were to be briefly outlined.

Establishment of an international school in Paris

(22) Replying to a remark by Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), who was in favour of adding, at the end of the paragraph, "even if its establishment is admitted to be necessary", Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) recalled that the Committee, with one exception, had decided to endorse the experts' views - as was in fact stated in the paragraph in question.

(23) Following a suggestion from Mr. PANNETON (Canada) for the deletion of the second half of paragraph 23 from "that: ....", the CHAIRMAN read out the experts' recommendation.

(24) The Committee then confirmed that it wished to keep the wording as it stood.

Unesco's Methods of Action

(25) The CHAIRMAN observed that, in the French text, the words "Commission générale du Programme et du Budget" should read "Commission du Programme et du Budget".

I. Direct and Indirect Action

(26) The CHAIRMAN questioned the words biased and not competent (French: partiellement incompétents) as applied to experts drawn from the Secretariat.

(27) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) said that the word biased had been used during the debates in the sense that experts outside the Organization would probably be more detached, and therefore more unbiased.

(28) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) wondered whether, on another point, the paragraph really reflected the opinion of the Expert Committee; would not the writing of a manuscript by a member of the Secretariat also have budgetary repercussions?

(29) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that the sentence in question should simply be redrafted to say that it could not be expected that expert knowledge in every field was to be found in the Secretariat.

(30) The CHAIRMAN thought that reference might suitably be made to the fact that members of the Secretariat could not prepare manuscripts and do their routine work at the same time.

(31) Mr. GUITON (representing the Director-General) hoped that, if the term biased were retained, it would be qualified by some words of explanation.

(32) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) said that it was quite clear from the context, where it was contrasted with the phrase "less likely to be biased in any way as regards Unesco itself" that the word applied to the attitude of outside experts.

(33) The CHAIRMAN said that the point could safely be left to the Rapporteur and himself.

II. Methods in general

(34) Approved without comment.

III. Specific methods of action

B. International Seminars

(35) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) reminded the Committee that it had been agreed, with regard to the duration of seminars, that the French text of the recommendations was the one to follow.

(36) It was decided that the report should be amended accordingly.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to the third paragraph under B. International Seminars, enquired what was implied by the words "which would be given sound publicity by the methods suggested". The Committee, if he understood aright, had rejected a recommendation by the Expert Committee to the effect that writers of standing be engaged. A suggestion had also been made that the Director-General should co-operate with the Chief of the Mass Communication Department in the field covered by the paragraph.

(38) The CHAIRMAN said it had also been agreed to refer the matter to the working party on mass communication.

(39) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) and the CHAIRMAN thought that the last paragraph could be deleted.

(40) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) thought it might be misleading.

(41) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur), on the other hand, felt that the last paragraph did in fact convey a new

idea, namely, that apportionment of expenses would not be an automatic process, but would depend on the nature of the seminar.

(42) The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said that it had been stressed in the Committee that the experts were merely making suggestions for experiments by Unesco in the holding of seminars. Perhaps that point should be made somewhat clearer in the section under discussion. In the meantime the sense of the Committee seemed to be that the last paragraph should be omitted.

C. Fellowships

(43) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that exception had been taken in the Committee to the word 'denationalizing' used by the experts in paragraph (5) (f) of their recommendations (8C/DIV/80). The word was too strong.

(44) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) stated that, at the previous meeting, the Committee had approved a proposal by the delegate of the United States of America that the word 'denationalizing should not be used in the report.

(45) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that, while the Committee had accepted the substance of paragraph (5) (f), it had agreed to include in its report a statement to the effect that it disliked that particular word.

(46) The CHAIRMAN observed that the point could be left to the Rapporteur.

G. Exhibitions

(47) Mr. FLORKIN (Belgium) doubted whether the last paragraph, which related solely to art exhibitions, was clear.

(48) The CHAIRMAN asked him to consult with Mr. Sedes about redrafting the passage.

(49) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) enquired what was meant by saying that an exhibition would be "treated as an item in a co-ordinated whole".

(50) The CHAIRMAN said that, while Unesco often had but a limited part to play in organizing any particular exhibition, it was frequently able to ensure that the organizers viewed the exhibition as an item in a complex whole.

(51) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the Committee had agreed how hard it was to assess the results of exhibitions, and that more research was needed in that field.

(52) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) doubted whether the Committee had in fact so decided. Surely the feeling had been that the results of any exhibition should be carefully considered.

(53) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) stressed the special need for consideration before an exhibition was launched.

(54) The CHAIRMAN said that the point might safely be left to the Rapporteur.

(55) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) asked what was meant by saying that the subjects chosen should develop aesthetic appreciation. Surely exhibitions were also held for educational purposes.

(56) It was agreed that Mr. Florkin (Belgium) should supply a draft for a new second paragraph under Section G.

H. Mass media of communication

(57) Mr. LEE (United States of America) thought that the section should be referred to the working party on mass communication.

(58) The CHAIRMAN said he would write to the Chairman of the working party, forwarding those parts of the report of concern to him.

(59) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that the words "be viewed independently, that is to say, as representing the experts' own ideas" should be changed to read: "be regarded as a personal statement of the experts' own ideas ...".

(60) Subject to the comments made and the amendments adopted, the report (document 8C/BUD/3 (prov.)) was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

# THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**ITEM 7.4 OF THE AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD ON THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF UNESCO (document 8C/PRG/13)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would deal first with the four questions referred to it by the Programme Commission (definition of general and special activities, criteria for the selection of major projects, schedule under which the Director-General and Executive Board could implement the remodelled programme, and suggestions proposed by the Brazilian delegation on the future programme, document 8C/DR/86). It would then discuss the Director-General's suggestions for adapting the proposed programme to the budget ceiling which had been voted, and make final recommendations to the Commission on the cuts necessary to fit the approved programme into the approved budget. It would then have to discuss the Appropriation Resolution.
(2) He opened the general discussion on the remodelling of the future programme.

(3) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the Committee would probably receive the final text of the programme and budget on 7 December 1954; an Appropriation Resolution would then be submitted to it. The Committee's main task for the time being was to clarify the principles which were to guide the Director-General in drawing up future programmes.
(4) In the first place, the Committee would have to define key terms such as general activities, special activities and major projects, as clearly as possible.
(5) In the second place, the Committee would have to pronounce upon two essential problems: the balance to be maintained between general activities and special activities, and selection of the fields in which the Director-General would be asked to submit major projects to the next session of the General Conference.
(6) In the third place, the Committee would have to deal with the provisions or methods to be adopted with a view to the gradual reorganization of Unesco's activities.

(7) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) hoped that a lead would be given by the Committee in defining major projects by means of examples. He also remarked that, although the subject had not yet been discussed by the Commission, technical aid, or preferably Aid to Member States should be considered, like technical assistance, as a broad system within which requests of all kinds might come.

(8) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought that the Brazilian proposal contained in draft resolution No. 86 should be considered in the light of the result of the discussion on general and special activities. Referring to the Assistant Director-General's remarks on the definition of terms, he said that the task before the meeting was not one of definition but of revision.

(9) Mr. LEE (United States of America) had talked to the Brazilian delegation and felt certain it had not intended to insist on the wording of the proposal, so long as the ideas contained in it were taken into account.

(10) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) considered that paragraphs 13-24 of the Executive Board document (8C/PRG/13) were sufficiently clear on the subject of the remodelled programme. Why seek farther?

(11) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Programme Commission had asked the Advisory Committee to translate that document into a more fully digested one which would make its task easier.

(12) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) disagreed with the basis on which the classification between general and special activities in the Executive Board document had been made. The question was not one of structure or of origin, but of what the programme sought to accomplish. General activities, the delegate of India maintained, should be all those that were of a universal character, including therefore some that were labelled as special in the Unesco programme, and special activities those which, wherever initiated, were designed to serve particular needs in the different areas. There should be no question of a balance between permanent and special activities, since the basic purpose of permanent activities was to serve special activities.

(13) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) had already drawn the attention of the Programme Commission to the division into general and special activities. He had objected that he did not understand the distinction between them, and had suggested the substitution of other terms. It would be advisable to emphasize the fact that general activities had a universal, or preferably world-wide character.

(14) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested

that it might be well to refer back to what the document was trying to accomplish: namely, the better use of limited resources. A special activity was by definition an activity with limits and, in preparing a special project, it was necessary to look first for its basic limitations from the point of view of objectives, time schedule and work methods. The delegate of the United States of America then presented a draft proposal, Suggestions for directive concerning future programme (8C/DIV/122), which the United States delegation proposed as a tentative basis for discussion. That document aimed at a procedure, he explained, that would be detailed enough to serve as a directive, while leaving a great deal of latitude to the Director-General and to the Executive Board.

(15) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) asked for an explanation: why divide the programme into general and special activities at all? It was usually understood that general activities were continuous, while special activities, though they were attributed a major part of the budget, were temporary, and suffered the good or bad fortunes of Unesco.
(16) In document 8C/BUD/2 the Advisory Committee had deemed it harmful to consider an artificial division. That division was perhaps the cause of many misunderstandings. However much the programme was referred to as integral, division had occurred naturally for many years, and had to be dealt with by the Committee as a serious matter.
(17) The delegate of Egypt recommended agreement in principle with the proposal submitted by the delegate of the United States of America of dividing activities into two sections, those Unesco ran on its own, continuously, and those it ran in collaboration with Member States, or other organizations, which were by nature limited. That division would eliminate a number of difficulties: (1) the matter of the balance between the types of activities, since the first category was strictly limited from the budgetary point of view. (2) The idea held by many delegates that one type of activity was directed towards certain countries while the other was directed towards another group of countries. It would also make evaluation easy, since each project would be definitely outlined from the start.

(18) The CHAIRMAN proposed an interval of ten minutes for the study of the United States proposal.

(The general discussion was then resumed.)

(19) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thanked the United States delegate for having provided the Committee with clearer definitions. He thought it unnecessary, however, to try to make each definition exhaustive - that would be a dangerous course. Moreover, terms should be used which the general public could easily understand.

(20) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the delegate of the United States of America might look upon his specific indications as examples of a non-restrictive character, or as open to completion by the Committee.

(21) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), in reply to the remarks made by the delegate of France, proposed that general activities be defined as those which served Member States in accordance with the basic objectives of the Organization, while special activities were defined as those which served a Member State or a group of Member States in the solution of their specific problems. The characteristics mentioned after the definition in the United States document could be transferred to the description of a major project on page 2 of document 8C/DIV/122; nor did they apply only to a major project. The delegate of India quoted the proposed Educational Development Fund as a special activity which was wider in scope. He reminded the meeting that the Organization was not tied forever to a fixed budget ceiling and that it was not necessary to assume a permanent basis of scarcity in making these definitions.

(22) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the delegate of India. A clear division was essential between those activities which the Director-General was planning for Member States, and the technical aid which they requested.

(23) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) reminded the meeting that his question still remained unanswered: what was the aim of the division between special and general activities? Was one section to be regarded more highly than the other? Or was remodelling a mere relabelling?

(24) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) stated that in his view the general activities built up the general fund of knowledge without which Unesco could not function at all, and the best title for those activities was general. He included in that category all work with non-governmental organizations, public information, international organizations, and the preparation of international conventions and regulations, although the latter were becoming more and more a matter for the United Nations. Two of those activities were not included in the United States resolution.
(25) For the rest of the programme it was essential to concentrate first on major projects, and secondly on technical aid. The reason for allocating a sum under technical aid to be used for special requests of Member States was that the latter would not be sufficiently interested to set up National Commissions until they felt that Unesco could help them at short notice in something they were particularly keen on.
(26) The programme, Sir Ronald concluded, in answer to the question of the Egyptian delegate, had been stated in the form of general and special activities. There did not seem to be any particular reason for changing it.

(27) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) did not think that the problem was very clearly presented in the American document. It mentioned major projects and priority zones. The use of the latter term was limited to special activities, whereas it should also be applied to general activities.

(28) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that

subdivisions would be helpful both in explaining and in executing the work. He understood that the first section was aimed at forming a central pool of knowledge and the second at making use of it in specific sectors.

(29) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) considered that the Committee should retain the division of the programme into general activities and special activites, for they were terms which everyone understood - if only within Unesco.
(30) General activities were aimed at developing: (a) education, science and culture, and an international meeting of minds; and (b) a better mutual understanding between nations and cultures.
(31) Such activities were carried on continuously and were of general interest to all Member States.
(32) The special activities were aimed at: (1) obtaining quick and practical results in the fields defined in paragraph (a) of general activities; and (2) helping Member States.
(33) They included the investigation and tackling of special problems, or again they directly concerned a Member State or a group of Member States. Their duration was strictly limited.
(34) It was imperative to mark the close relation existing between the two kinds of activity; the French delegation was strongly opposed to any attempt to dissociate them.

General activities

(35) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) thought that there was no need to distinguish between the two types of activity. He drew the Committee's attention to the last words of the third paragraph in the English text submitted by the United States delegation.
(36) The fourth kind of general activity was: "(4) Programme planning and appraisal of a general nature". The Canadian delegate considered the French delegation's definition to be more satisfactory.

(37) Mr. LEE (United States of America) understood the difficulties of the Belgian delegate on questions of terminology, but pointed out that in all branches of activity it was necessary to establish a certain number of technical terms. Mr. Lee welcomed the French delegate's contribution to the discussion.

(38) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew attention to two serious omissions in the American text, when compared with the Executive Board's report on the remodelling of the future programme of Unesco (document 8C/PRG/13). Paragraph 23 of the Executive Board's text read: "(B) Assistance to international collaboration between specialists", and "(D) The preparation of international conventions and regulations". There was no sign of those activities in the United States proposal.
(39) Moreover, it was important to know what the United States delegate meant by programme appraisal. Was it a question of a purely administrative appraisal, or was it a proposal similar to that of the Brazilian delegation in document 8C/DR/[illegible]? As a matter of fact, the Brazilian delegation had asked for another activity to be added to paragraph 23, namely: "F. The investigation and study of fresh subjects with a view to the preparation of future programmes of action".
(40) Mr. Maheu had always thought that appraisal should be the last stage in the carrying out of any project.
(41) As regarded international conventions, those with which Unesco dealt were highly specialized and did not come within the province of the United Nations.

(42) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) suggested that the following sentence should be incorporated in the text: "General activities are all those continuing activities which provide the basis of the programme and are generally of interest to Member States".

(43) Mr. LEE (United States of America) accepted the suggestions made. One of the two omissions referred to by the Assistant Director-General had been made on the perhaps erroneous assumption that international collaboration between specialists might be either a form of general information or a type of special activity.
(44) He did not object to the inclusion of the phrase proposed by Sir Ronald Adam, and agreed with the importance of paragraphs 19 and 20 of the Executive Board's document. He had no strong feelings as to where point 4 of General activities (United States text) was placed, but insisted that the Conference should recognize a continuing and not intermittent obligation of planning and appraisal of a general nature.

(45) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), comparing the United States and Executive Board texts in the light of the Assistant Director-General's remarks, thought that assistance to international collaboration between specialists was not unimportant but should not be placed in toto under general activities. A part of those activities were limited in time and scope. The same applied to the preparation of international conventions and regulations. The promotion of a convention, for instance, was a special activity. Those two types of activity ought to be subdivided into the two sections.

(46) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that anything in the programme could be described as special or general according to the viewpoint of the observer. He urged the Committee to try to reach a satisfactory agreement.
(47) Mr. Maheu feared that, by engaging in discussions of terminology, the Committee might "forsake the substance for the shadow", especially as its time was limited in comparison with that spent by the Executive Board on studying the question.
(48) As far as general activities were concerned, it was a question of continuing services: exchange of information, technical advice to the United Nations, etc.
(49) Special activities, on the other hand, related to concrete problems capable of delimitation in time and place. That was the main difference between the two sections. If a good many special activities were considered, some would be found to

stand out above others as mountains towered above their foothills. Those were the major projects in favour of which available funds would be concentrated.

(50) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) thought that the Committee should take the situation as it was and accept the division into general activities and special activities. Those terms were just as suitable as any others, as long as they were properly defined.

(51) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) preferred the list in paragraph 23 to the text of the United States delegate. The list in paragraph 23, however, should be completed by an additional item on Education for International Co-operation and Human Rights. The American document made constant reference to news; the thirst for news was a modern disease.
(52) Mr. François appreciated the ideas expressed in the amendments proposed by the Brazilian delegation (document 8C/DR/86), and particularly those in item F: Investigations and Studies.
(53) He proposed that the text which he himself had submitted should be examined at the following meeting.

(54) The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in line 1 of the definition of general activities in the United States text, the word activities on the second occasion of its use should be replaced by functions. The phrase proposed by the Chairman of the Executive Board should then be inserted, after which the text would run: "the following is a non-limitative list", with the list proposed by the Executive Board to follow. Point 4 of the United States draft could be revised in connexion with draft resolution No. 86 submitted by the Brazilian delegation.

(55) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) drew the Committee's attention to the wording of document 8C/PRG/13. Paragraph 23 B read: "Assistance to international collaboration between specialists". It would be better to say: "Assistance to international collaboration in the fields of science, art and literature".

(56) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) considered it unwise to relate the idea behind the Brazilian amendment to the fourth item in the American list of general activities. The two ideas were not the same: the United States delegation had an administrative aim in view, as was apparent from the third paragraph from the end of its document: "The Director-General is authorized to establish in his immediate office a planning unit .....". The United States delegation evidently had in mind a unit responsible for supervising the preparation and implementation of projects.
(57) The Brazilian delegation's idea was quite different: every project implied preparatory stages and, even before the projects could be selected, there had to be a stage of general preparation. Mr. Maheu reminded the Committee that the text to be drafted was not intended for press or radio; it was a legal text and from that point of view the publicity value of the terms used mattered little. They only needed to be clear.

(58) Mr. SEDES (Rapporteur) observed that the Committee could not submit any amendment to document 8C/PRG/13, for it was an Executive Board report. It could, however, submit a draft resolution.

(59) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) agreed with the delegate of France and suggested that special activities be described as particular. As an example of a project for general activities, he mentioned the conservation of natural resources, which, in his opinion, should be undertaken by Unesco in collaboration with FAO. He asked whether the Brazilian draft amendment had allowed for that possibility.

(60) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained that Unesco arranged for preliminary investigations to be carried out by other international organizations, especially non-governmental ones. Even if Unesco decided, at that stage of its programme, to devote its attention to the conservation of natural resources, it would only be in the form of preliminary investigation, prior to action proper.
(61) He added that the example chosen was a good illustration of the difference between general, continuing activities, and activities of local interest.

(62) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) remarked that his interventions had all been made with the aim of showing that general and special activities should be integrated into a single programme. He stressed the point, made by the Chairman of the Executive Board, that a central pool of knowledge must exist first, whether divided into continuous activities or not, and which could be used later in a series of special activities.

(63) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the Egyptian delegate's remarks. On the assistance to international collaboration between specialists (B of paragraph 23, document 8C/PRG/13) he suggested that what was actually wanted was the collaboration of the specialists with Unesco.

(64) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought the word collaboration was too strong, since it covered contracts, which were exclusively special activities.

(65) The CHAIRMAN offered to prepare a draft, with the assistance of the Rapporteur and the Secretariat, for discussion the following morning.

(66) Agreed.

Special Activities

(67) There was already a proposal on this subject submitted by the French delegate.

(68) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that the characteristics given in paragraph 4 of document 8C/DIV/122 did not apply to special activities as a whole, but only to major projects within them. The United States definition of aid to Member States was excellent, as those might have long-range

programmes of their own with different budgets and time schedules. His objection to the Executive Board's definition was that special activities had to provide a solution of the problems of Member States. Special activities, Mr. Junankar concluded, should be divided into major projects and aid to Member States.

(69) The CHAIRMAN proposed the following alterations in the United States text, special activities: line 2, to run: "the solution of specific problems of Member States, and are made up of minor and major projects ..." etc.

(70) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was against the trend towards multiplying special activities by limiting their geographical scope. Why should a special activity concern only one Member State, or at most a small group? Education for living in a world community, for instance, could be regarded as a special activity in so far as it was a special project in the wider field of education for international understanding. It was obvious that a subject likely to interest all Member States could be dealt with in a strictly limited way and therefore not be included under general activities.

(71) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed the division according to certain themes, rather than general and special activities.

(72) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the French delegate that the meeting was becoming unnecessarily involved in a too detailed examination of the source of ideas or of geographical limitations. It would be better to consider a project as having various forms of limitation. A special project might have a wide scope but it might be the limited application of a special type of effort.

(73) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) drew the Committee's attention to the desirability of making a clear distinction between projects initiated by Unesco and those undertaken at the request of Member States. Unesco projects were focused as time went on on a few subjects. Aid to Member States, on the contrary, was designed to become increasingly diversified.

(74) Education for living in a world community, referred to by the French delegate, was not a project or activity which yielded practical results. The same might be said of many similar activities: they were studies or propaganda campaigns of a general and permanent kind classifiable as general activities. The question of special activities arose when action was directed to specific and concrete ends.

(75) The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said there were two points to be included, his own proposal to include the words Member States, and the subdivision of projects initiated by Unesco or by the direct request of Member States into minor and major ones. He suggested that the Rapporteur should prepare another text on the subject for the next morning's discussion, and asked for further comments.

(76) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) queried the phrase "the solution of specific problems". Problems had to be stated before they could be solved.

(77) The CHAIRMAN proposed to replace the word solution by the word tackling.

(78) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed the following phrase: "Special activities are those which are designed to meet the needs of a Member State or group of Member States and are concerned with specific problems".

(79) Mr. LEE (United States of America) insisted on the word solution because the whole idea behind that definition was one of action.

(80) The CHAIRMAN then suggested the word used by Mr. Lee, action towards.

(81) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) asked why the definition given in paragraph 37 of the Executive Board document could not be used.

(82) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) replied that that omitted the point made by the Indian delegate, with regard to the needs of Member States.

(83) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) endorsed that remark. The whole of the remodelling was aimed at meeting the needs of Member States, which were not always in the form of problems. Decentralization, for instance, had been studied by a working party to meet the needs of Member States.

(84) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed another phrase: "Special activities are those which are designed to meet the specific needs of a Member State or group of Member States. They consist of problems, each of which is characterized by" etc. A special need, he said, was a problem.

(85) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) pointed out that the Board had taken seven paragraphs to define special activities. It had brought out the needs of Member States in separate paragraphs.

(86) The CHAIRMAN considered that the United Kingdom proposal was a fairly comprehensive one, and proposed to produce a further text for discussion the next morning.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

# THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

*30 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF THE ORGANIZATION** (documents 8C/DIV/122, 8C/DIV/121, 8C/DIV/120, 8C/PRG/13)

(1) The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting it had been decided to request the Rapporteur, the Assistant Director-General and himself to redraft paragraphs 3 and 4 of the United States proposal concerning the future programme (US Del. 8/PRG/46). The revised text of the two paragraphs was now before the Committee in document 8C/DIV/121.
(2) The Committee also had before it a proposal of the delegate of France concerning the future programme (document 8C/DIV/120). He proposed that it take the revised text of paragraphs 3 and 4 as a basis for discussion and attempt to co-ordinate with it the proposal of the French representative.

(3) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that it should be possible to work out a joint text, by taking document 8C/DIV/121 as a basis and introducing certain of the points in document 8C/DIV/120.
(4) Paragraph 3 (document 8C/DIV/121), for instance, might be drafted as follows: "General activities are those forming the basis of the programme and corresponding to the continuing functions of the Organization, which are generally of interest to all Member States".

(5) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that general activities should be defined in relation to Unesco's two fundamental aims: (a) the co-operation of all men of culture in the establishment of an international community of minds; (b) mutual understanding between the different nations and cultures as the basis for a lasting peace.

(6) In order to define general activities more clearly, and also to illustrate that definition, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed that the paragraph concerned be worded in the following way: "Their purpose is, on the one hand ..... , and on the .... They include: (a) etc. ..".

(7) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) considered that sub-paragraph (6) of paragraph 3 in document 8C/DIV/121 was superfluous, as it simply expressed what was already stated in the preceding sub-paragraphs.

(8) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the scope of sub-paragraph (6) might be extended by saying, for instance: "Any general investigation likely to be useful for special activities".

(9) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) pointed out that, to introduce the idea of special activities, which had not yet been defined, into the definition of general activities, might easily confuse.

(10) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) drew attention to the fact that education for international co-operation and understanding, which was a slow process of conversion to a certain attitude of mind, should be included among the basic general activities, instead of simply appearing under public information (sub-paragraph (5)).

(11) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the general idea was expressed in the words "promotion of human rights and a spirit of international co-operation" and that it would not be advisable to refer there to a specific field of Unesco's activities, such as education.
(12) Thus, it would be better to replace the words public information, which might lead to confusion, by the words action on public opinion.

(13) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) then proposed the following text for sub-paragraph (5): "action on public opinion for the promotion of human rights and a spirit of international co-operation"; further, he emphasized the importance that should be attached to the different sub-paragraphs of paragraph 3, which corresponded to sections of the programme as a whole.

(14) The CHAIRMAN, supporting a suggestion by the Egyptian representative, proposed that the points under paragraph 3 be provisionally accepted and their final wording agreed at a later stage in the light of future discussion. He invited the Committee to consider paragraph 4 in its revised text.

(15) Mr. SILLER (Mexico), referring to sub-paragraph (3) of paragraph 4, asked why it was necessary to include budget and defined methods among the characteristics of special activities.

(16) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) explained what the authors of the paragraph had had in mind; they had wished to make it clear that the Organization, in undertaking special activities, should make full use of all the ideas, experience and resources which the general activities, on which they were based, had made it possible to assemble.

(17) After criticism of certain points of detail, mainly concerning the wording of the French text, had been expressed by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. PANNETON (Canada) and Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General), the latter, replying to a remark which had been made by the Mexican delegate regarding the words 'full use', pointed out that they were the key to all the rest, and that, if they were weakened, the whole structure of the text would be in danger of crumbling.
(18) If the Committee wished to avoid the words 'full use', it would at least have to say "requires the use of part or all of the technical resources", or "requires the full utilization of the technical resources".

(19) The CHAIRMAN favoured a wording which would in some way qualify the word 'use'; he regretted that the formula full utilization did not meet with the Committee's approval.

(20) Taking account of a remark made by Mr. FRANCOIS (France), Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed that it be left to the Secretariat to redraft the paragraph, incorporating in it all or part of paragraph 20 of document 8C/PRG/13 and making it quite clear that special activities and general activities were indissolubly linked.

(21) Adopted.

(22) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had already expressed itself on those lines and suggested that a sentence reflecting that idea might be added when the Committee returned to the point later.
(23) With regard to the balance which should be maintained between general and special activities, he recalled that, when the question was referred to the Committee by the Commission on Programme and Budget, the problem of balance was specifically omitted from the terms of reference, and he did not therefore think the Committee should give it detailed consideration. He invited it to take up paragraphs 6 and 7 of the United States suggestions for a directive on the future programme (document 8C/DIV/122) which were more or less closely related, and then perhaps consider a general statement on the question of balance.

(24) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) requested some clarification of the difference between a major project and a high priority area.
(25) He hoped that some information might also be available as to the proportion of effort and money which was at the present time being allocated to the items under points 1 to 6 of the paragraph on high priority areas.

(26) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), dealing with the paragraph on high priority areas, suggested that the words 'especially racial' be added to point (4), and that point (6) be altered to read "utilization of scientific knowledge, research and discoveries for peaceful purposes and for the improvement of living conditions".

(27) During previous discussions in the Committee it had been agreed that efforts should be made to request Member States to provide information about what they wished the Organization to do. The report of the Working Party on Decentralization furthermore stressed the need for greater concentration of effort. In that connexion he hoped that the Director-General would consult Member States or groups of Member States with a view to finding out their needs and proposals for future activity by the Organization.

(28) In answer to the question raised by the delegate of Egypt, Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that, as he did not recall the exact figures, he was unable at the moment to say exactly how much money it was proposed to allocate to each of the six fields of activity, which had been chosen by the United States delegation.
(29) Passing on to the question of the remodelling of the programme, the Assistant Director-General recalled the two basic aims underlying the proposals that had been made: (1) to adapt the programme to the needs of Member States within the framework of international co-operation and understanding; (2) to concentrate efforts and resources on certain specific points where international action seemed most urgent and necessary.
(30) When those two basic principles were combined, a practical definition of concentration emerged. That was to say, major projects.
(31) The Assistant Director-General then tried to make the meaning of that expression clearer by contrasting it with the more familiar concept of high priority areas.
(32) A high priority area was a field of activity, and not the activity itself. Fundamental education, for example, and the progressive extension of free and compulsory education were limited fields - a site as it were on which to undertake practical and constructive projects, planned with great care and worked out to the last detail.
(33) A considerable amount of thought had already been given to the delimitation of those high priority areas by Unesco and the Economic and Social Council.
(34) The General Conference, during its Florence session, had established a decalogue defining the high priority areas. At its last session, the General Conference had instructed a special working party to single out, among the fields defined by the Economic and Social Council and lying within Unesco's competence, those which deserved priority status.
(35) The working party's report had been forwarded to Member States for comments and, when the Executive Board had prepared document 8C/PRG/13, it had had before it the list of priorities established by the Economic and Social Council, those indicated by the working party and approved by the General Conference, and the comments received from Member States.
(36) Unfortunately, the latter had not answered exactly in the manner desired. They had spoken of projects and not of fields, so that any further consultation would only delay the work.

(37) What was really urgent was that the Member States represented at the present Conference should indicate immediately to which of the main fields already chosen (there were some twenty of them) they wished priority to be given.
(38) That was an important decision which the General Conference alone could take, and which should be taken as soon as possible.
(39) At the present time, Unesco had a programme of action which took the form of special activities in each of the high priority areas. Owing to the resulting dispersion of efforts and funds, such activities yielded only modest results. It was only by reducing their number, and thus enabling resources to be concentrated, that Unesco would be able to carry out the selected projects on an adequate scale.
(40) The Executive Board's idea was certainly to maintain, for some time yet, the policy of having many different projects; but although the transition from dispersion to concentration was bound to be a gradual one, the tendency towards concentration should be introduced into the programme forthwith.
(41) Lastly, while a reduction in the number of major projects was essential to the concentration of efforts and resources, the very nature of those projects would make it necessary to have recourse to different methods and branches of knowledge at one and the same time.
(42) The present programme contained special projects requiring the assistance of certain disciplines. No doubt, those various activities required to be co-ordinated; but the very idea of major projects implied progress in such co-ordination.
(43) The present system of co-ordination through co-operation would have to be replaced by co-ordination through integration. A general plan would have to be drawn up, enabling the problem to be tackled simultaneously from all angles. Only thus would Unesco be able to lay claim to practical achievements on a large scale, instead of being able to quote, as examples of constructive activities, only (with a few fortunate exceptions) the recommendations, advice or directives which it lavished on its Member States.

(44) The CHAIRMAN thanked the Assistant Director-General for his clear explanation and proposed that the Committee first study high priority areas and then major projects. A list of high priority areas had been drawn up by the Economic and Social Council; a second list had been drawn up by the General Conference in Florence, a third, though somewhat less comprehensive, was contained in the basic programme. The Committee might consider those documents and, from the number of high priority areas listed, choose those upon which the efforts of the Organization might be concentrated.

(45) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) had noted with some anxiety a remark by the Assistant Director-General that it would be useless to consult Member States again in order to ascertain which projects they wished to see implemented. Although delegations at the present session of the Conference were authorized to decide which were the most important high priority areas, they could not choose the major projects without previously consulting their respective governments and National Commissions, which had certainly not yet had time to study the Executive Board's report on the remodelling of the future programme, it being dated 30 August.
(46) A time-limit of six months would enable Member States to submit practical proposals, and the projects mentioned most frequently would automatically attract the Secretariat's attention.

(47) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) was still not clear about the exact meaning of the term major project. He wished to know if any of the Organization's present activities could be qualified as such and asked if a major project was to be defined by unity of content or approach. The Assistant Director-General had mentioned the notion of integration as a criterion. But such integration would not prevent the various aspects of a single project from being entrusted to a number of different departments.

(48) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said his point had been a specific one. It would be very useful in regard to the Organization's future programmes to consult Member States on what they believed to be the areas of highest priority and what projects they wished to see undertaken there. Consultations with Member States would prevent the latter from flooding the Organization with a variety of projects when it was too late to do anything about them.

(49) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that the questions which he had just been asked clearly showed that the debate needed clarifying.
(50) Replying to the delegate of France, he pointed out that, although he did not think it necessary for Member States to be consulted on the choice of high priority areas, he had never believed nor said that major projects could be selected without prior consultation with governments. It was indeed inconceivable that the Executive Board or the Secretariat should take such steps except in close agreement with Member States.
(51) However, between the two steps of defining priority areas and consulting Member States on the choice of major projects, there was an indispensable intermediary step, namely, the selection, by the General Conference, of a limited number of such areas in order to have a definite basis for consultation with Member States.
(52) If the Secretariat was to submit to the General Conference, at its next session, projects likely to meet with its approval, there was no time to be lost, for the process - beginning with preliminary exchanges of views and ending, after thorough study and consultation with experts, with the drawing up of the draft projects - would be a long one.
(53) Replying to the next question: Which of the existing projects corresponds most closely to the new idea of major projects?, the Assistant Director-General quoted the world network of international fundamental education centres, as originally conceived. There, the object had been to solve, as quickly as possible, a practical problem,

namely, the lack of qualified staff to train fundamental education teachers, who, themselves, were too few in number. The very nature of that education made it necessary to try out various methods and apply them to the different disciplines. Lastly, there was direct co-operation with the Member States on whose territory those centres were established and who assisted in the scheme.
(54) According to the new policy the process would be the following. The Director-General would ask Member States to indicate their main and most urgent problems in a high priority area, such as fundamental education. For some, it would be the training of staff; for others the production of reading material, and for others the obtaining of audio-visual aids. Certain countries would explain that what interested them was how to build schools cheaply; others would reply that their main problem was the training of rural teachers. It would then be possible to draw up a world chart of the exact needs of Member States, and it would only be after consultation with experts, both outside and inside the Secretariat, on each of the problems raised that the Director-General would be able to submit constructive preliminary plans to those States.

(55) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) wished to stress the importance of the time factor. It was rare for Member States to answer letters for at least six months following the General Conference. Also the Executive Board would be meeting in November 1955 to study the programme for the year 1957-58. A further difficulty was that there were not at present enough National Commissions to advise governments. The General Conference therefore needed to urge Member States to begin work as soon as possible and instruct the Director-General to consult them on their needs.

(56) Mrs. HEFFELFINGER (United States of America) thought that some members of the Committee were unduly concerned because they did not realize the exact nature of major projects. More patience was needed in developing them. Not enough was known about Unesco activities because the programme of the Organization was too diffuse. However, in considering ideas and suggestions from Member States, it would probably be seen that many projects were already under way which might develop into major projects.
(57) It was important to promote concentration of effort, to strive for a greater impact upon public opinion, to achieve closer consultation with Member States and closer collaboration with other international organizations on major projects. It was therefore necessary to list a few objectives and give the Secretariat enough time to develop them.

(58) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the views of the representative of the United States of America. He feared it would be difficult for one Member State to produce a blueprint for a project to be carried out in another Member State; it was clear that such plans could only be drawn up by the State in whose territory the project would be carried out. An alternative might be for the Director-General to make a number of proposals.
(59) A large number of requests for assistance had been made under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, with which Unesco had been associated for years. He wondered if those requests from Member States did not constitute a valuable source of information as to possible projects. He also wished to know if the Palestine relief scheme for Arab refugees could be considered characteristic of a major project.

(60) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) agreed that there was no good reason for upsetting the Director-General's time-table and, if the Member States did not reply, the Secretariat would merely pursue its work in accordance with the decisions of the General Conference.

(61) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) repeated that Member States would be consulted on the nature of the major projects which they wished to carry out and that they would be given sufficient time to send in answers, on which, as they knew, the programme for 1957-58 would largely depend.
(62) What the Director-General desired, however, was that the General Conference should choose, from among the ten or twenty high priority areas, those in which a start should be made; otherwise, the Secretariat itself would be obliged to make a somewhat arbitrary choice from among countless requests.
(63) In answer to the first question of the delegate of the United Kingdom, Mr. Maheu said that, although the Secretariat already possessed information on the needs of Member States, such information mainly concerned requests for technical assistance for economic development, and not requests relating to the social and cultural fields.
(64) With regard to the second question of the delegate of the United Kingdom concerning aid for Palestine refugees, the Assistant Director-General said that it might indeed have formed a major project to be conducted, for example, over a period of 10 years, had it been attacked in 1949 in the spirit that animated the remodelled programme.
(65) He added, however, that that project was of an urgent, but temporary and limited nature, whereas the major projects that the Committee was at present discussing should be long-term projects, although calling for urgent action.
(66) Nevertheless, the major projects which the General Conference authorized the Director-General to undertake each year could include a project which was merely urgent.

(67) The CHAIRMAN said that the matter of consultations was dealt with to a certain extent under paragraph 9 of 8C/DIV/122. At the present stage it was necessary to agree on a definition of priority areas, to select a certain number of them and only then would he ask the Committee to discuss major projects under paragraph 6.

(68) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) agreed that the

Palestine relief scheme could be considered a good major project. He wondered, however, what relationship there would be between such a major project and areas of high priority which the Committee was considering. He believed that in selecting high priority areas the Committee would by implication be choosing the major projects to be implemented there and vice versa. In his opinion the two elements were very closely connected.

(69) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed that it was difficult to choose a high priority area without having one or more practical projects in mind; but, if Member States were asked to supply a list of projects before fields had been strictly defined, the variety of projects proposed would be so great that it would be practically impossible to make a wise and effective choice.

(70) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) thought that the definition of high priority areas in document 8C/DIV/122 made them too transitory, as a two-year period only was mentioned.

(71) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the Mexican representative that most of the projects would in fact require more than two years to be completed. In that connexion he stressed the need for a system of periodical re-appraisal of the situation in the areas of activity concerned. The General Conference, it had to be assumed, was a responsible body which would not without warning withdraw the priority it had granted a certain area at its previous session.

(72) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) insisted that there should be no allusion to a time-limit for the high priority areas, which ought to be of a more lasting nature.

(73) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that agreement on a small number of high priority areas and the subsequent implementation in those areas of major projects provided no guarantee of increased effectiveness in the Organization's work.
(74) It was also possible that the concentration of the programme and the reduction to a small number of the high priority areas might estrange Member States from the Organization, since it would in the future be impossible to cater for the needs of as many countries as in the past.

(75) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) was convinced that the Board, which would henceforth represent 22 member governments, would work in close co-operation with the Director-General, and would be in a position to ensure the required effectiveness in the Organization's work.

(76) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that the Egyptian delegate's remarks concerned the very concept of concentration; the latter had been decided upon by the General Conference itself and Member States did not seem to have feared that it would lead to such a change in their relations with one another or with Unesco.
(77) It was true that certain Member States would benefit more directly than others from the programme in its new form; hence the need for a proper balance in the selection of projects; in attempting to maintain that balance, the Director-General would need the support of the Executive Board.
(78) Mr. Maheu added that, although only a few Member States would derive immediate benefit from the major projects, the latter would have been chosen by the General Conference because they were of universal importance and likely to contribute to world peace.
(79) Because activities were localized, it did not mean that the results obtained would not be of great importance; the programme of assistance to underdeveloped countries, for instance, had been drawn up with a view to such results.
(80) Further, it might be thought that even States which would not derive immediate benefit would not only have the satisfaction of knowing that they had done their duty but would also secure certain advantages.

(81) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) appreciated the safeguards referred to by the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Assistant Director-General, but thought the point raised by the Egyptian representative an important one. The smaller the number of major projects, the greater would be the need for co-operation. In his opinion the Organization needed to increase the number of major projects to cover the various areas of the world since its resources were drawn from all Member States.

(82) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that a number of countries, among them Norway, would be interested only in the general activities of the Organization. The major projects were designed to a far greater degree for the so-called underdeveloped countries. He favoured the introduction of some principle of rotation which would make it possible for certain countries or groups of countries to obtain assistance at different periods.

(83) Mr. LEE (United States of America) did not entirely agree with that view. He did not think that major projects should be defined as applying exclusively to underdeveloped areas. He could well conceive of the United States of America being interested in certain major projects, touching upon cultural activities or international understanding, being implemented in its own territory.
(84) He believed that the Committee should stress the overall objectives of Unesco and not merely the immediate gains to any one party. The time had come to abandon parochialism and to endeavour to find a compromise between national or regional aspirations on the one hand and the overall ideals of the Organization on the other.

(85) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that the proposal to introduce a principle of rotation did little to allay his fears; furthermore he still thought there was a danger that concentration of effort on the basis of a small number of high priority areas might threaten the relationship between the Organization and the Member States.

(86) The CHAIRMAN replied that the Organization was in fact representative of the Member States and was therefore unlikely to take action that might estrange them.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.

# THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

*30 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE FUTURE PROGRAMME OF THE ORGANIZATION** (documents 8C/DIV/122 – formerly United States deleg. 8C/PRG/46 – 8C/DIV/123, 8C/DIV/124 and 8C/DIV/125)

(1) The CHAIRMAN, opening the meeting, pointed to a slight change to be introduced in the text of document 8C/DIV/124. At the end of the third line of paragraph 3, the words "they include" should be replaced by "they are aimed at". Similarly, after sub-paragraph (b) in 3, the words "and cover" should be replaced by "these activities include".
(2) He then moved to the consideration of document 8C/DIV/123, which constituted a redrafting of the first sentence in paragraph 7 of 8C/DIV/122, based on the morning's discussions. He asked for comments on it.

(3) No comments having been made, the document was considered adopted and would be incorporated in the final document.

(4) Going on to examination of the areas of high priority enumerated in that paragraph 7, the CHAIRMAN referred to the mention which had been made at the morning meeting of the considerable work already done in the determination of priority areas both by the Economic and Social Council and by the General Conference itself. The Committee would have before it, in a few moments, a document summarizing that work.

(5) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that, in the meantime, the Committee move to the examination of paragraphs 9 and 10 of document 8C/DIV/122. The two paragraphs were fairly non-controversial, as they corresponded more or less to the views expressed at the morning meeting.

(6) It was however agreed to adjourn for ten minutes, to enable the Committee to be in possession of the documents before proceeding with the discussion.

(7) The meeting was resumed when document 8C/DIV/125, listing the Unesco and United Nations documents on programme priorities, was distributed, together with a copy of document 7C/Resolutions, where the report of the working party of the seventh session on the future programme and development of Unesco was reproduced in extenso.

(8) The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had now before it a fairly wide list of areas to choose from.

(9) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that, in view of the great variety of proposals contained in the documents which had been distributed, the best practical basis for discussion would be to take from the table of contents in document 8C/5 (proposed programme and budget) the items relating to those of Unesco's activities whose importance the General Conference had never contested. In the chapter on education, for instance, he mentioned items 1.21, 1.31, 1.32 and 1.33 in Section II. With regard to document 8C/DIV/125, he noted that, among the priority programmes adopted by the United Nations, only paragraphs E and F related to Unesco's work.

(10) The CHAIRMAN said that, starting with the chapter on education, the Committee had a number of items to consider in 8C/DIV/125, those being items (a), (b), (c) and (d) under paragraph E, and (a) under paragraph F. Referring to the Florence Decalogue, there were the first three tasks to be considered. In document 8C/DIV/122, the first two areas mentioned in paragraph 7 were involved.
(11) Before going into a detailed discussion of those various recommendations, the Committee should formulate an answer to two fundamental questions: what was the extent of concentration aimed at and how many projects would be specifically mentioned?

(12) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was disturbed and confused by the formidable number of documents and proposals from which a few priority areas and projects for recommendation to the General Conference had to be extracted. In his opinion, the document submitted by the United States delegation had certainly been drawn up with due regard to all the work already accomplished, either by the United Nations or by the General Conference itself. He therefore proposed that the United States document be taken as the basis

for discussion and amended in the light of observations made by members of the Committee.

(13) The CHAIRMAN expressed his agreement with the proposal of the delegate of France. It had been deemed desirable that the Committee be in possession of all relevant information. However, if the Committee agreed, the proposals put forward by the United States delegation could well form a basis for discussion. The Committee would therefore examine them, and adopt or modify each point contained in them.

(14) Mr. LEE (United States of America) stated that he had presented the list in the document without any assumption that it would be finally adopted. It was only put forward for the guidance of the Secretariat and of the Executive Board. There was no point in trying to enumerate all the fields where Unesco was active. On the other hand, it would not be convenient to make the list too restrictive. The Organization should aim at utilizing all skills and types of knowledge and, above all, avoid departmentalization.

(15) The CHAIRMAN said that the best way would be to take the United States list, and modify the points therein mentioned in the light of the discussion, but, nevertheless, to use it as a basis.

(16) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) agreed with the list of priority areas in paragraph 7 of document 8C/DIV/122, except for item (4). He proposed that the wording should be amended to read "social science research to reduce racial, social and international tensions", and that it should be mentioned at the end that the items were not listed in order of importance.

(17) Mr. LEE (United States of America) asked for an interpretation of the rewording proposed by his French colleague. Was it the intention to limit action to research in the social sciences, or was the definition to be broad enough to include media of mass communication?

(18) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) observed, regarding item (1) in the list, that that was an area where what was required was not so much a series of major projects, as aid to Member States. It would be useful therefore not to lay it down as a priority area, but to couple it with technical aid.
(19) On area (4) he wished to add something regarding peaceful co-operation, and in area (6) the utilization of scientific knowledge for peaceful purposes and the application of scientific discoveries and achievements to improvement of the living conditions of mankind should both be stressed.

(20) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) asked whether item (2) should not include vocational training. He also found that item (5) was too vague and that the exchange of culture should be accompanied by research and study of the various cultural values existing in the world.

(21) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that for eight years he had been listening to similar discussions, both in the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies, and had found them all alike. Whenever the idea of working out a concentrated programme was mooted, everybody was at first full of enthusiasm: committees set out to be very strict, to retain none but genuine priority projects, very carefully chosen. They proposed ruthless cuts so that only what was really essential would remain. But as soon as they came to discuss specific projects, difficulties arose. Each delegation in turn put forward very strong arguments for retaining or re-inserting a particular project. Definitions became wider and wider and increasingly vague and indefinite. The final result was not very different from the original.
(22) He warned the Committee against that tendency, which was already evident in the amendments proposed by France and India in connexion with item (4).
(23) What the Director-General hoped to obtain from the General Conference was a series of definite directives on a few specific points connected with the future programme, and he trusted that the Committee's discussion would follow that line steadily.

(24) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought nobody could fail to realize that, when meetings were requested to suggest cuts or make savings in a programme, the result was the opposite of what was desired. Economies were effected only when the government suggested them, at the request of parliament. In the case in point, however, he did not think that any attempt was being made to go back to Unesco's past programmes.
(25) He maintained that it was most important for Unesco to give attention to the problem of racial tensions. Not long ago the world had gone through terrible suffering because of such tensions, and even at the present time they were an acute problem in several parts of the globe. He therefore did not think he was overstating the truth in saying that Unesco should take action in that field as soon as possible.

(26) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that where he disagreed with the French delegate was on the expression the problem of tensions. In his opinion, that was more than an area; the whole of Unesco's work was directed towards the solution of the problem of tensions in the world.

(27) The CHAIRMAN agreed that it was a matter of how much the Conference wished to place limits on the activities now being defined.

(28) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that this was a first reading of the document, during which it would be difficult to arrive at a final decision. The Committee would be in a better position to appreciate it when it reached a second reading.

(29) The CHAIRMAN agreed with the delegate of Egypt. Nevertheless he could see the point made by the delegate of France, and would like

an agreement to be reached on principles.

(30) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) thought it would be difficult to avoid mentioning a particular field when defining priority areas. The two notions were much too closely tied together for a separation to be made easily. On the other hand, he feared that fields not mentioned would be considered as not being of high priority.

(31) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed that a preliminary selection of priority areas for discussion be made immediately. In the light of the discussion, the Director-General could then submit specific proposals for delimiting the work more exactly within each of the accepted areas.

(32) The CHAIRMAN accepted the suggestion by the Assistant Director-General. The tensions problem would be placed among the high priority areas, and the next day further study would be made of that point, taking into consideration specific ideas put forward by the Director-General.

(33) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) was always pleased to hear any reference to concentration of the programme because in his opinion that was the best way of making Unesco more efficient. It seemed to him that items (1), (2), (3) and (4) in paragraph 7 should have very high priority, while the last two depended upon the first four and should give way to them.

(34) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) reminded the Assistant Director-General of the question he had put forward, and wondered if an answer were now available.

(35) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that he had the replies which he had promised the Egyptian delegate that morning. He pointed out that the figures in the reply were expressed as percentages of the whole of Part II of the programme, with the exception of the Documents and Publications Service. He warned the meeting not to interpret the figures too strictly.
(36) For item (1) the appropriations for 1955 to 1956 were 7.84% of the total. For item (2) the appropriations were 14.70%, for item (3) 18.56%, and for item (4) 1.17%.
(37) He mentioned that the last figure referred only to appropriations in the Social Sciences chapter and did not include any Education or Mass Communication projects.
(38) For item (5) the appropriations for 1955 to 1956 were 3.69% of the total and for item (6) 3.12%.
(39) Mr. Maheu pointed out that the last figure referred only to Natural Science projects. If certain Social Science projects were included, the figure became 4.58%.

(40) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) agreed with the delegate of India that, when choosing high priority areas, one had always in view what type of projects would come under them. He noted, from the figures given by the Assistant Director-General, that the six areas mentioned under paragraph 7 accounted for about 50% of the programme for 1955-56. With concentration of the programme, that would become 100%. He therefore proposed that, within each area, an appropriate sub-title be agreed upon, in order to obtain the best results.

(41) Mr. LEE (United States of America) understood that the Director-General would present a list of such possible choices at the next meeting.

(42) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee agree on a list of about half a dozen high priority areas, to be defined in fairly wide terms. He would then propose within each area a series of three possible breakdowns, on which the Committee would make a choice.

(43) Mr. LEE (United States of America) preferred a list of about 15 such priority areas, out of which the Committee would choose only 8 by selective voting. He particularly had in mind the objections raised by the delegates of France, Norway and India, and did not find it practicable to start on such a narrow basis as 6 areas.

(44) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was pleased that priority areas already accounted for 50% of the programme. He did not favour the procedure of successive votes on a longer list.

(45) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Committee agreed on items (1) and (2) in paragraph 7.

(46) Items (1) and (2) were agreed upon by the Committee.

(47) The CHAIRMAN then opened discussion of item (3).

(48) Mr. LEE (United States of America), keeping in mind the remarks of the delegate of France, suggested that action to remove tensions might well be included under that item.

(49) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) doubted whether item (3) should be included in the paragraph, as the Committee had classified action for the promotion of international understanding among the general activities. He personally felt that item (3) was not a project but a permanent activity and proposed that it be deleted from the paragraph.

(50) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with that view. The Committee, instead of working on concentration of the programme, was merely relabelling activities.

(51) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee agreed with what the Assistant Director-General had just said.

(52) Mr. LEE (United States of America) could not agree. If that item was a permanent function of Unesco, the same could be said of fundamental education, and of the development of scientific research.

(53) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) found the sentence too vague, it contained a whole programme. The Committee should try to be more specific, and recommend some concrete subject.

(54) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) proposed that items (3) and (4) be combined so as to cover both international understanding and action to remove tensions of any kind.

(55) It was agreed to eliminate item (3) on the understanding that it would be covered by the next item.

(56) The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on item (4).

(57) Mr. FRANCOIS (France), in the course of a general discussion on this item, repeated his proposal, made earlier, that the item be modified to include the reduction of racial, social and international tensions.

(58) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Assistant Director-General of his offer to put to the Committee suggestions for possible specifications of each area, once that area had been accepted in principle by the Committee.
(59) He asked whether the Assistant Director-General would present such specifications for items (1) and (2) as well as for item (3).

(60) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that, in his opinion, it was unnecessary to be more specific with regard to items (1) and (2), which seemed to him sufficiently precise. He would make suggestions only on item (4), which was vaguer.

(61) The CHAIRMAN proposed, in that case, that the Committee should do that now, and he thought that it would be easy.

(62) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that, in his opinion, the whole theme was important, and to try and narrow it down would leave aside a number of problems where Unesco's action was absolutely essential.

(63) The CHAIRMAN agreed with the delegate of India that all problems coming under that item were important. However, it was the Committee's task to indicate to the Director-General those projects upon which it was necessary to concentrate Unesco's action.

(64) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) reminded the Committee of three important considerations which should guide it in its choice of priority areas: first, the importance of the subject; next, the urgency of the problem, and lastly the effectiveness of Unesco's action in this area. It should not be forgotten that Unesco was a young organization which was only just beginning to make itself heard in the world. It would be a mistake to commit the Organization without due consideration to action in an area where it could not make its influence felt. He asked the Committee to reflect what would happen to Unesco's prestige, and to the confidence which the peoples of different countries placed in the Organization, if, after raising great hopes, it failed in its attack on a problem that proved beyond its solution.

(65) Mr. LEE (United States of America), referring to paragraph E (c) of the Economic and Social Council list of priorities (document 8C/DIV/125), proposed adoption of the sentence without the words "Education for", and suggested the addition of "education for the removal of discrimination".

(66) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that would be a very suitable problem for Unesco's attention: the analysis of the conditions for coexistence.

(67) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), referring to project 3.4 of the Social Sciences programme, wondered if the resolution did not cover the point now being considered.

(68) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, if the Committee could not reach agreement on a narrow area, then, it would have to be extended until some point of common agreement was found.

(69) It was agreed that the proposal of the delegate of France would be used as a basis for the point, leaving the Chairman and the Rapporteur the final drafting of it.

(70) The CHAIRMAN then moved to discussion of item (5) of paragraph 7.

(71) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) doubted whether the word 'exchange was correct. In his opinion, the term was too vague.

(72) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) proposed "knowledge and mutual understanding of different cultures".

(73) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the text should be more precise.

(74) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of its earlier decision to give priority to the exchange of culture between the East and the West, and proposed the following draft "mutual appreciation and understanding of Eastern and Western cultural values".

(75) Mr. FREY (German Federal Republic) seconded the Chairman's proposal.

(76) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) proposed "comparative study of Eastern and Western cultures".

(77) The CHAIRMAN would not agree. It did not seem that the study would correspond to an area where priority ought to be considered essential.

(78) Mr. LEE (United States of America) suggested "promotion of East and West inter-cultural exchanges for international understanding".

(79) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General)

thought that, in French, the sentence might read "connaissance et compréhension mutuelle des cultures de l'Orient et de l'Occident". The delegate of the United States of America wished to add "for international understanding", but that would be anticipating the results. Mr. Maheu asked him if he insisted on the last phrase.

(80) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed to the deletion of the words "for international understanding" from his proposal.

(81) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested instead "the enrichment of cultural life".

(82) The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said that there were two proposals before the Committee, one from the delegate of Norway and the other from the United States delegate, modified in the light of the ensuing discussion. He called for support of the proposal of the delegate of Norway.

(83) No support being given, that proposal was dropped.

(84) The CHAIRMAN then read the proposal of the Assistant Director-General.

(85) This last proposal was adopted.

(86) The Committee moved to discussion of item (6) of paragraph 7.

(87) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked whether the United States delegate wished to retain the word 'natural'. It seemed to him that the Social Sciences were also concerned.

(88) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed to deletion of the word 'natural' although, for American audiences, he would have both words 'natural and social'.

(89) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) referred to his earlier proposal for additions to this point. He also proposed to include research into the application of atomic energy to peaceful purposes.

(90) The CHAIRMAN accepted the first point of the delegate of India, leaving the Committee to take the final decision. The second point, however, seemed to be too restrictive, and contrary to the accepted definition of an area.

(91) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) agreed with regard to the second point proposed by the Indian delegate that it was really too restrictive. It would mean including applied science, but he reminded the meeting that, although scientific research was a matter for Unesco alone, several other Specialized Agencies, such as WHO and FAO, were concerned with the applied forms of certain sciences.
(92) Reverting to the first point, he proposed that the words for peaceful purposes be deleted.

(93) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) remarked that the applications of science were also important for the improvement of the living conditions of mankind.
(94) He also wished to maintain the words for peaceful purposes. Scientific research could be directed both towards war and towards peace, and it was Unesco's task to encourage only such research as would tend to the promotion of international peace.

(95) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) preferred not to add the words for peaceful purposes.

(96) Mr. LEE (United States of America) remarked that action to promote peace was implied in all Unesco action and was in fact the very reason for Unesco's existence.

(97) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) added that the diffusion of scientific knowledge was also important, and that it would be eliminated from Unesco's action, if the present draft were adopted.

(98) The CHAIRMAN remarked that, since the Committee was aiming at concentrating activity on a small group of high priority areas, some of them would naturally be left out.
(99) He asked whether the Committee wished to retain 'for peaceful purposes'.

(100) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) stated that he considered the second point to be important, and proposed that it should appear in the recommendations of the Committee. To his mind, the mention of peaceful purposes was a specific recommendation, without which the interpretation of item (6) would not be satisfactory.

(101) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought the fact of adding for the improvement of living conditions in itself indicated a utilitarian purpose. If the Committee wished to include the practical application of science in its recommendations, it should be inserted as an additional item.

(102) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that item (6) be adopted as suggested by the Assistant Director-General.

(103) This was agreed.

(104) The CHAIRMAN then moved to consideration of paragraphs 8 and 9.

(105) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) proposed to make the French and English texts of paragraph 8 agree. He suggested replacing "not less than 3 and not more than 6" by "a small number", which seemed to him less restrictive.

(106) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed to delete the last sentence in paragraph 9.

(107) The two paragraphs, as amended, were adopted.

(108) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed to delete the word 'truly' from

paragraph 10 and also suggested that the expression "task force" be altered.

(109) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed to the dropping of "task force."

(110) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested merging paragraphs 10 and 11 which formed one directive.

(111) Mr. LEE (United States of America) favoured separate paragraphs. In paragraph 11, there was a specific authorization to the Director-General to establish a planning unit.

(112) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) recommended therefore changing the order, and making paragraph 11 become 10, as the sequence would then be more logical. He also favoured suppression of the words in his immediate office in that paragraph.

(113) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) doubted whether paragraph 11, which in no way increased the powers of the Director-General, served any useful purpose, as he could already introduce changes in the administrative structure of the Organization without the authorization of the General Conference, and had in fact done so.

(114) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) confirmed that the Director-General was competent to alter the administrative structure of the Organization.
(115) Nevertheless, he hoped that paragraph 10 would be retained in an amended form, in order to give a more concrete basis for the Director-General's action in introducing the changes made necessary by the remodelling of the programme. He suggested the following wording:
"The Director-General is authorized to study the methods for administering major projects and to give special consideration to the organizational pattern calculated to ensure full use of all relevant disciplines, as each project may require".
(116) He agreed that the order of paragraphs 10 and 11 should be changed as suggested by the United Kingdom delegate, but doubted whether paragraph 11 was really necessary. It seemed to him even dangerous.

(117) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed to the suppression of paragraph 11 and suggested further that paragraph 10 might be deleted.

(118) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed to deletion of paragraph 10.

(119) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) wished to know what additional authority paragraph 10 gave to the Director-General.

(120) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) admitted that paragraph 10 in no way increased the existing powers of the Director-General. He thought, however, that, for psychological reasons, it would be wiser to reassert the principle.

(121) It was decided by 5 votes to 1, without abstention, that paragraph 10, in its new form, should be retained.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

# THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE FUTURE PROGRAMME** (document 8C/DIV/127)

(1) The CHAIRMAN, opening the discussion, said that he did not understand paragraph 10.

(2) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said it was not known whether money and staff would be required for planning. The paragraph had been included to ensure that the proposals made in the resolution did not fall through if the Director-General and his staff felt unable to devote the necessary time to the important planning required for the high priority activities.

(3) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that he now understood more clearly the sense which the United States delegate attributed to paragraph 10. Even so, he thought that it might with advantage be moved elsewhere, and that the wording might be altered.
(4) The point of the paragraph was to ask the Director-General to pay particular attention to the planning referred to in paragraph 7. It gave the Director-General increased authority by emphasizing that the work in question was no mere routine matter, but creative and imaginative work which should accompany the implementation of the programme for 1955-56. It would therefore be better for that paragraph 10 to come at the end of paragraph 7, or to be inserted between the

existing paragraphs 7 and 8, with a number of its own.
(5) He also thought that the wording of paragraph 10 was not clear, particularly in its reference to evaluation. Apparently what was meant was the planning of future activities. The Assistant Director-General accordingly proposed the following text, subject to subsequent rewording:

"In carrying out activities in the 1955-56 programme which fall within priority areas, the Director-General shall attach special importance to making a critical review of those activities with a view to preparing major projects for execution in 1957-58".

(6) The CHAIRMAN observed that an additional sentence in paragraph 7 would cover the point.

(7) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the Assistant Director-General, namely, that paragraph 7 could be suitably enlarged and that paragraph 10 could be deleted.
(8) He would like to see the words 'is authorized to' replaced, throughout the resolution, by shall.

(9) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) agreed with the Assistant Director-General as regarded paragraph 10, but, if the paragraph were retained, 'evaluation and planning aspects should read planning and evaluation aspects, since evaluation of results normally followed the implementation of action proposed.
(10) In addition, there was a certain abuse of the term high priority, used adjectivally throughout the document.

(11) The CHAIRMAN, referring to the first point made by the delegate of Israel, said that evaluation was put before planning because the evaluation was evaluation of past work, while the planning was the planning of future work.

(12) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that, in planning future work, it would be desirable to have some idea of what methods had been most successful in the past. Perhaps a small-scale evaluation project should be organized to assist planning.

(13) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) asked about the funds for such work.

(14) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) observed that such planning, to be conducted on the basis of a critical review of past work, was regarded by the Director-General as a task of the greatest importance. Emphasis would, however, be laid on quality rather than quantity in reviewing past achievements.
(15) The Director-General already had the necessary staff available. There was no advantage in creating a special office, since such work should be regarded as a combined effort on the part of the Secretariat as a whole. The Planning Group which had occasionally been mentioned already existed. It consisted of the Director-General, the Assistant Directors-General and their immediate assistants.

(16) It might be necessary, in organizing the work, to engage some temporary lower ranking officials. In addition, the help of certain consultants and specialists might be needed. That did not mean, however, that it would be necessary to provide extra funds and posts. The Director-General could meet requirements by exercising his right to transfer funds during the year. That flexible procedure seemed better from every point of view. The work planned might accordingly be carried out by the staff and with the funds already available, subject to transfers to be arranged later.

(17) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), referring to paragraph 10, said that, if evaluation were limited to high priority areas, and did not extend to the programme as a whole, it was hard to see how any general planning was possible.

(18) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that such an idea was rather a long way from the original intention of the United States delegate, who regarded evaluation as the starting point for planning. The major projects belonged to the limited priority areas, and the evaluation in question only concerned those areas. If evaluation were to apply to the whole programme, the proposition would be quite a different one.

(19) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed that evaluation should extend to as much of the programme as possible. But the point of the paragraph was to stress that planning and evaluation were particularly important in the high priority areas.

(20) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that, with all deference towards the social scientists, it was over-optimistic to believe that evaluation could be applied to the whole range of Unesco's activities. If evaluation were to apply to the whole programme, there was a danger that a special organ might be required. That, of course, would have budgetary implications.
(21) The Director-General, he added, was given authority to implement the programme decided on by the Conference. Paragraph 11 implied that he was being given latitude to tamper with it, which was surely improper.

(22) The CHAIRMAN said that evaluation as used in the document did not have the technical meaning it bore for the social scientists.

(23) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested placing paragraph 11 before paragraph 7, at the same time broadening its scope as suggested by the delegate of Egypt. The purpose of the paragraph was to ask the Director-General to keep constantly in mind the need for a critical review, but not for a scientific evaluation of the programme. As the programme was to be scrutinized with an eye to the future, the Director-General would endeavour to complete certain projects in 1956 and, where appropriate, to cut down those appearing unlikely to yield results.

(24) Paragraph 11 thus pointed to a critical review of the whole programme by the Director-General, with the aim of ensuring a certain amount of flexibility in carrying it out.
(25) Paragraph 7 as it stood would be followed by a modified version of paragraph 10; paragraph 8, providing for consultation with Member States and the bodies concerned, and paragraph 9, dealing with the possible administrative repercussions of remodelling the programme, would then follow logically.

(26) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), referring to the point raised by the delegate of India, said that Unesco, in its Social Sciences Department, was continually using the word 'evaluation' in the scientific sense.

(27) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) pointed out that, for the time being, the evaluation on which the Department of Social Sciences was engaged was more limited in scope. What it was principally concerned with was trying out different evaluation techniques. No really certain methods yet existed in that field. For the time being, plain common sense and some critical thinking were all that were needed.

(28) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suspected that the word 'evaluation' as used by the United States delegation in its draft resolution, simply meant a critical review.
(29) As a matter of drafting, he felt that it would be well to reverse the order of the existing paragraphs (5) and (6), so that the definition of priority area came before the definition of major project.

(30) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) noted, in paragraph 3 (v), that the term 'action sur les esprits' had been replaced by 'action sur l'opinion publique'. The French delegation very much preferred the previous version, which had the advantage of covering educational activities concerned with human rights and international co-operation.

(31) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) believed that the original French text had been translated by action on public opinion, and that the expression had been translated back word for word when the present resolution was being drafted. He proposed readopting the original French text, and leaving the English as it stood.

(32) Approved.

(33) Referring to the French text, Mr. FRANCOIS (France) thought that paragraphs 4 and 5 needed to be brought into line. They contained the expressions 'activités spéciales', 'projets' and 'entreprises', all of which appeared to represent the same idea.

(34) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that "projets d'importance majeure" be substituted for "entreprises d'importance majeure". The amendment did not affect the English text.

(35) Approved.

(36) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was glad to accept Mr. Cowell's suggestion that the order of paragraphs 5 and 6 be reversed, but he thought that the definition of priority areas in paragraph 6 should be reworded.

(37) As proposed by Mr. François, it was agreed to amend the beginning of paragraph 6 to read:
"Priority areas are those subject fields to which the General Conference decides to attach particular importance within the framework of special activities, and in which major projects should be worked out and organized".

(38) Mr. JUNANKAR (India), referring to paragraph 3 (v), said that public opinion, therein mentioned, was a vague concept. It would be better to say action to promote human rights and international co-operation.

(39) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) wondered whether it would be possible to satisfy the delegate for India without arousing objections on the part of the delegate of France, who had made a special request for the reintroduction in the French text of the expression 'action sur les esprits'.

(40) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that in paragraph 3, 'general activities' were defined as the permanent functions of the Organization of interest to all Member States. Would it not be better to say 'continuous' rather than 'permanent'?

(41) The CHAIRMAN said it had originally been agreed to use the expression 'continuous functions'. The words 'permanent functions' might be a translation back from the French.

(42) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that there were some activities, such as the furthering of co-operation between National Commissions faced with similar problems, that were difficult to class either as general or as special activities, as defined in the document.

(43) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) recalled that the Chairman of the Executive Board had on several occasions emphasized the fact that Unesco's tenth anniversary would mark a new starting point in the Organization's career. The remodelling of the programme was the first stage in the new phase. The request for the collaboration of Member States and the choice of methods to be employed in order that such collaboration might be effective was another stage.

(44) Mr. PANNETON (Canada) suggested substituting 'long-term functions' for 'permanent functions'.

(45) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested the following reading for paragraph 3: "those functions of the Organization which concern all Member States".

(46) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) would prefer to retain "permanent functions".

(47) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that in previous discussions much stress had been laid on the fact that the two parts of the programme, i.e. general and special activities, were really parts of a whole, and that the full use of knowledge gained as a result of general activities could be applied with advantage to the special activities. But the reverse was also true, and perhaps the point should be made in the resolution.
(48) In paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 3, it was stated that general activities were designed to develop education, science and culture and to improve international understanding. But that could be said of the special activities too.

(49) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) acknowledged the cogency of the Egyptian delegate's remarks, and hoped that Mr. Abdel-Rahman would be able to suggest ways of solving the difficulties to which he had referred.
(50) Mr. Maheu also recalled that sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) had been inserted at the request of the French delegation. He agreed that they referred to general aims, which were equally applicable to special projects and technical aid.
(51) Further, point (3) of paragraph 4 on page 2 had been inserted at the proposal of the United States delegate. It was true that general activities also were covered by budget estimates and carried out in accordance with clearly defined methods. The United States delegation, however, must have meant that the Conference should know exactly what it was undertaking when it agreed to the implementation of a long-term project. If a project were spread over several financial years, provision should be made for the necessary funds in the budget for each of the years concerned.
(52) Mr. Maheu went on to emphasize the fact that the unity of the programme had two equally valid meanings. General activities were essential to special activities; conversely, general activities increased in effectiveness as the Organization developed its special activities and technical aid. It would accordingly be advisable to draw attention in paragraph 2 to the complete interdependence of the two parts of the programme.

(53) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) understood that the problem of the balance between general and special activities lay outside the terms of reference of the Committee. But it would inevitably arise once the resolution was forwarded to the Programme and Budget Commission. Should the Committee recommend that it be considered? If a mathematical balance between the two activities was not necessary, should not the Committee say so?

(54) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) did not see any difficulty there. The Programme and Budget Commission had announced that it intended to return to the matter, and the Committee had already expressed its opinion in document 8C/BUD/2.

(55) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed out that the point raised by the delegate of Egypt was clearly dealt with in paragraph 18 of the report by the Executive Board on remodelling of the future programme (document 8C/PRG/13). To remove all misunderstanding, it might be well to include, at the beginning of the draft resolution, a statement recording the Committee's approval of the general policy set forth in document 8C/PRG/13.

(56) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that, in its own report on document 8C/PRG/13 (document 8C/BUD/2, paragraph 7), the Committee had already recorded its agreement with the views of the Executive Board "that, in considering each of the proposed activities, the need for integration should be constantly borne in mind". That same paragraph went on to say that "it would therefore be harmful to seek to determine in advance the apportionment of funds between the general aspect and the special aspect of these activities". Hence it would be sufficient to say that the Committee agreed with the views of the Board, as set forth in document 8C/PRG/13.

(57) In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. FRANCOIS (France) stated that he maintained his position in favour of retaining sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 3 (DIV/127). He had however noted the comments of the Egyptian delegate with keen interest, and would suggest the following wording for sub-paragraph (a): "The development, in all Member States, of education..."; further, the beginning of paragraph 4 might read: "Special activities are those of the general activities designed to meet ...".

(58) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the second amendment might lead to confusion between two quite separate ideas.

(59) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed with the Assistant Director-General that paragraphs (a) and (b) might not be logically necessary. They had been introduced merely in order to emphasize the purpose of all Unesco activity. It would be better to include them under paragraph 2, with a sentence stressing the essential solidarity of both parts of the programme, and then to say that both types of activity were designed to achieve the aims set forth in paragraphs (a) and (b).

(60) It was decided by vote not to delete paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 3, but to include them under paragraph 2.

(61) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) thought that some reference ought perhaps to be made to the Constitution at that point in the resolution.

(62) The CHAIRMAN, personally, would prefer to omit such a reference.

(63) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the delegate of Norway. Perhaps the existing paragraph 3 (v) might suitably become (c) under paragraph 2.

(64) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) saw no reason for altering the position of sub-paragraph 3 (v), which would lose much of its

point if it merely drew attention to a very general aim. On the contrary, it referred to very definite and practical action with a view to teaching adults and young people the principles of human rights and international co-operation.

(65) It was finally agreed not to move sub-paragraph 3 (v).

(66) In paragraph 3 (v) it was agreed that the English words "action on public opinion" should be revised with a view to finding an exact translation of the French expression "action sur les esprits".

(67) Mr. LEE (United States of America) and Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) supported the idea advanced by the delegate of the United Kingdom, namely, that the Committee and its resolution should record approval of document 8C/PRG/13, and the latter thought that there should also be a reference to document 8C/BUD/2.

(68) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) stated that the French delegation was fundamentally opposed to paragraphs 62 and 68 of document 8C/PRG/13. On the other hand, it approved document 8C/BUD/2, in which the Committee had expressed quite a different opinion on the problem dealt with in those two paragraphs.

(69) The CHAIRMAN said that, because of the views held by the delegate of France, the question would have to be decided by vote.

(70) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that reference ought perhaps to be made to the report by the Expert Committee on remodelling of the programme (8C/DIV/80).

(71) The CHAIRMAN and Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) both agreed that the report referred to was not a report by an organ of the Conference. It was a report to the Director-General, referred to the Committee in order that the Committee might submit its views on it to the Programme Commission. In submitting the resolution, reference might be made to the fact that the report had been so used, but the Conference should not be asked to take note of the document.

(72) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) asked whether the Committee would agree to add a paragraph at the end on the procedure to be followed for aid to Member States.

(73) In paragraph 63 of document 8C/PRG/13, the Board had recommended the methods and procedures successfully used in implementing the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. The view of the Board had been that the period 1955-56 should be considered a trial period as regards the allotment of funds for such purposes, and that, in the light of the experience gathered, the Director-General should include in the draft programme for 1957-58 a statement of the conditions proposed for the grant of aid to Member States, together with an apportionment of funds under that heading, in the light of the requests received from Member States during the preceding period.

(74) The CHAIRMAN said that, if a member cared to move something on those lines, a paragraph might be added, under the heading Aid to Member States.

(75) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) assumed that in any major project, such as fundamental education, there might be activities which would be classed as aid to Member States. The two would not be mutually exclusive. He would prepare an amendment to the resolution designed to make his point clear.

(76) It was agreed that the Secretariat should prepare a final draft of the resolution to take into account the comments and amendments made during the meeting.

(77) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) called attention to a point of drafting in the last paragraph of paragraph 4. It was stated that some projects required only small resources, while others called for concentration of efforts and resources, i.e., a contrast was presumably intended. If so, was the word concentration not misleading?

(78) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that paragraph 4 began as follows: "Special activities are those designed to meet the individual needs of Member States". It would be better to say: "... to meet the needs of individual Member States or groups of Member States".

(79) The CHAIRMAN said that the above points would be duly considered in preparing the second draft.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.

# THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

*2 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE FUTURE PROGRAMME** (document 8C/DIV/137)

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that document 8C/DIV/137 contained the draft resolution appearing in document 8C/DIV/127, as amended at the previous day's meeting.

Paragraph 1

(2) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that the paragraph should be rearranged, in conformity with the practice adopted for resolutions; as follows:

"The General Conference
Approves the report ... and
Authorizes the Director-General ....".

(3) Adopted.

(4) He also suggested that, in order to avoid any ambiguity, the last line but one of paragraph 1 should read: "in the light of the principles laid down in the aforementioned documents ...".

Definitions

Paragraph 2

(5) The CHAIRMAN observed that the English text of the last three lines, together with the final line of the second sub-paragraph, needed improvement. The Secretariat could be entrusted with the task of seeing that they corresponded to the French.

(6) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) wanted the word 'compromise' in the second line replaced by something stronger.

(7) The CHAIRMAN suggested the word 'endanger'.

(8) Thus amended, paragraph 2 was adopted.

Paragraph 3

(9) The CHAIRMAN observed that the first line should be brought into line with the French.

(10) After some discussion it was agreed that sub-paragraph (c) should read: "(c) to develop better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world."

(11) Thus amended, paragraph 3 was adopted.

Paragraph 4

(12) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested that the words 'as such' in the second line should be deleted.

(13) This amendment was adopted.

(14) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) suggested that the words 'in preparation for' in paragraph 4 (vi) be deleted.

(15) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) said that the paragraph had been included to meet the concerns of the Brazilian delegation. Special activities, and major projects in particular, of course, always necessitated preliminary studies, the first stage, as it were, of implementation. But the studies in question were of a different kind: they were preliminary enquiries preceding the working out of defined projects into possibilities, undertaken even before deciding which of such possibilities should be retained as a basis for projects. Such preliminary enquiries were to enable the Secretariat to keep abreast of a large number of problems which might occasion action on the part of Unesco.

(16) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the paragraph should run: "such enquiries, studies and research as are necessary as a basis for special activities".

(17) This amendment was adopted.

(18) Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 5

(19) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), referring to the last sub-paragraph, said that the projects mentioned as requiring only small resources for a limited time were presumably the activities mentioned under 5 (i). The sentence should therefore read: "Some of the projects mentioned under (i) above ...".

(20) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that 'will require' in the first line of the last sub-paragraph should read 'may require'.

(21) In (b) of the second sub-paragraph, the words 'in carrying them out' (English text) should read 'of their execution'.

(22) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked whether the phrase: "in accordance with such procedures as may be established" meant that the procedures would be altered and whether

a special procedure would be established.

(23) The CHAIRMAN referred the speaker to paragraph 13.

(24) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that the transition from paragraph 5 to paragraph 6 would be smoother if the following were added at the end of paragraph 5: "Such major projects would be selected in the light of the following considerations".

(25) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) appreciated the Egyptian delegate's point, but did not consider the addition necessary. The chain of ideas carrying on from paragraph 5 to paragraph 6 seemed to him to be clear enough.
(26) With regard to the wording of paragraph 5, Mr. Maheu proposed that in sub-paragraph (i) of the French text 'activités' be substituted for 'projets' and that after sub-paragraph (ii), "Ces projets tendent..." should be replaced by "Les activités spéciales tendent à apporter une solution pratique ..."

(27) Mr. SEDES (France) proposed that the last paragraph of 5 be amended as follows: "In the case of activities initiated by the Organization, some of the projects will require only ..."

(28) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that the sentence: "They are calculated to provide a practical solution ..." might follow immediately after the first sentence of paragraph 5.

(29) Adopted, subject to drafting changes.

Paragraph 6

(30) It was decided that the sentence beginning "These priority areas..." should form a new paragraph, and that the description of the areas themselves should be set out according to the French text.

Paragraph 7

(31) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that in line 2 of paragraph 7 (French version) the word 'ampleur' be substituted for 'importance'.

(32) Adopted.

(33) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked what was meant by "While no specification is placed upon the size of the major projects ..." It might be better to say "While there is no specific limit on the size..."

(34) The CHAIRMAN observed that the idea behind the paragraph was that no specific recommendation was made about the size of projects, rather than that their size should be restricted.

(35) It was agreed to amend the beginning of the sentence to read: "Major projects must be of sufficient magnitude to ensure..."

(36) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) thought that the French text might be amended to read: "L'ampleur de ces projets doit être suffisante pour permettre d'obtenir...", the beginning of the sentence being deleted.

(37) The proposed amendments were adopted.

(38) As the result of a point raised by Mr. SILLER (Mexico), it was agreed to delete the words and early (fourth line), by 8 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

(39) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) pointed out that a reference was nevertheless made to time-limits in paragraph 5.

(40) The CHAIRMAN suggested (and it was so decided) that the sentence be amended to read: "... must be of sufficient magnitude to ensure, within a given time, substantial practical results..."

(41) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) asked whether the French-speaking delegates would be willing to substitute 'projets majeurs' for 'projets d'importance majeure', for the sake of concision and conformity with the English text.

(42) Agreed.

(43) Thus amended paragraph 7 was adopted.

Paragraph 8

(44) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel), referring to the second line, said that the activities referred to were both special and general. That should be made clear.
(45) He was also in favour of including paragraph 8 after paragraph 10, on the grounds that it merely constituted advice to the Director-General.

(46) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) suggested that 'Directives d'exécution' be substituted for 'Règles d'exécution', at the top of page 3 (French text). He also considered that the two sub-headings - Major Projects and Aid to Member States might be deleted.
(47) Mr. Maheu did not agree with the Israeli delegate with regard to the position of paragraph 8. It seemed logical to him to mention the financial conditions for the planning of the future programme in that paragraph; to make provision for a preliminary critical study in paragraph 9; and, in paragraph 10, to invite the Director-General to draw up the necessary plans. He also suggested that the second line of the English text of paragraph 8 read: "which special activities can be completed..", and of the French text: "à déterminer les activités spéciales qui peuvent être conduites à leur terme..."

(48) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) asked why the same provisions should not apply also to general activities.

(49) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) replied that Mr. Avidor's remark touched on an important question of substance which was

liable to reopen the whole discussion.

(50) Mr. SEDES (France) proposed that the order of the phrases in paragraph 8 be inverted, to read: "In order to release funds for the planning of the future programme, the Director-General is authorized, with the approval of the Executive Board..."

(51) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) wanted the words 'Major Projects'(sub-title) moved to immediately before paragraph 9. It would be better to leave paragraph 8 as it was.

(52) After some discussion, it was agreed to eliminate sub-titles completely.

(53) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that the inversion suggested by Mr. Sedes would make it look as though funds were only to be obtained by means of transfers. Did not the Director-General already have funds for planning work?

(54) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) considered that the only purpose of the French delegate's proposal was to improve the arrangement of the text, without changing its meaning.
(55) However, the problem to be settled was what the paragraph meant, and whether it should stand. It authorized the Director-General, with the approval of the Executive Board, to release funds. The provision was not absolutely essential, as the Director-General was already authorized to make transfers within the budget in certain cases, but it had the advantage of drawing attention to the possibility of such transfers. On the other hand, it might arouse some anxiety in the Programme and Budget Commission.

(56) Mr. SEDES (France) thought that, if no other funds were provided for the planning work mentioned in the resolution, the Director-General should be given explicit authorization to make transfers for the purpose.

(57) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was not convinced, and moved deletion of paragraph 8 as unnecessary.

(58) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said the only aim of the paragraph was to ensure that the Director-General had sufficient funds for planning. The Assistant Director-General had said that funds were not needed. Hence the paragraph was no longer needed, and he would second the proposal for its deletion.

(59) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Director-General was now in a strong position, having been authorized to make transfers from line to line in the budget. Throughout the year, money was always becoming free for one reason or another. Hence paragraph 9 by itself was enough.

(60) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought that, nevertheless, paragraph 8 contained a useful idea not repeated in paragraph 9 or 10, namely, that the Director-General was authorized to release funds for planning.

(61) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) proposed that paragraph 8 be deleted and that the following sentence be added at the end of paragraph 10: "He is authorized to release during 1955-56, with the approval of the Executive Board, the funds required for the preparation of these major projects."
(62) No appropriation had yet been made for the planning of future programmes, but, as it was a new activity, it would probably be an omission to make no mention of the possibility of budgetary transfers in the document.

(63) By 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, it was agreed to delete paragraph 8, and to make the addition proposed by the Assistant Director-General at the end of paragraph 10.

(64) Paragraphs 9 and 10 (amended) were adopted.

Paragraph 11

(65) Mr. SEDES (France) proposed (and it was so decided) that the third line should be amended to read: "... National Commissions, the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies, and non-governmental organizations."

(66) Paragraph 11, thus amended, was adopted.

(67) Paragraphs 12 and 13 were adopted.

(68) Document 8C/DIV/137, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.

# THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING

*6 December 1954 at 6 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**RESUME OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION, AND PROPOSED REDUCTIONS WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR 1955-56, TO BALANCE THE BUDGET** (document 8C/BUD/4)

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that the Programme and Budget Commission had completed its work on the programme for 1955-56. He understood that the programme approved by the Commission represented an increase of some $365,000 over the provisional ceiling decided on by the Conference. The Committee was called upon to adapt that programme to the ceiling on the basis of the proposals made by the Director-General in document 8C/BUD/4.
(2) The first part of the document outlined the action taken by the Commission, while the second contained a series of proposals for reduction.
(3) The task faced by the Director-General in harmonizing the Committee's recommendations with the decisions (sometimes in direct contradiction with each other) taken by the Commission, had been exceedingly difficult. He hoped that the Committee would be able to accept the proposals as a whole, even though individual members might have misgivings about certain items.

(4) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that his task had not been easy. It had been necessary to strike a balance between contradictory wishes expressed by different organs of the Conference.
(5) In cases where increases had been made in the cost of combined activities, and the Secretariat felt that the Conference wished to maintain those increases, or as much of them as possible, it had sometimes been necessary, in order to balance the budget, to take money from aid to Member States in general and devote it to aid to Member States in particular.
(6) The Committee would also note some reduction in staff costs, not only in common services but also in individual posts.

(7) The CHAIRMAN said that the first eight pages (in which minor corrections were required as a result of the afternoon meeting of the Programme Commission) were for purposes of information only, and he would propose that the Committee start with a discussion of page 9.
(8) At so late a stage in the Conference's work, he trusted that members disagreeing with the Director-General's proposals would present suggestions themselves, any deletion from those proposals necessitating a suggestion for a corresponding amount to be eliminated elsewhere in the programme.

(9) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) enquired about the possibility of transferring money, within budget lines, from one chapter to another, and asked for a table showing the appropriation lines.

(10) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that, on page 1, appropriation lines were shown as would be provided for in the appropriation resolution. The Executive Board had recommended that each department constitute only one appropriation line, as an improvement on the practice followed in past years.
(11) The Director-General would be authorized to make transfers within each line. But, if money were to be transferred from one line to another, authorization would have to be obtained from the Executive Board.

(12) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that, if for any reason a project were deleted altogether from the programme, the possibility of making money available for such a project, should it prove to be desirable in the course of the financial period, would be considerably reduced.

(13) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, after the Conference, the Secretariat would prepare Approved Work Plans for the various departments, on the basis of the resolutions adopted, and with due regard to points made by the delegations during the session. If any project had been deleted altogether from the programme, the Secretariat would not feel authorized to revive it. However, if a project were left in, the Secretariat would consider it justified to transfer money to that project, if it felt the need for doing so.
(14) Ordinarily the Secretariat implemented the appropriation resolution without unnecessary transfers. If it felt there were serious reasons for not implementing any part of a resolution, it would have to refer the matter to the Executive Board.

(15) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) suggested that it might be well to leave at least a token figure for each project, rather than to delete it entirely, so that the Director-General might be able to revive it in certain circumstances.

(16) Mr. LEE (United States of America) said that delegations had had insufficient time to study

document 8C/BUD/4, and proposed adjournment.

(17) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed, but wanted to know what principles had guided the Director-General in making his proposals.
(18) Some projects had been adopted by the Programme Commission by very small margins. That was a point to which the Director-General might have given attention in considering where to make cuts.
(19) There seemed to be some inconsistency in the treatment of subventions. Why were some subventions reduced while others were not mentioned at all?

(20) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he had tried to decide on the reductions to be made in subventions in the light of three factors: the views expressed by the delegations in the Commissions, his own views, and the opinions of the Heads of Departments as to the cuts which would cause least damage to the Unesco programme as a whole.
(21) Some savings had been effected by simply postponing the date on which it was intended that action should start. Thus, in connexion with paragraph 222, it was proposed that money should be saved by delaying the recruitment of staff for several months.

(22) It was agreed to adjourn and to contine the discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

# THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING

*7 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**RESUME OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION AND PROPOSED REDUCTIONS WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR 1955-56 TO BALANCE THE BUDGET** (document 8C/BUD/4) (continued)

**SECOND PART: PROPOSED REDUCTIONS**

**PART I – GENERAL POLICY**

**CHAPTER II – EXECUTIVE BOARD**

Paragraph 17: Reduction of $102

(1) Approved.

**PART II – PROGRAMME OPERATIONS AND SERVICES**

**CHAPTER I – EDUCATION**

Paragraph 51 - Subvention to World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession

(2) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether during the discussions in the Programme and Budget Commission any proposals had been made for increasing other subventions in the Department of Education.

(3) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied in the negative.

(4) Mr. LEE (United States of America) considered that, on the whole, document 8C/BUD/4 represented an excellent piece of work on the part of the Secretariat in adjusting the programme to meet the views of the Conference and the various contingencies which had arisen. In the present case, however, he formally opposed the recommendation of the Secretariat on paragraph 51. The World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession was doing valuable work and to reduce its subvention, without adequate explanation, at a time when subventions were being granted to new organizations, was contrary to the criteria which had been laid down. The Programme and Budget Commission had justly proposed restoring the subvention to its level in previous years and he urged that that recommendation should be adopted.

(5) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee, if it decided against any of the Director-General's proposals, would have to indicate other items where the reduction could be made. Any proposals for maintaining budgetary provisions under one project must therefore be accompanied by suggestions for deletion elsewhere.

(6) Mr. LEE (United States of America) proposed that the $4,000 required under paragraph 51 should be taken from the campaign against cancer (Natural Sciences, paragraphs 101 and 102). He further proposed deferment of the campaign and retention of the funds for other purposes. The Advisory Committee had recommended the deletion of that project and the Programme and Budget Commission had only approved it after

considerable argument and by a very narrow margin. As funds were short, it was a suitable part of the programme for making reductions and it would be wise to allow the project to mature before Unesco became involved in a controversial field.

(7) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the proposal of the United States delegate, for the reasons the latter had given, and also because such enquiries as his own delegation had been able to make during the Conference indicated that considered scientific opinion would favour the line of action he had proposed. The arguments in the Programme Commission had been emotional and not scientific. If the United States proposal were accepted, nearly $18,000 would become available, which were needed for increases in other parts of the programme. The Programme Commission, for example, had wished to increase the subvention to the International Council of Scientific Unions, but the Director-General had been unable to implement the proposal through lack of funds. He therefore moved the adoption of the United States resolution, the savings, after deduction of $4,000 for the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, to be held in abeyance.

(8) Mr BOW (Canada) supported the proposal of the United States delegate and the suggestion of the United Kingdom delegate. He approved the principle of tapering off subventions, but, in that instance, he would favour maintenance at the previous level for the reason which had been given.
(9) With regard to the campaign against cancer, he urged that the Committee, in its report, should strongly reaffirm its previous decision. Approval of the project would create an unfavourable impression in Canada, where more than Unesco's total budget was being spent annually on cancer research, and where it would be difficult to explain how Unesco could hope to do any effective work with such a small allocation.

(10) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) agreed with the first part of the United States delegate's proposal. With regard to the campaign against cancer, however, while he understood the reasoning, he could not approve the suppression of the project for reasons of economy, or because it was desired to use the funds for another project. If delegates were opposed to the allocation of funds for the campaign, they should raise the question in the Programme and Budget Commission or in the Plenary Conference, but not in the Advisory Committee, whose task was to adjust the budget. The Committee must be practical: if the project were suppressed, it would certainly be raised again during the Conference and more time would have to be spent discussing it. He urged that the Committee should have faith in the judgment of the Secretariat not to proceed with a project if it were found to be impracticable. He proposed that the $4,000 in question should be taken from paragraph 384 of the chapter on Education.

(11) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed that the campaign against cancer should not be eliminated, but that it should be left in the programme, even with a reduced budget, to allow the possibility of further consideration.

(12) Mr. LAUGIER (France) said that his delegation would do everything in its power to convince the Executive Board and the General Conference that cancer research needed to be co-ordinated and promoted by international action. Research had been begun in many countries, and fresh results were being obtained every day. But the French delegation was persuaded that, if the results of all the research were internationally co-ordinated, it would be considerably more effective.
(13) Mr. Laugier pointed out that the appropriations requested were ludicrously small, and that it was not a question of setting up a laboratory, but of endeavouring to make better use of the efforts of isolated research workers.
(14) When the World Health Organization had made its position clear, it had been found that WHO could usefully undertake concerted action with Unesco.
(15) Mr. Laugier felt that Unesco could not stand aside from the campaign against cancer and was convinced that the Organization's decision would be of historic significance.

(16) Mr. LEE (United States of America) accepted the Egyptian delegate's proposal to postpone discussion of the campaign against cancer and saw some merit in the United Kingdom delegate's proposal. He requested that the cancer project should be considered as the source for the $4,000 needed to restore the WCOTP subvention to the level agreed by the Programme and Budget Commission.

(17) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there could be no subsequent discussion of the campaign against cancer, since it was not included in the document under consideration. It was essential to consider not only the re-establishment of the subvention, but also where the funds were to come from, and a vote must therefore be taken first on whether or not to restore the subvention, secondly on the United States delegate's proposal and lastly on the delegate of Israel's proposal.

(18) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) said that there could be no question of returning to major items on which the Programme Commission had already taken a decision, and he doubted whether the Committee had the right to say whether a project or a budgetary allocation already approved by the Commission should be dropped or deferred. With regard to the subvention, in view of the explanation in document 8C/BUD/4 (page 1, Education: paragraph 51), and since it appeared adequate for the present needs of the Confederation, he could see no reason for an increase.

(19) Mr. BOW (Canada) disagreed with the statement of the delegate of France that research on cancer was unco-ordinated: on the contrary, there was close international liaison in that field. He did, however, agree that the sum Unesco was proposing to allocate to such an important subject

was ludicrous, and that its adoption would be regarded as an historic retrograde step on the part of Unesco. With regard to the World Health Organization, he had listened to the speech of the representative of that Organization and his interpretation of it did not accord with that of the French delegate.

(20) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that a vote be taken first on whether or not the subvention should be increased and then, if necessary, on where the additional money should be found.

(21) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that adequate reasons had been given for reducing the subvention. The normal procedure in helping an organization to establish itself was to start with a high subvention and taper it off as the organization became more secure. In certain circumstances, as in the case of ICSU, a normal sustaining subvention was given. The original proposal had been to give a sustaining subvention to WCOTP, but, in view of the Commission's decision, it had been decided, as a compromise, to make the tapering off process more gradual.
(22) With regard to the campaign against cancer, it would be out of order to cancel the project at the present stage, but there would be no objection to proposing a reduction in the budgetary allocation. If it were decided to increase the subvention to WCOTP by $4,000, he would not oppose the deduction of that sum from the cancer project. He did not, in any case, consider the budgetary provision for that project ludicrous: the work envisaged was in the nature of co-ordination, and at the present juncture it was only proposed to make a study for submission to the next General Conference. He had consulted the World Health Organization, which had approved the plan of work.

(23) The CHAIRMAN did not accept the possibility of restoring a subvention as an excuse for eliminating another project. He insisted that only the amount needed should be sought and accordingly proposed the following procedure:

(1) A vote on the desirability of restoring the amount of $4,000 to WCOTP.

(2) A vote on the United States proposal to take the sum from the cancer project.

(3) A vote on the delegate of Israel's proposal, if the United States delegate's proposal were rejected.

(24) Mr. LEE (United States of America) accepted the course proposed by the Chairman.
(25) With regard to the Director-General's explanation, he saw no evidence in the budget for Education to show that the tapering off process was a normal procedure: it appeared to be limited to the case in question.

(26) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that there had been no inconsistency. The case in question happened to be the only one arising under Education.

(27) Mr. SEDES (France) said that the French delegation fully accepted the reasons the Director-General had given to justify the reduction in the subvention.
(28) In his opinion, a distinction should be made between starting subventions and sustaining subventions. The decision taken might have implications for the future and enable Unesco to revise its policy on contracts.
(29) Mr. Sedes agreed with the Indian delegate that the Committee should accept the explanations given by the Secretariat and let the proposed reduction stand.
(30) A vote was taken on the proposal to restore the sum of $4,000 to the subvention granted to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

(31) The proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 4 with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 167

(32) Approved.

Paragraph 175

(33) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the recommendation was the first instance of the elimination of an entire project. He proposed that an amount of $2,000 should be retained, to be found from paragraphs 178, 213 or 384 under Education. In the case of paragraph 384, it would mean reducing the addition proposed by the Programme and Budget Commission from $14,000 to $12,000.

(34) Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Secretariat had proposed the cut with great reluctance, and it had been thought that funds might perhaps be found under paragraph 246 of the Department of Social Sciences. The Secretariat would not, however, oppose the delegate of Israel's proposal, and would prefer the last of the three alternatives suggested.

(35) Mr. SEDES (France) said that, as a practical social scientist, he considered it impossible to evaluate a pilot project with an appropriation of $2,000. In his opinion, the solution proposed by the Director-General should be adopted.

(36) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the $2,000 would be of some use, and it might be possible to transfer other funds to add to it later in the year.

(37) The proposal of the delegate of Israel, seconded by the delegates of Germany, India and Egypt, was adopted by 8 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

(38) Paragraphs 185, 192, 213, 218, 413 and 415 were approved.

**CHAPTER 2 – NATURAL SCIENCES**

Paragraph 58

(39) Approved.

Paragraph 79

(40) Mr. SILLER (Mexico) asked how the proposed cut would be made.

(41) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that, in the past, the records of symposia on arid zone research had been published in a bilingual French-English edition, the papers remaining in the original language. It was proposed to insert after each paper a summary in Spanish, sufficient to give the reader the gist of it.
(42) That course would involve an additional expenditure of only $2,500, whereas a separate Spanish edition would cost double that amount. Moreover, in the latter case, there would be no reason for not having separate French and English editions.

(43) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the volume included an English summary of the original French and a French summary of the original English.

(44) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied in the negative and confirmed the Chairman's assumption that Spanish readers would have readier access to the complete records, although in summarized form.

(45) Paragraph 79 was approved.

Paragraph 137

(46) Mr. BOW (Canada), recalling that the question of the campaign against cancer was still in abeyance, proposed that the budget for that project should be reduced to a nominal amount, to maintain it in existence, and that the remainder of the funds be applied to paragraph 137.
(47) The proposal was supported by the delegates of Egypt and the United States of America, and the Chairman pointed out that the restoration of $15,000 under paragraph 137 of Natural Sciences would leave a sum of about $2,000 for the project on cancer.

(48) In reply to a question from the United Kingdom delegate, the CHAIRMAN said that there was nothing to prevent further cuts being made in the allocation for the campaign against cancer if funds had to be found under any paragraphs where the Committee might decide to reject the Secretariat's proposed reductions.

(49) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) asked why the Director-General and the Secretariat had not themselves proposed any reduction for the cancer campaign.

(50) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) recalled that there had been a lengthy discussion in the Programme and Budget Commission on the campaign against cancer, and that the Commission had voted in favour of maintaining the project. The Secretariat had therefore taken the view that it would be improper to do away with the project for purely financial reasons.

(51) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) accepted the explanation given.

(52) Mr. BOW (Canada) found the explanation concerning the campaign against cancer inconsistent with the Secretariat's proposal to eliminate the project under paragraph 175 of the chapter on Education.

(53) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in the case of paragraph 175 the Director-General's proposal had not been approved in its entirety; an amount of $2,000 had had to be found from another part of the programme. He saw no inconsistency.

(54) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, even if the sum of $2,000 had not been retained under paragraph 175, the project would not have been entirely ruled out, since evaluation was also provided for under Social Sciences. The situation was therefore different.
(55) He recalled the remark of the Director, Department of Natural Sciences, that it would be inelegant to kill a project, and also his reference to the long debate in the Programme and Budget Commission. It was undesirable to delete the project entirely, but he had been willing to agree to funds being transferred from it if the proposal to restore the subvention to WCOTP had been adopted.

(56) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the delegate of Canada would be quite at liberty to oppose the cut under any paragraph and to recommend in each case that funds be taken from the campaign against cancer.

(57) Mr. SEDES (France) thought the Canadian delegate's proposal regarding paragraph 137 inadmissible. It was not a question of eliminating a project, but of reducing the number of experts from 3 to 2. In his opinion, with the co-operation that could be expected from the National Commissions, the project could be carried out with 2 experts.
(58) Mr. Sedes informed the Committee that his delegation approved the proposed reduction of $15,000.

(59) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) failed to understand the degrees of elegance as between reductions proposed by the Director-General and those recommended by the Committee. In his view the wisest procedure would be to work through the document, leaving to the end of each chapter the task of deciding how to find the funds for the total of any cuts which the Committee wished to restore.

(60) The CHAIRMAN was strongly opposed to the procedure suggested by the United Kingdom delegate, which would involve the Committee in working through the programme a second time. If cuts were opposed, the means to restore them must be considered in each case when a proposal was made.

(61) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) supported the procedure

advocated by the Chairman. Any other method would involve a complete revision of the programme, and the reopening of controversial discussions.

(62) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium), reverting to the Committee's decision on paragraph 175, pointed out that it meant deleting an appropriation of $7 000, which had been obtained for youth movements, with great difficulty, during the discussions of the Programme and Budget Commission. He was surprised at such a hasty decision.

(63) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL did not understand the objections of the Belgian delegate. The procedure proposed for paragraph 137 of the Natural Sciences chapter was entirely analogous to that followed in connexion with paragraph 175 of the chapter on Education.

(64) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) proposed that a vote should be taken on whether or not to retain the campaign against cancer.

(65) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) referred to the question of a balanced programme, and suggested that the deletion of the activity under paragraph 139 of the chapter on Natural Sciences might to some extent be compensated by the retention of the $15,000 under paragraph 137. He accordingly proposed the restoration of the budget under paragraph 137, the funds to be taken from the campaign against cancer, leaving the sum of $2,680 for the retention of that project.

(66) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) proposed that the retention under paragraph 137 and the reduction for the campaign against cancer should be voted on separately.

(67) The CHAIRMAN said that a vote to restore the $15,000 to paragraph 137 must be conditional on finding the sum elsewhere in the programme.

(68) Mr. SEDES (France) thought that the two decisions should be taken together, for, if the Committee decided to restore the $15,000, the sum would automatically be taken from the appropriations for the campaign against cancer.

(69) Mr. BOW (Canada) supported the proposal of the French delegate.

(70) The proposal of the delegate of France was put to the vote and adopted by 7 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions.

(71) A vote was then taken on the proposal of the Canadian delegate to restore the amount of $15,000 under paragraph 137 of the Natural Sciences chapter, and to deduct the amount from the campaign against cancer.

(72) The proposal was adopted by 6 votes to 4 with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 172

(73) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences), reminded the Committee that the Programme and Budget Commission had decided to maintain the Delhi Office at the existing level, i.e., with an appropriation of $95,000 for the two years, instead of the $35,000 provided for in the draft programme.
(74) The Secretariat proposed that the extra $60,000 be obtained in the following way: (1) a sum of $35,000 would be allocated to the Delhi Office; (2) to cover the remaining $25,000, an official (grade P.4) from the Department of Natural Sciences would be seconded to Delhi to fill one of the posts that were to have been abolished in the draft programme. The appropriation for the P.4 post would be found by a transfer within the budget. The sum required would be $21,826.

(75) In answer to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. AUGER said that the Indian delegation had agreed to a reduction of $25,000 on the $60,000 required for maintaining the office at the existing level, on condition that an official from headquarters were sent to Delhi.

Paragraph 196

(76) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that paragraph 196 referred to a headquarters post for co-ordinating Science Co-operation Offices. The proposal included an incumbent who might be transferred to New Delhi.

(77) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) asked for an explanation of how the additional $60,000 proposed by the Programme and Budget Commission in the first part of document 8C/BUD/4 under paragraph 172 of the Natural Sciences chapter (page 3) was financed.

(78) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) explained that the Programme and Budget Commission had proposed an increase of $60,000 under paragraph 172 and the Secretariat's proposal was to reduce that increase by $25,000 and to restore the staffing pattern by having a P.5 post instead of a P.4 one. The remainder of the sum would be provided partly by the reduction under paragraph 196 and partly by the Indian Government.

(79) Paragraph 196 was approved.

Paragraph 197

(80) Mr. AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought the Committee realized that the Director-General would have to review the whole question of Science Co-operation Offices during 1955. The proposal regarding paragraph 197 marked the beginning of that review.
(81) As the Secretariat saw it, the Science Co-operation Offices were destined to become decentralized bodies, capable of carrying out the Unesco programme themselves, whereas in the past they had been liaison agents.
(82) It had been found that, in the new programme, the Offices could be made responsible for

co-ordinating Unesco's activities in their respective regions. Those, like the Istanbul Office, which existed solely for liaison purposes, could be dispensed with.
(83) The Cairo Office would take over the activities of the branch office in Turkey.

(84) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the Istanbul Office had been established for three countries: Turkey, Iran and Israel. The delegate of Turkey had indicated that his country wished to belong to the European and not the Middle East region; for Israel, contact with Headquarters in Paris was adequate; and Iran could be accommodated by either Cairo or Paris. He accordingly supported the closing of the Istanbul Office.

(85) Paragraph 197 was approved.

Paragraph 198

(86) Approved.

(87) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) asked what weight should be attached to the note at the top of page 4 of the document: a recommendation to increase the subvention to ICSU if funds are available had no meaning. As he understood it, if the Commission had recommended that the subvention should be increased, the Director-General would have submitted proposals on how the necessary funds should be found.

(88) The CHAIRMAN said that funds were not, in fact, available. In any case, he did not see how the Advisory Committee could take action in the absence of a definite recommendation from the Programme and Budget Commission.

(89) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Programme and Budget Commission had had in mind that if, after the proposed reductions had been considered, there were found to be any surplus, it should be used to increase the subvention to ICSU. Since the Commission had made no suggestions for finding funds from other parts of the budget, he had not felt it possible to offer any proposals himself. The Commission had not taken a vote on the matter.

CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL SCIENCES

Paragraphs 123 and 127

(90) Approved.

Paragraphs 140-163

(91) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the sum of $826 was an incidental saving resulting from the replanning of Project 3.4.

(92) Paragraphs 140-163 were approved.

Paragraph 190

(93) Approved.

Paragraph 222

(94) Mr. LEE (United States of America) recalled that the Advisory Committee, when discussing the project, had advocated high priority because it was eminently suited to the basic purposes of Unesco. In the course of discussion the Social Sciences Department had suffered most and been the least demanding, and he felt that the reduction under paragraph 222 should be less severe. He accordingly proposed the restoration of a sum of $6,420, to be taken from the project in draft resolution 8C/DR/63 (referred to on page 5 of document 8C/BUD/4) to publish the works of the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz. That resolution had been placed in the programme at a very late date and was not integrated in the programme; it was, moreover, an activity more appropriate for non-governmental organizations, National Commissions and national organizations. Several similar projects had been rejected, and he saw no reason to depart from principles in programme planning at the expense of a high priority project.

(95) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) agreed that the project under paragraph 222 deserved high priority and appreciated the fact that the proposed international centre was to be located in India. The proposal to stagger the establishment of the centre would not materially affect its priority and he accordingly gave it his support.

(96) Mr. SEDES (France) was prepared to approve the proposed reduction if the Indian delegate agreed to it.
(97) But he found it difficult to accept the method suggested by the delegate of the United States of America, who had advocated a cut in one item of the programme in order to make possible an increase in another.
(98) Mr. Sedes pointed out that, if an appropriation of $6,420 for a particular project were cut out, so that the sum might be transferred elsewhere, it would not necessarily meet the requirements of the project to which it was allocated.

(99) Mrs. MYRDAL (Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the amount of $13,400 represented reductions of from $2,000 to $3,000 in five posts at the centre. A delay in recruiting staff from the beginning of January 1956 to February or March was possible and introduced a certain flexibility in the funds required.

(100) Mr. LEE (United States of America), while realizing that the country primarily concerned with the project was India, considered that the Secretariat should not take a decision without consulting all interested countries.
(101) With regard to the proposed reduction, it appeared to him irresponsible to reduce funds for a high priority project, while adding funds for a project which was not viewed very favourably and which had been submitted too late to be properly integrated in the programme.

(102) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the item referred to by the delegate of the United States of America had been approved in the Programme and Budget Commission by 14 votes to 12 on a motion to delete the resolution.

(103) Mr BOW (Canada) supported the proposal of the United States delegate.

(104) The proposal of the delegate of the United States of America to restore the sum of $6,420 to paragraph 222 and withdraw the amount from the implementation of resolution 8C/DR/63 was put to the vote and rejected by 2 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions.

(105) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) explained his abstention from voting. He might equally well have been faced with a choice between diphtheria and smallpox, neither of which he desired.

(106) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) said that the United Kingdom delegate had voiced his own views. The vote which had just been taken was a departure from normal procedure. The operative part had been the proposed reduction, and while he favoured that cut he would have preferred to see the funds applied elsewhere.

(107) Mr. LEE (United States of America) pointed out that he had spoken in favour of the International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization in Asia long before resolution 8C/DR/63 had been received.

(108) The CHAIRMAN noted the comment of the United States delegate.

(109) The Director-General's proposal concerning paragraph 222 was approved.

Paragraph 261

(110) Approved.

**CHAPTER 4 – CULTURAL ACTIVITIES: PARAGRAPHS 32-34, 296-298, 304-311, 403, 415**

(111) Approved.

**CHAPTER 5 – MASS COMMUNICATION: PARAGRAPHS 197 and 251**

(112) Approved.

**CHAPTER 6 – EXCHANGE OF PERSONS: PARAGRAPHS 106 and 111**

(113) Approved.

**CHAPTER 7 – GENERAL RESOLUTIONS: PARAGRAPH 27**

(114) Approved.

**CHAPTER 8 – DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS: PARAGRAPH 15**

(115) Approved.

**PART III – GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**

**CHAPTER 1: PARAGRAPH 16**

**CHAPTER 2: PARAGRAPHS 39 AND 57**

**CHAPTER 4: PARAGRAPH 79**

(116) Approved.

**PART IV – COMMON SERVICE COSTS**

Paragraphs 14 and 39

(117) Approved.

(118) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) drew attention to two further alterations proposed by the Programme and Budget Commission, which had been received too late for inclusion in the document:

1. A reduction of $2,000 for the two-year period under General Resolutions, paragraph 21.
2. Approval of resolution 8C/DR/15 (Friends of Unesco Clubs) involving a sum of $500 for 1956.

(119) The total amount available would therefore be $1,500.

(120) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) proposed that the sum should be applied to the International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization in Asia (paragraph 222 of the Social Sciences chapter).

(121) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) proposed that it should be used for the pilot project under paragraph 175 of the chapter on Education.

(122) The proposal of the delegate of Egypt was adopted.

(123) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the first report of the Advisory Committee had contained a recommendation that draft resolutions from Member States should be submitted to the Director-General at an earlier date in order not to impede the work of the Conference, as had happened at the present session. No action, however, had been taken by the Programme and Budget Commission, and he thought that it would be appropriate to call the matter to the Commission's attention.

(124) Another question still outstanding was the future of the Advisory Committee. In his opinion, the change in the Executive Board's structure to provide for government representation eliminated the need for the Committee, but members would have to consider the matter so that a recommendation could be made to the Conference.

(125) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the

question of draft resolutions would normally come up for discussion by the Executive Board in connexion with the organization of the work of the next session of the General Conference. If, therefore, no action were taken by the Programme and Budget Commission, he himself would bring it to the attention of the Board.

(126) In reply to a question from Miss LAISE (United States of America), the CHAIRMAN said that the Appropriation Resolution would be discussed at the next meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission and subsequently by the Advisory Committee.

(127) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) thought that the changes made in the structure of the Executive Board should be a reason for keeping the Committee in being, since it represented the voice of the majority in the Conference.

(128) He therefore proposed that the Committee be maintained, and that its members be chosen, for preference, from among the delegates of countries not represented on the Executive Board.

(129) The CHAIRMAN said that the question would be taken up at the next meeting of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

# THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING

*8 December 1954 at 5.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Australia)

**APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION FOR 1955 AND 1956 (document 8C/BUD/6, Rev.)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, paid a tribute to the work done by Mr. Rao in producing the resolution and appropriation table.

(2) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that the resolution and table had been drawn up as in previous years.

Paragraph 1 and the Annex

(3) The CHAIRMAN pointed out a typing error. The figure 874,861 opposite Total, Part I should read 847,861 (English text only).

(4) Paragraph 1 and the Annex were adopted.

(5) Paragraph 3 was adopted.

Paragraph 4

(6) On a point being raised by Mr. LEE (United States of America), there was some discussion whether the figures given referred to assessments or to total estimates.

(7) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested (and it was so decided) that the paragraph should read: "Assessments in respect of 1955 shall be based on the total estimates ($9,491,420), for that year, and assessments in respect of 1956 shall be based on the total estimates ($10,508,580) for that year."

(8) Paragraphs 5 and 6 were adopted.

Paragraph 7

(9) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget), in answer to a question by Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt), said that the Executive Board would have to endorse any emergency transfers the Director-General might make between appropriation lines.

(10) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that, when the Executive Board were informed of the details of the transfers and the reasons for them, it might disagree with the Director-General's action.

(11) Mr. RAO (Acting Chief, Bureau of Programme and Budget) said that the paragraph was a safety clause, which the Director-General had never in fact invoked. The Director-General would take the action mentioned only when it was perfectly clear that the Executive Board would not take exception to it.

(12) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) said that the Director-General had never used the authority given him under the clause and was very unlikely to do so. In practice, he could always get hold of the Chairman of the Board, who would quickly send a circular letter to the members, before action was taken.

(13) Paragraph 7 was adopted.

(14) Paragraphs 8 and 9 were adopted.

(15) The CHAIRMAN said that the resolution, as amended, with the table, would be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission at its next meeting.

FUTURE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(16) The Chairman said that the Committee had one more point to discuss before its work could be considered completed. That was whether or not there should be an Advisory Committee at future sessions.
(17) The question had been raised in the General Committee. The Director-General had suggested that the members of the Advisory Committee for the ninth session should be designated at the eighth session, and that the Executive Board should be authorized to decide whether the Committee should be convened before, or during, the ninth session. The Director-General had made that suggestion because, under a resolution submitted by the Scandinavian countries, the Executive Board would be called upon to consider how the ninth session should be organized.
(18) Hence, as the new Executive Board would be composed of government representatives, the Committee might wish to consider the question and make some recommendation to the Programme and Budget Commission.

(19) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) thought that the Committee might show a certain bias in favour of its own continued existence.
(20) He did not, however, see what connexion there was between the new procedure for election of the Executive Board and the rôle of the Advisory Committee.
(21) It was true that the new Board would consist of government representatives, who, in their wisdom, might feel qualified to speak on behalf of the other fifty States not represented on the Board. But it did seem to him that there might be a call for some other body, such as the Advisory Committee, to express the views of those latter States.
(22) The Advisory Committee had wasted a good deal of effort because it had lacked clear instructions (in connexion with the two budget levels, for example). It would have been better if the Conference had taken a decision on financial limitations at the outset.

(23) Mr. HACQUAERT (Belgium) considered that the continued existence of the Advisory Committee was justified, particularly in view of the new structure of the Executive Board.
(24) As far as the Advisory Committee's work was concerned, experience at the eighth session had shown that the majority of points on which the Committee had taken decisions had been thrown open again for discussion and that at least some of its recommendations had not been followed.
(25) Mr. Hacquaert maintained that the work of the Advisory Committee had been done too late; to be really useful, it should have been done before document 8C/5 (proposed programme and budget) was drawn up; it was obvious, however, that such a procedure would not be desirable, for the Advisory Committee would then become a sort of second Executive Board.
(26) However, in view of the undoubted value of some of its discussions (those on the preparation of future programmes, for example), the delegate of Belgium believed the existence of the Committee to be justified, but its methods of work should be revised.

(27) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) thought that only the Board was competent to comment on the Director-General's proposals before the Conference began. Once the Conference had started, however, it was difficult for the Board to work effectively, since its members were also members of national delegations. Hence, during the Conference, it would be useful to have an advisory committee.

(28) Mr. SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that, with the Programme and Budget Commission as now organized, the Advisory Committee might well be unnecessary. But the organization of the work of the Programme and Budget Commission should be thoroughly reviewed.
(29) The Advisory Committee could do useful work if its membership were increased (say to 24 or 25), and if the majority of its members represented countries not represented on the Executive Board. In addition, the Committee's report ought to be ready before the Conference began, so that it could form the basis for discussion in the Programme and Budget Commission.

(30) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) thought it was difficult to decide whether the Committee was of value, because it was not known what changes might be made in the procedure for preparation of the programme. For example, how far would the Board be responsible for drawing up the programme?
(31) Under the circumstances, all the Committee could do would be to recommend that the possibility be maintained of convening an advisory committee to consider the programme and to submit a report.

(32) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) was of opinion that meetings held during the eighth session could be divided into two types:

1. Meetings of the Programme and Budget Commission type, where the discussion proceeded article by article, almost farthing by farthing, as if the Advisory Committee had not already cleared the ground and made recommendations, moreover, in the end, that discussion often led to completely different, if not contradictory, decisions. Such methods should certainly not continue, for they resulted in an equal waste of money and effort.
2. Certain meetings of the Advisory Committee at which the discussion, limited to a particular problem and based on documents and specific information, had made it possible to do useful work.

(33) It might therefore be concluded that the Advisory Committee's work was not without value, if it were considered to consist, primarily, of expressing opinions on particular problems. If it were also to deal usefully with wider questions and their budgetary implications, other methods of work would have to be envisaged.

(34) Mr. LEE (United States of America) agreed that perhaps too little was known of future procedures

for it to be possible to recommend terms of reference for the Committee. But the Committee might agree that the Executive Board should study the organization of the Conference and provide for an advisory committee to serve when and if required.
(35) It had been suggested that the Advisory Committee might be useful in so far as it represented countries not represented on the Board. That point should not be pressed too far. There were other considerations to be borne in mind.

(36) Mr. AVIDOR (Israel) said that the Committee could not at that stage start discussing the organization of future sessions. The Executive Board and the Secretariat should be left free to decide how the organization of the Conference might be improved.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought there was a good deal to be said for reinforcing the preliminary work on programme and budget done before the Conference.
(38) At the eighth session, the advice offered by the Committee had sometimes differed from that of the Executive Board, and there had been some duplication of effort. Would that situation arise again with the new Board? It was difficult to say.
(39) There was certainly a need for an advisory committee to deal with particular problems referred to it by the Programme and Budget Commission.
(40) Possibly the Director-General's suggestion had much to commend it, namely, that the Conference should set up an advisory committee, freely chosen from among the 72 Member States of Unesco. The Executive Board would then be free to convene the committee before the Conference, if it saw fit to do so.

(41) The CHAIRMAN thought that, if the advisory committee were to be merely a body called upon to ensure that the views of the countries not represented on the Executive Board were made known, then a case could be made for having a second body, consisting of countries not represented on the advisory committee, to check the latter's conclusions, and so on ad absurdum.
(42) He was therefore not in favour of a second examination of the programme by the Advisory Committee, if the preliminary examination were made by the Executive Board.
(43) He agreed with the delegate of France that the Committee had been most successful in dealing with the particular problems referred to it. But, since it was not possible to know in advance what those problems would be, it would be unwise to oblige the Board to convene the committee before the Conference began.
(44) Hence he was inclined to agree with the Director-General's suggestion that the Conference should set up a committee which the Board would convene as it thought fit.

(45) To show that there was often no real exchange of views, Mr. FRANCOIS (France) recalled the difference of opinion that had arisen at a meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission between the French delegation and the Director of the Department of Education, the delegate of France had made a speech, the Director of the Department had made a speech, but the two parallel monologues had resulted in nothing constructive. Yet that was the type of question which should be thoroughly discussed by a small group of competent people fully aware of the importance of the subject.

(46) The CHAIRMAN said that the heads of departments would be obliged to attend meetings of the Programme and Budget Commission, and it was not easy for them to attend meetings of the Advisory Committee held at the same time.

(47) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) stated that the Director-General was well aware of the need for a complete revision of the organization of the Conference's work. He had no solutions to propose at the moment but hoped that, during the coming months, he would have an opportunity to study the problem with members of the Executive Board.
(48) With regard to the future of the Advisory Committee, the Director-General had not wished to express an opinion on the fundamental issues involved. The only purpose of the proposal he had made was to point to a procedure which, while safeguarding both the sovereignty of the General Conference and the constitutional powers of the Executive Board, would make it possible to get out of a difficulty.
(49) Mr. Maheu then drew attention to two aspects of the problem which might shed some light on the question of the existence and responsibilities of the advisory committee.
(50) Hitherto, the Executive Board had been responsible for presenting, together with its comments, a programme which had in fact been prepared by the Director-General. It would be desirable for the Executive Board's comments to be more detailed, and even expressed in stronger terms, so that governments would be sure that the draft programme and budget had been very closely examined.
(51) There were also certain difficulties inherent in the present membership of the Programme and Budget Commission, which in fact worked like several parallel commissions. In the seats reserved for each delegation, a succession of specialists replaced one another and thus all hope of a general view of the programme disappeared.
(52) If, in considering the usefulness of the Advisory Committee, it were assumed that the Executive Board would in future make a more thorough examination of the draft programme, and that the methods of work of the Programme and Budget Commission would be revised in such a way as to give it a general view, it would be seen that the Committee was not so essential, except for dealing with very special problems which might be submitted to it, either directly by the Executive Board, or by the Programme and Budget Commission as its work progressed.
(53) The Committee would thus serve as a small standing advisory committee whose various working parties would be sub-committees.

(54) Mr. SEDES (France) considered that

Mr. Maheu's remarks had done much to clarify the question.
(55) It should not be forgotten that the programme for 1957-58 would differ in many ways from the present programme. For example, the study of major projects would call for many committees of specialists belonging to various disciplines, whose activities would no longer be parallel, but would have to be very closely co-ordinated.

(56) Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Egypt) still felt that there were many unknown factors to be taken into consideration. The Committee could only recommend that the question whether an advisory committee was necessary should be referred to the Executive Board.

(57) Mr. JUNANKAR (India) doubted whether there were in fact so many unknown factors. The Programme and Budget Commission had already taken certain decisions on the procedure for preparing future programmes.
(58) A detailed scrutiny of the programme by the Conference itself was always necessary. It could not be made by so large and unwieldy a body as the Programme and Budget Commission. The Commission could only lay down general policy, leaving the Advisory Committee to examine points of detail.
(59) If the Executive Board in its new form were really responsible to Unesco as a whole, and really desirous of giving due weight to the views of all Member States, then there was no reason why its report on the programme should be different, in broad outline, from the report by the Programme and Budget Commission.

(60) Mr. LEE (United States of America) queried whether it was possible for the Conference to adopt a resolution authorizing the Board to lay down procedure for the next session. Could the Board be authorized to appoint an advisory committee?

(61) The CHAIRMAN observed that the Conference would have to give special instructions if the Board were to be allowed to elect such a body.

(62) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) recalled that, under the Constitution, the Executive Board was responsible for drawing up the agenda of the General Conference, but it could not decide upon the membership of a committee, or appoint its members.
(63) It was for that reason that the Director-General had made his proposal concerning procedure, with the idea that the General Conference, in setting up an advisory committee, would show that it agreed on the principle, while leaving it to the Executive Board to define the committee's terms of reference and decide when to convene it.

(64) The CHAIRMAN said that little was known about what the Board would propose for the reorganization of the Conference. The best course would be for the Conference to elect an advisory committee and leave the Board to decide when it should be convened.

(65) Mr. FRANCOIS (France) proposed the closure of the debate.
(66) Firstly, the Programme and Budget Commission was a necessary evil, its methods of work would have to be improved if scientists, teachers, men of letters and specialists in all branches were to feel that they were doing useful and interesting work. Secondly, the advisory committee could be an asset, as experience had proved, if it remained a strictly advisory body.
(67) The delegate of France therefore suggested that the Committee, taking account of what he had just said, should do no more than make very general recommendations, thus in fact leaving it to others to deal with the fundamental issues

(68) Mr. MAHEU (Assistant Director-General) had a strong impression that the Committee was about to reach agreement and that it would be better to take a decision forthwith.

(69) Mr. LEE (United States of America) moved that the Committee recommend the Conference to elect an advisory committee of x members (the number to be decided on by the Programme and Budget Commission), to be convened at such times, and for such purposes as might be specified by the Executive Board.

(70) Mr. BOW (Canada) seconded.
(71) His delegation was not in favour of the Executive Board being called on to make a detailed examination of the programme. It had been suggested that the sessions of the Board were already too long and too many.
(72) Similarly, he was not in favour of such an examination being made by the Programme and Budget Commission, which was too large for such a task.

(73) The United States motion was adopted.

(74) After the usual expressions of thanks the meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

# CHAPTER VII

# NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

## FIRST MEETING

*12 November 1954 at 4.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. KABIR (India)

**ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AND OF THE CHAIRMEN OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES (document 8C/NOM/1)**

(1) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL opened the meeting and pointed out that the Executive Board had drawn up a list of candidates for election to the posts of President and Vice-Presidents of the Conference, and chairmen of the commissions and committees. He called on the Chairman of the Executive Board to present his report.

(2) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) explained that the Board had considered at length all the possible nominations to the various posts to be filled, so as to ensure representation of all continents and groups of countries on the General Committee of the Conference. The list drawn up on the basis of the Board's discussions seemed to satisfy that requirement.
(3) He called on the Committee to elect first its Chairman, and, in accordance with the Board's recommendation, to appoint the delegate of India.

(4) Unanimously approved.

(Mr. KABIR (India) then took the Chair)

(5) The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee for the honour done to his delegation and asked the Chairman of the Executive Board to present his suggestions for the choice of other members of the General Committee.

(6) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) read out Rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, according to which the Nominations Committee, on a report by the Executive Board, was required to submit a list of candidates for the posts of President and Vice-Presidents of the General Conference, and to submit to the commissions, committees and subsidiary organs, proposals for the election of their chairmen, vice-chairmen and rapporteurs.
(7) He stressed the difficulty of the task devolving upon the Executive Board, which, in drawing up its list, had taken account of two main factors: (1) the need for ensuring fair geographical distribution, so that all regions and cultural groups would be represented on the General Committee of the Conference; (2) the desirability of bringing in certain Member States which had not yet been represented on the General Committee of the Conference.
(8) Furthermore, although the functions assigned to the various members of the General Committee were equally important, some called for gifts of leadership and experience of Unesco work not possessed by all candidates. The Executive Board had therefore thought it should in some cases nominate individual delegates who had already successfully discharged such functions. For instance, for the Programme and Administrative Commissions, which carried the great bulk of the Conference's work, it suggested calling upon Mr. Bourgeois (Switzerland) and Mr. Beeby (New Zealand) respectively.
(9) The Executive Board had made the following proposals:

President of the Conference: Uruguay

Vice-Presidents of the Conference: Brazil, France, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, Spain, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom and United States of America.

Programme and Budget Commission, Chairman: Switzerland (Mr. Bourgeois)

Administrative Commission, Chairman: New Zealand (Mr. Beeby)

Legal Committee, Chairman: Egypt

Nominations Committee, Chairman: India

Credentials Committee. Colombia

Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget, Chairman: Australia (Mr. Gardner Davies)

Committee on Reports of Member States, Chairman: Iraq

Headquarters Committee: Venezuela.

(10) As the Chairmen of the Credentials and the Nominations Committees had already been elected, the Committee had to decide on the other proposals.

(11) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the list proposed by the Executive Board did not allow for adequate

representation of the Eastern and Central European countries, of which six were already members of Unesco and several others had applied for admission. He thought that at least two seats on the General Committee of the Conference should be granted to those countries and asked for the Committee's views on that point.

(12) Mr. COLOMBO (Argentina) emphasized that not one of the Vice-Presidents of the Conference was a representative of the Spanish-speaking Latin American countries and proposed considering nomination of candidates from Chile and Mexico.

(13) The CHAIRMAN explained that in the General Committee the Chairmen of Commissions and Committees were on an equal footing with the Vice-Presidents of the Conference and that among them the Spanish-speaking countries seemed to be well represented (Spain, Colombia, Uruguay and Venezuela).
(14) Furthermore, he wondered how the Committee could take decisions on the suggestions of the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Argentina, as put forward.
(15) He proposed that the Committee first decide on the choice of the President of the Conference.

(16) The nomination of Uruguay was unanimously approved.

(17) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) agreed with the delegates of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Argentina that the list proposed by the Executive Board was less satisfactory than he had expected. He emphasized that South East Asia, for which only one country, Thailand, had been nominated, was inadequately represented.

(18) Mr. TERAN ROBALINO (Ecuador) congratulated the delegate of Uruguay on the honour done to his country by offering it the Presidency of the Conference.

(19) The CHAIRMAN asked members to vote on the rest of the list as a whole, as the comments made did not take the form of specific proposals.

(20) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his remarks were based on two considerations: (1) the list proposed did not allow for a fair geographical distribution of the countries of Eastern and Central Europe; (2) considering the number of members on the General Committee, those countries were obviously less well represented than the others. It would be only right to give them another seat. A fair decision on that point would make it easier to deal later with a number of other problems.

(21) Mr. BUSTAMANTE (El Salvador) proposed adding Chile and Mexico to the list.

(22) The Proposal was supported by the delegate of Brazil.

(23) Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) pointed out that the list had been drawn up by the Executive Board after lengthy discussion and with due regard to certain basic considerations; he proposed that the Committee vote first on the nominations to the posts of Vice-President.

(24) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) thought that, as all seats on the General Committee were of equal importance, the Committee should consider the list as a whole. However, as Venezuela did not seem likely to be represented at the Conference, the proposal concerning the Chairmanship of the Headquarters Committee would probably have to be amended.

(25) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) explained that out of the 19 posts to be filled, 6 were allocated to Europe, 5 to the American continent, 4 to Asia, 2 to the Middle East and 2 to other regions of the world, including Africa and the South Pacific (2 seats had been set aside for the latter group because of the special qualifications of the candidates proposed).

(26) The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to vote on whether it would take a decision on the list as a whole.

(27) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) thought the Committee should adjourn the meeting in order to work out a new procedure. It was difficult to take a decision on a single proposal.

(28) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) recalled that the original idea had been to appoint Egypt one of the Vice-Presidents, and he wondered whether it would not be possible to give one of the Latin American countries the post originally proposed for Egypt seeing that the latter had finally been chosen for the Chairmanship of the Legal Committee.

(29) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) was disappointed to find the Committee working so slowly.

(30) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) saw no reason to alter the list of Vice-Presidents. Spain had been chosen to replace Egypt on that list and he supported the new nomination.

(31) Mr. VASSALLO ROJAS (Chile) thought it was contrary to the democratic principles on which Unesco was based to discuss one single list; every country should be given a chance of expressing its views.

(32) Mr. BERREDO CERNEIRO (Brazil) emphasized that the Executive Board had always proposed lists of candidates without any idea of imposing them on the Conference. He suggested taking a secret vote which would enable all delegates to include new names on the list.

(33) Mr. NUFER (United States of America) was prepared to vote on the whole list, which did not imply that he would accept all the names proposed by the Board.

(34) Mr. COLOMBO (Argentina) supported the proposal of the delegate of Brazil.

(35) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) also felt that the Committee should prepare a new list.

(36) Sir Charles Webster (United Kingdom) thought that the Committee should bear in mind the Executive Board's efforts and vote first on the proposed list. If that list were not approved, the Committee could then consider a different solution.

(37) Mr. THA HLA (Union of Burma) saw no point in prolonging the discussion. The only question was whether to vote on the entire list or consider the different categories of posts separately.

(38) The CHAIRMAN put that question to the vote.

(39) The Committee decided, by 26 votes to 13, to vote on the list as a whole.

(40) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the nominations proposed by the Executive Board.

(41) That list was approved by 25 votes to 12 with 6 abstentions.

(42) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he had voted against the Board's proposals, not from lack of confidence in the Board but because he thought that when a delegation submitted a new nomination it was entitled to have that nomination considered.

(43) Mr. COLOMBO (Argentina) also said that he had not intended to show any mistrust in the Board. He had voted against merely in order to make his position clear.

(44) Mr. TERAN ROBALINO (Ecuador) said he had voted against the Board's list in order to emphasize that not enough seats had been set aside for Latin America and also to affirm the principle according to which the Board should make proposals and not impose its suggestions.

(45) Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) was satisfied with the appointment of nine of the ten countries included on the list. He had voted against the list because he had had no opportunity of expressing his opinion by a secret vote.

(46) Mr. PRATT (Australia) asked whether a new nomination would be made for the chairmanship of the Headquarters Committee if it turned out that Venezuela would not be attending the Conference.

(47) Mr. de ERICE y O'SHEA (Spain) urged that when the time came to elect the Vice-Chairman of the Headquarters Committee consideration be given to appointing a delegate of Latin America.

(48) The CHAIRMAN replied that the suggestion would be borne in mind.

(49) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Secretariat had not yet received any official communication about Venezuela attending the Conference.

(50) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, by its vote, the Nominations Committee had adopted the same list as the Executive Board.

(51) He congratulated the countries nominated.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

# SECOND MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. KABIR (India)

**SUBMISSION OF CANDIDATE'S NAMES FOR THE POST OF CHAIRMAN OF THE HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE AND FOR ONE POST OF VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE**

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that the item on the agenda for the meeting was the choice of a candidate for the post of Chairman of the Headquarters Committee, so far held by Mr. Parra-Perez, the delegate of Venezuela, who was absent. He added that the delegate of Brazil, Professor Berredo Carneiro, had been nominated. If Mr. Carneiro were elected, he would have to resign from the Vice-Presidency of the Conference.

(2) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) agreed to stand for the post of Chairman of the Headquarters Committee and to resign from the Vice-Presidency of the General Conference provided it were understood that Mr. Parra-Perez, who was unable to attend the Conference, would resume his post afterwards.

(3) Mr. BADINI CONFALONIERI (Italy) hoped very much that the delegate of Brazil, whose experience would be invaluable to the work of the Headquarters Committee, would be replaced as Vice-President of the General Conference by the delegate of one of the other Latin American countries. That would, he thought, be logical and fair from the point of view of geographical distribution.

(4) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) suggested that the Chairman should remind the Committee of the "numerus clausus" system adopted by the Headquarters Committee and should enumerate the countries represented on the Committee. He thought that would save time.

(5) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia), who was speaking on behalf of his delegation and, he thought, expressing the general feeling of all the Latin American delegations, thanked Mr. Carneiro for resigning from the Vice-Presidency of the Conference and accepting the post of Chairman of the Headquarters Committee.

(6) He also thanked the delegate of Italy for expressing the hope that the post of Vice-President of the General Conference would continue to be held by a member of one of the Latin American delegations.

(7) He proposed, as Vice-President of the Conference, the delegate of Chile, a country which had only recently joined Unesco but which was a centre of culture and peace in Latin America.

(8) The CHAIRMAN thought that suggestion useful, though somewhat premature: the Committee must first nominate the candidate for the post of Chairman of the Headquarters Committee.

(9) Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) was elected by general agreement. The Chairman reminded the meeting of the unofficial proposal submitted by the Colombian delegate, which could, he thought, now be considered official.

(10) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) supported the Colombian delegate's proposal to nominate the delegate of Chile to the post of Vice-President of the Conference.

(11) Mr. Vassallo Rojas (Chile) was nominated by general agreement.

(12) On behalf of his delegation, Mr. VASSALLO ROJAS (Chile) agreed to stand for the post of Vice-President of the Conference, and assured the Committee of his earnest intention to fulfil his task sincerely and energetically, in pursuit of the ideal of international freedom and brotherhood.

(13) The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

# THIRD MEETING

*6 December 1954 at 4.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. KABIR (India)

**NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD (documents 8C/JUR/2, 8C/JUR/5, 8C/NOM/35 8C/DIV/133 and 8C/DIV/140)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN reminded the Nominations Committee that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the procedure for the election of members of the Executive Board. That procedure, set forth in document 8C/DIV/133, had just been partially amended by the adoption of document 8C/JUR/5 by the General Conference in plenary session. The Committee would not vote on nominations until the following morning (7 December). He asked if that procedure would be acceptable to the Committee.

(2) The procedure proposed by the Chairman was approved.

(3) At the request of Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece), Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) read Article V of the Constitution, as amended, relating to the Executive Board.

(4) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Committee would agree not to have any discussion on the merits of individual candidates or countries.

(5) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) agreed entirely with the Chairman's suggestion, but asked whether he might apprise the Committee of a letter he had received from Mr. Piaget, a candidate for the Executive Board.

(6) Speaking on a point of order, Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) asked whether the Committee would, before voting, discuss document 8C/DIV/140, relating to the geographical distribution of seats among Member States.

(7) Replying to the delegate of Turkey, the CHAIRMAN explained that the relevant document would be considered as soon as the question of procedure had been settled. On the subject of the letter from Professor Piaget, he feared that to allow his message to be read would open the door to other communications relating to individual candidates. He therefore wondered if the delegate of Switzerland would be kind enough to refrain from pressing his point.

(8) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) explained that he had no intention of going into Mr. Piaget's merits; he merely wished to inform the Committee of a personal communication from Mr. Piaget, giving the reasons for his absence and explaining his views regarding Unesco.

(9) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked that Mr. Bourgeois be authorized to read the communication from an absent candidate. If other delegations wished to present other official communications likely to influence the voting, it was the time to bring them forward too.

(10) Mr. MIGONE (Italy) supported Mr. Cabouat's proposal.

(11) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) saw no reason why the letter should not be read, since it related to a person so important as Professor Piaget. He thought, however, that it would be difficult later to refuse the same right to other candidates who were prevented from being present at the session or felt it would be unsuitable for them to attend, but who might also wish to make written communications to the Committee.

(12) The CHAIRMAN decided to put the matter to the vote.

(13) The French proposal that the Committee hear the communication from Professor Piaget was adopted by 30 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.

(14) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) read the following passages from Mr. Piaget's letter:

Princeton, December 1954

"Although the General Conference has modified the structure of the Executive Board, this decision has naturally not altered my attitude towards Unesco. I had agreed to stand again for election to

the Board, and I stand by my agreement, since our Government and my friends of the Swiss delegation are good enough to place their confidence in me - for which I am infinitely grateful.

I regret that I am unable to be among you on this occasion. Invited by the Princeton Institute to spend two years here in order to finish a job with the help of the mathematicians of this famous School, I was able to accept a stay of only three months, and my obligations in Geneva and at the Sorbonne made it imperative that I should take these three months precisely this autumn when I should have liked to be in Montevideo.

.....

So I should be most grateful if you would explain and excuse my absence to all my friends, whom I should not like to disappoint. Despite appearances and the circumstances I have just mentioned, I am still as anxious as ever to work with the Organization, whose shortcomings and growing pains have never prevented us from believing in it and its great future.

.....".

(15) It was unanimously agreed that there should be no discussion of individual candidates.

(16) The Committee then considered document 8C/DIV/140.

(17) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) considered that document 8C/DIV/140 was already out of date. The Turkish delegation had studied it closely, particularly as it dealt with a question which had been discussed in Turkey's last two reports to Unesco. In its relations with the Unesco Secretariat, Turkey was at the moment regarded as one of the European countries.

(18) Turkey, however, in the document, was included in Group B. In spite of its close relations with the other countries in that group, Turkey wished, by reason of its membership of the Council of Europe and its relations with Unesco, to be included in Group A.

(19) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that document 8C/DIV/140 was not intended to define "regions". It was a tentative arrangement, taking into account the distribution in the past. Mr. Saba added that, for the purposes of the Secretariat's work, Turkey was at the moment included in the European group.

(20) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) was quite satisfied with Mr. Saba's statement, but asked for Turkey to be included in Group A for the Executive Board elections.

(21) The CHAIRMAN considered that the Committee was in agreement with the Turkish delegate's proposal.

(22) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) stressed that the Committee was an advisory body and asked how many of the candidates for the Executive Board were persons competent in the arts, the humanities, science, education and the diffusion of ideas, within the meaning of Article V, A, 2 of the Constitution.

(23) The CHAIRMAN was sure that members of the Committee would bear the remarks of the delegate of Greece in mind. He pointed out that the curriculum vitae of each candidate was before the Committee and that those defined their special fields of interest and competence; clearly all candidates were eminent personalities in their fields. All were persons of culture.

(24) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) would have liked the name of each candidate to be accompanied by an indication of his specialty.

(25) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) asked whether the Nominations Committee had power to transfer a country from one geographical group to another. He pointed out that Turkey had been chosen more often and for a longer time than any other country to represent Member States of the Middle East on the Board. His delegation very much hoped that Turkey would continue to feel that she belonged to that geographical area.

(26) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that the document in question did not bind the Committee in any way. It had been drawn up at the request of the General Committee, which wanted to have a list in accordance with the recommendations made by the Programme Commission at the sixth session. There was no official definition of regions; the document merely gave indications on the basis of what had been done in the past.

(27) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) pointed out that since the previous year Turkey had been included in the European group for the purposes of the Secretariat.

(28) Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) considered that there could be no objection to the contentions of the Turkish delegation. Moreover, a strictly geographical distribution was not enough; the main factor to consider was cultural grouping.

(29) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) stressed that the problem was solely that of the relations between Turkey and Unesco. Turkey wanted those relations to be maintained through the "European" unit. Mr. Tuncel had no wish to go into the definition of the geographical region of the Middle East, and stated that Turkey, whose territories were situated in both Europe and Asia, could freely choose to be included in the European group for the purposes of its relations with Unesco.

(30) The CHAIRMAN announced that the two following candidatures had been withdrawn: Mr. Diaz Samayoa (Guatemala) and Mr. Al-Hilli (Iraq). There thus remained thirty candidates.

(31) The ballot would take place the following morning, 7 December, at 10 a.m.

(32) Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) wished for clarification of a point regarding electoral procedure which was obscure in the Rules of

Procedure. Rule 95, read with Rule 89, which had been amended that afternoon, stipulated that the majority for election was 50 per cent plus 1 of the votes cast. Half the number of votes might not be an integer, for example, half 41, would be 20 1/2. According to generally recognized parliamentary practice, it would be necessary to take the nearest whole number above, and accordingly, in the case he had instanced, 22 votes would be required for election. The Mexican delegate asked if that interpretation was correct.

(33) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) endorsed that interpretation. Supposing that 61 votes were cast, half of that figure would be 30.5, and the majority required would be 32.

(34) Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia) desired that, before rising, the meeting should take note of a statement by the group of Latin American countries and perhaps subscribed to by the United States of America and Canada; while geographical and cultural distribution was a criterion commonly adopted for elections, it was unfavourable to the American continent because it did not take into account the proportion of countries included in that continent nor the importance of its culture.
(35) The American countries might have hoped that when the number of members of the Executive Board was increased to 22, they would be allowed a larger representation on it.
(36) The question had been studied very unselfishly and the American countries were willing that other continents should have a larger number of members on the Board so that Europe and Asia would be better represented. That did not mean that in the future distribution of seats on the Board which would certainly be made at the next session of the General Conference, the American continent should not be given the proportion of Executive Board members to which it was entitled.
(37) The countries of America had taken that decision in the hope that it would lead to closer understanding between all the peoples and abate regional self-interest; it was for that reason that America was prepared to give the advantage to the peoples of Europe and Asia.

(38) The Colombian delegate asked that his statement should appear in the record.

(39) The CHAIRMAN was sure that all delegations would appreciate the spirit of generosity shown by the countries of the American continent Their gesture would not of course serve as a precedent, as each session of the General Conference was independent of the others.

(40) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) reverted to the definition of a simple majority. The Legal Adviser had said that, if there were 61 valid votes, the majority required would be 32; the minority, however, would then be 29 and there would be a difference of three votes between the two.

(41) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) while appreciating the United States delegate's point, stressed that under the terms of Rule 17 (new Rule 16) of the Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Secret Ballot, as amended, "Fifty per cent plus one of the votes recorded shall constitute the majority required...". If the number of votes cast was 61, fifty per cent plus one of that figure would be 31.5. Mr. Saba also pointed out that the procedure of drawing lots if votes were equally divided, which was already in force at the United Nations, had been adopted.

(42) Mr. SPILHAUS (United States of America) was perfectly satisfied with the legality of the interpretation, but not with the wisdom of it.

(43) Mr. RUIZ-GIMENEZ (Spain) had wished to speak immediately after the statement by the Colombian delegate. The debate had then turned to legal questions. He wished, however, to record his satisfaction and gratitude for the generous action of the American countries and asked that it should be taken into consideration at the next General Conference.

(44) In order to avoid any doubt on the matter, Mr. SANDOVAL VALLARTA (Mexico) again asked the Legal Adviser whether fractions were to count as whole votes, i.e. whether half counted as a whole.

(45) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) replied affirmatively.

(46) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) wanted to know what would happen if the result of the ballot was 31 votes to 30. There would not be an equal division of votes, and lots could not be drawn as laid down in document 8C/JUR/5.

(47) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) admitted that in such a case there would be no need to draw lots. As from the third ballot, a candidate obtaining 31 votes against 30 could be regarded as elected.

(48) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought that it would be well, at the ninth session of the Conference, to propose an amendment to the provisions concerned in order to remove any ambiguity.

(49) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) considered that it would be more satisfactory to regard 31 votes to 30 as constituting a majority even if the figure was not, mathematically, fifty per cent of the votes recorded plus one.

(50) Mr. MONTAGNIER (Secretary of the Conference), replying to Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland), said that the Committee met in camera only if it decided so to do.

(51) The proposal to hold the next meeting of the Nominations Committee in the main Conference Hall was adopted by 34 votes to 0, with 10 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

# FOURTH MEETING

*7 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. KABIR (India)

**NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(1) The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been agreed the previous day to proceed immediately with the secret ballot. As soon as the ballot had started, no new names could be proposed. He therefore invited any delegations wishing to propose new names to do so at once.

(No new candidates were proposed.)

(2) The Chairman informed members of the Committee that, out of the 30 candidates, they were to vote for 22: if they voted for more or fewer, their ballot papers would be invalid.

(3) At the Chairman's request, Miss McPHEE (Secretary of the Committee) read the list of candidates.

(4) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) read out Rule 95 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, as amended.

(5) Norway and Yugoslavia were appointed as tellers.
(6) The Nominations Committee then proceeded to vote by secret ballot.
(7) The result of the vote was as follows

Mr. G. A. Raadi (Iran) 65 votes; Mr. Oscar Secco Ellauri (Uruguay) 64; Mr. José Ricardo Martinez Cobo (Ecuador) 64; Mr. Athelstan Spilhaus (United States of America) 64; Mr. Orestes Ferrara Marino (Cuba) 62; Mr. Henri Laugier (France) 62; Mr. S. M. Sharif (Pakistan) 62; Mr. Mohamed Awad (Egypt) 61; Mr. Paulo E. de Berredo Carneiro (Brazil) 61; Mr. Arcot L. Mudaliar (India) 60; Sir Ben Bowen Thomas (United Kingdom) 60; Mr. Vittorino Veronese (Italy) 58; Mr. Haguiwara (Japan) 55; Mr. Juan Estelrich y Artigues (Spain) 54; Mgr Jean Maroun (Lebanon) 53; Mr. Nathaniel V. Massaquoi (Liberia) 53; Mrs. Maria Schlueter-Hermkes (German Federal Republic) 51; Mr. Frans Bender (Netherlands) 48; Mr. Jakob Nielsen (Denmark) (Denmark) 44; Mr. Alexandr V. Solodovnikov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) 42; Mr. Herman Johannes (Indonesia) 41; Mom Luang Pin Malakul (Thailand) 41; Mr. Jean Piaget (Switzerland) 39; Mrs. Paz Reinoso de Rodriguez (Philippines) 35; Mr. Samuel Sambursky (Israel) 33; Mr. Stefan Wierblowski (Poland) 32; Mr. Rafael Bardales (Honduras) 23; Mr. George L. Paik (Korea) 23; Princess Souvanna Phouma (Laos) 23; Mr. Vo Van Lua (Viet-Nam) 20.

(8) The CHAIRMAN announced that the number of delegations entitled to vote had been 72. Four delegations had been absent and there had been 1 abstention and 1 invalid ballot.

(9) There had thus been 66 valid votes. The majority required was therefore 34 votes. There were 24 candidates who had more than the required majority. He therefore proposed that the Nominations Committee recommend the first 22 names to the General Conference, adding that two other candidates had obtained more than the required majority.

(10) The General Conference might wish to adopt a provision for the future, stipulating that, when the number of candidates having obtained more than the required majority was greater than the number of seats available, the first 22 on the list should be elected.

(11) To solve the problem and avoid any difficulty when the election was held at the plenary meeting, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) suggested that the Committee recommend the General Conference to add the following clauses to Rule 89 of its Rules of Procedure:

"If at any of the ballots a number of candidates greater than the number of seats to be filled obtains the required majority, those candidates having obtained the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected.

If, however, amongst the candidates having obtained the greatest number of votes, two or more have obtained an equal number of votes and are competing for one or more seats yet to be filled, the President shall decide between them by drawing lots."

(12) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) considered that the Committee could hardly express an opinion straight away on a proposal which had not been submitted in writing. He therefore asked for it to be distributed in the various working languages.

(13) The CHAIRMAN asked if the Committee would agree to the proposal in principle, leaving it to the Legal Adviser and the Rapporteur of the Legal Committee to prepare a text for approval by the General Conference.

(14) Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) asked whether the proposal had been studied beforehand by the Legal Committee and recommended by it.

(15) It was unanimously agreed to recommend the first 22 names to the General Conference, adding that two other candidates had obtained the required majority.

(16) With regard to the proposed modification of procedure, as the text of the proposal was not available and as it had not been considered by the Legal Committee, it was agreed to suggest, but not to recommend, that procedure to the General Conference.

(17) The CHAIRMAN thanked all the heads of delegations for the patience and goodwill which they had shown at the third meeting of the Nominations Committee. He assured them that his only intention in proposing that discussion be limited to procedural matters had been to ensure that the Committee completed its work in time.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.

# FIFTH MEETING

*10 December 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Dr. MUDALIAR (India)

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GENERAL CONFERENCE CONCERNING THE ELECTION OF MEMBER STATES TO SERVE ON THE LEGAL COMMITTEE, THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET AND THE COMMITTEE ON REPORTS BY MEMBER STATES**

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that he had been called upon to replace the Chairman of the Committee, who had left for India.

(2) The task of the Committee was to elect the Member States who would serve on three Committees of the General Conference at its next session: the Legal Committee, the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget and the Committee on Reports by Member States.

(3) Document 8C/DIV/154 showed the membership of those Committees as elected at previous sessions.

(4) The Member States to serve on the Headquarters Committee and on the Executive Board had already been elected.

(5) The President proposed the following lists for the approval of the Committee:

Legal Committee (15 members) - Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay.

Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (17 members) - Australia, Burma (Union of), Chile, Egypt, France, Guatemala, India, Israel, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia. Of those 17 members, 6 were also members of the new Executive Board.

Committee on Reports by Member States (15 members) - Argentina, Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Colombia, France, Honduras, Hungary, Iran, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It had been suggested that, in the last Committee, Korea should take the place of Colombia.

(6) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) said that the Latin American countries were under-represented on the three Committees as proposed. They would not, however, ask for additional seats. They did, nevertheless, wish to propose that Colombia and Argentina should be represented on the Legal Committee, Chile and Mexico on the Advisory Committee, and Guatemala and Honduras on the Committee on Reports by Member States.

(7) Mr. SECCO ELLAURI (Uruguay) said that the group of Latin American countries had reached easy agreement on candidatures for the Executive Board, because a number of possible candidates had stood down to make way for others. His country would follow that example and would not stand for election to the Legal Committee.

(8) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) thanked the delegate of Uruguay, and proposed that the place of Uruguay be taken by Argentina.

(9) Mr. COLOMBO (Argentina), thanking the delegate of Ecuador, said that his country was unable to accept, being already proposed for the Committee on Reports by Member States. It would prefer a seat on the Legal Committee.

(10) Mr. DUERING (Sweden) said that for two years Sweden had been represented on the Advisory Committee. He would suggest that Sweden be replaced by Norway on the Advisory Committee, and that Sweden be elected to a seat on the Committee on Reports by Member States.

(11) Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) suggested that Costa Rica be represented on the Committee on Reports by Member States.

(12) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) had understood that the Scandinavian countries had wanted Denmark to serve on the Committee on Reports by Member States, instead of Norway.

(13) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the delegate of Sweden had just suggested that Sweden, rather than Norway, should serve on that Committee.
(14) In view of the suggestions made, he proposed that the three committees be composed as follows:

Legal Committee (15 members) - Argentina, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget (17) members) - Australia, Burma (Union of), Chile, Egypt, France, Guatemala, India, Israel, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Committee on Reports by Member States (15 members) - Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Honduras, Hungary, Iran, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Korea, Spain, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(15) The three proposals were unanimously adopted.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.

# CHAPTER VIII

# LEGAL COMMITTEE

## FIRST MEETING

*12 November 1954, 6.10 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AWAD (Egypt)

OPENING OF THE MEETING AND NOMINATION OF A CHAIRMAN

(1) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) declared the meeting open and requested members of the Legal Committee to elect their chairman. The Nominations Committee had put forward the name of Mr. Mohamed Awad Mohamed, leader of the Egyptian delegation. In the absence of any observations, the choice of Mr. Awad was automatically accepted.

(Mr. Awad took the chair.)

(2) The CHAIRMAN, after expressing his thanks for the honour done him, proposed that the meeting be adjourned and that the General Conference be informed of this decision.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

## SECOND MEETING

*17 November 1954, at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AWAD (Egypt)

ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN AND A RAPPORTEUR

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that the first business of the Committee was the election of a Vice-Chairman and of a Rapporteur.

(2) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) proposed, and the proposal was duly seconded, that Mr. Jaramillo Arango (Colombia) should be elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

(3) It was also proposed, and the proposal was seconded, that Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) be elected Rapporteur.

(4) Both these proposals were adopted.

(5) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) thanked the Committee for the honour thus done him. However, he could agree to act as Rapporteur only provided that that would not prevent him from speaking freely during the discussions.

(6) The CHAIRMAN said that anyone acting as Rapporteur was rendering a service to the Committee. The Rapporteur would of course retain complete liberty to put forward an independent point of view.

(7) Mr. JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia) expressed his appreciation of the honour done to him.

DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONS REFERRED TO THE LEGAL COMMITTEE BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

(8) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the following questions had been referred to the Committee by the Administrative Commission: (a) Item 9.3.2 of the agenda - Draft amendments to Articles V and VI of the Constitution, proposed by the Director-General

(reports of the Director-General), (b) Item 9.3.4 of the agenda - Draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference; (c) Item 9.3.3 of the agenda - Draft amendment to the Constitution, relating to the withdrawal of Member States.
(9) On the last item, Mr. Saba recalled that a decision of principle had already been taken by the Administrative Commission, which had declared in favour of introducing into the Constitution a clause enabling Member States to withdraw on their own decision alone.
(10) Mr. Saba went on to say that the Committee had also been asked by the Administrative Commission to take a decision on two legal questions connected with item 9.3.1 of the agenda (Draft amendments to Article V of the Constitution - structure of the Executive Board).
(11) The first of those two questions was as follows: on 11 August 1954 the Japanese Government had submitted a proposal to modify a draft amendment already presented to the Director-General by the United States Government, the text of which was reproduced in document CL/943 Annex 1. If the American proposal were rejected, could the amendment proposed by Japan be adopted? In other words, could the General Conference, after rejecting a draft amendment, accept a proposal which had itself been submitted as an amendment to that draft?
(12) The second legal point on which the Committee was asked to give its opinion was the following: should a change in a figure (such as the change which would increase the number of members of the Executive Board from 22 to 24) be regarded as a formal change, or as a change of substance? In accordance with Rule 105 of the Rules of Procedure, the General Conference could in fact adopt certain purely formal changes without prior communication to Member States.

(13) The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to begin by examining Mr. Saba's second point.

(14) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) considered it advisable to exercise great prudence whenever it was contemplated changing Unesco's Constitution. Article XIII of the Constitution, under which such amendments became effective upon receiving the approval of the General Conference by a two-thirds majority, already constituted an important exception to the much stricter rules usually followed in matters of international law.
(15) Mr. Haguiwara also drew the Committee's attention to the very restrictive nature of the terms used in Rule 105 of the Rules of Procedure, where the changes which the Conference might adopt without prior communication to Member States were described as "purely matters of drafting".
(16) For his part Mr. Haguiwara thought that a change which would result in the number of members of the Executive Board being increased from 22 to 24 could not be considered purely a matter of drafting, and that it would therefore be dangerous to treat it as such.

(17) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought it well to remind the meeting that the question whether a change in figures could be regarded purely a matter of drafting had already been raised at the seventh session of the General Conference as a result of proposals submitted by the Canadian delegation. The latter had asked the General Conference to decide that an amendment consisting of a change of figures, or of proportions, could not be regarded as a substantive change. In view of the arguments then put forward in the Legal Committee and the Administrative Commission, the Canadian delegation had finally decided to withdraw its proposal and ask the Executive Board and the Director-General to examine the possibility of changing the Rules of Procedure dealing with amendments to the Constitution (Rules 103 to 106).
(18) However, the Administrative Commission found that some delegations did not wish the interpretation given by the Commission to Rule 105 of the Rules of Procedure to be taken as a precedent binding upon the General Conference.
(19) These then, concluded Mr. Saba, were the precedents on which the Committee could, if it so wished, base its decision on the question now submitted to it for examination.
(20) Furthermore, at its seventh session the General Conference had occasion to interpret and apply Rules 105 and 106 when the United Kingdom delegation submitted a proposal concerning the tenure of office of members serving on the Executive Board in 1952. Various solutions had been suggested and had been the subject of draft amendments forwarded to Member States within the time-limit fixed by the Constitution. The United Kingdom proposal differed slightly from those draft amendments and, in view of the temporary nature of its provisions, was not regarded by the Conference as a substantive amendment; it was adopted.

(21) In view of the importance of the Executive Board's work, Mgr MAROUN (Lebanon) thought that an amendment designed to change the number of its members from 22 to 24 could not be considered purely a matter of drafting; in his opinion, such an amendment constituted "a substantive change".

(22) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) said he was not a legal expert. Nor had he been present at the seventh session of the General Conference, at which the amendments mentioned by the Legal Adviser had been discussed. He did feel, however, that what had happened at that session could not be regarded as an irrevocable precedent governing the decisions which the Committee now has to take.

(23) To use non-legal terminology, he thought that a proposal for an increase in the membership of the Executive Board was a serious one. He had much sympathy with the view expressed by the delegate of Lebanon. The ratio obtaining between the size of the Board and the total number of Member States was so important, and had such an effect on the whole Organization, that it was difficult to regard such a proposal as merely a matter of drafting.

(24) Mr. PAGE (Canada) strongly endorsed the view expressed by the previous speaker that such a proposal was not merely a drafting matter, but a question of substance.

(25) The CHAIRMAN asked whether he could assume that the Committee unanimously considered an increase in the number of members of the Board to twenty-four to be a substantive change.

(26) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) observed that what the Committee was being asked to decide was not the actual number of seats on the Executive Board, but whether a change of figure could or could not be regarded as merely a formal change.

(27) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) moved that the Committee adopt the following motion: "The Legal Committee considers that any change in the membership of the Executive Board, as proposed by Japan, is not merely a matter of drafting."

(28) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that there should be no mention of the Japanese proposal. Several delegations had raised the question of increasing the membership of the Board beyond the figure proposed by Japan.

(29) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) suggested that no mention be made of any figure, but that the Committee confine itself to expressing its opinion that any change made in the number of members of the Executive Board was a substantive change.

(30) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) agreed to the change in his motion.

(31) Mr. JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia) said that the change discussed by the Legal Committee regarding the number of members of the Executive Board was a substantive and not a merely formal change. There was a proposal to increase the number of members of the Executive Board; it was no mere matter of drafting but was a subject on which the General Conference would give a final decision.

(32) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) submitted to the Committee a draft resolution worded thus:

"The Legal Committee is of opinion that any change in the number of members of the Executive Board cannot be regarded as a change which is purely a matter of drafting."

(33) The Rapporteur's text was then put to the vote and adopted by 10 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

(34) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), explaining his abstention, said that Rules 103 to 106 of the Rules of Procedure should not be interpreted in too narrow a sense. Of course, any change in the Constitution was a most important matter. But, if those Rules were interpreted too narrowly, no room would be left for any rewording of amendments duly submitted to the Conference, and it might even be that a minority would be able to prevent adoption of an amendment by the Conference on purely formal grounds. As regarded the Japanese amendment itself, proposing an increase of two members, he was convinced that the change proposed was no mere drafting matter, but he had serious doubts whether it was a matter of substance.

(35) The CHAIRMAN said that the Legal Committee now had to decide whether the Japanese proposal for an increase in membership from twenty to twenty-two (submitted, in accordance with the Rules, three months before the Conference) could stand by itself if the United States amendment to the Constitution (document 8C/ADM/1, Annex III) were rejected.

(36) Mr. SALIM (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) pointed out that, under Rule 104, the proposed changes had to be "communicated to Member States at least three months before the opening of the session". Had that been done in the specific case before the Committee?

(37) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) confirmed that Rule 104 had been observed in the case of the Japanese amendment.

(38) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) thought that the Japanese amendment, submitted as it had been according to the Rules, had independent status, and therefore should stand even if the United States proposal were rejected.

(39) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) disagreed. He had no doubt at all (and neither had his legal advisers) that the Japanese proposal was an amendment to the United States amendment. In the Director-General's communication to Member States, it was clearly stated that the Japanese Government was submitting an amendment to an amendment. That had been made clear by the Japanese Government itself, and confirmed only the day before by the Japanese delegation. Otherwise, it would have to be considered as an amendment to the Constitution and, as such, would be out of order, having been submitted only three months before the Conference.

(40) A striking proof of his assertion was afforded in paragraph C (b) of the Japanese amendment (document 8C/ADM/1 Add.): "ten members may serve..... in the new capacity as provided for in the present amendments to the Constitution pertaining to the composition of the Executive Board." If the Japanese amendment was not an amendment to the United States amendment, what was the meaning of the expression "new capacity"? Thence, for irrefutable reasons, if the United States amendment to the Constitution were rejected, the Japanese amendment would lapse too.

(41) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) thought it desirable that the Committee should know the exact terms of the letter addressed to the Director-General on 11 August 1954 by the representative of the Japanese Government.

(42) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) read out that letter and said that its annex was a draft amendment to the amendments proposed jointly by the United States, Australia, Brazil and the United Kingdom. Those amendments, as he had already mentioned, would be found in document CL/943 Annex 1.

(43) Mr. Saba also drew the Committee's attention to Rule 86 of the Conference Rules of Procedure, which dealt with voting on amendments. According to that Rule, the Conference should first vote on the Japanese amendment and then, if that were adopted, on the American proposal as altered by that amendment.

(44) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) felt that the Japanese amendment should not be adopted independently of the American proposal.

(45) As no other delegate wished to speak, the CHAIRMAN asked the Rapporteur to submit to the Committee a draft resolution on the question.

(46) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) then submitted to the Committee the following text:

"The Legal Committee is of opinion that the amendment submitted to the Director-General by the Japanese Government on 11 August 1954 constitutes, as indicated by the title of the document annexed to the letter in question, a draft amendment to the amendments to Article V of the Constitution proposed jointly by the United States of America, Australia, Brazil and the United Kingdom (CL/943, Annex 1). It cannot therefore be regarded as a separate and self-contained amendment to the provisions of Article V of the Constitution. It could not, therefore, be adopted by the General Conference unless the amendment to which it relates were itself adopted."

(47) After a comment by Mr. MAYER (France), Mr. BAUGNIER (Rapporteur) said that he was willing to delete the last sentence of the above text.

(48) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation had no objection to deletion of the last sentence in the rapporteur's original draft, provided it were clearly understood and acknowledged that the last sentence was an obvious consequence of the earlier part of the motion.

(49) The Rapporteur's text, without the last sentence, was put to the vote and adopted by 10 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

# THIRD MEETING

*19 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. AWAD (Egypt)

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO PARAGRAPHS 1, 3, 4, 12 and 13 OF ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION CONCERNING THE EXECUTIVE BOARD** (document 8C/ADM/1, Annex III)

(1) The CHAIRMAN announced that the Legal Committee had been convened to examine draft amendments to Article V of the Constitution as adopted by the Administrative Commission that morning. The original United States amendment, co-sponsored by Australia, Brazil and the United Kingdom, had been adopted in an amended form by the Administrative Commission as follows:

A. Composition

Paragraph 1

As in document 8C/ADM/1, Annex III, page 4, save for the substitution of "twenty-two" for "twenty" in the second line (Japanese amendment).

Paragraph 3

The United States delegation had withdrawn its amendment to paragraph 3 and the original paragraph in the Constitution had therefore been retained.

Paragraph 4

As in document 8C/ADM/1, Annex III, page 4.

B. Functions

Paragraph 12

Replaced by paragraph 11 of document 8C/ADM/1, Annex II, page 3.

C. Transitional provisions

Paragraph 13

As in document 8C/ADM/1, Annex III, page 4, save for the substitution of "twenty-two" for "twenty" in the third line, and the substitution of "eleven" for "ten" in the last line but one.

(2) The Chairman explained that it was the Committee's task to see that there was nothing contradictory or legally inadmissible in the amendments adopted.

(3) In reply to a question from Mr. MAYER (France), Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the intention in paragraph 4 was that a government should nominate only one candidate, in the event of the death or resignation of a member; however, if that person were not appointed, he assumed that the government concerned would be able to nominate someone else.

(4) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) rather feared difficulties of interpretation in connexion with the new Article 12, which, he recalled, read as follows:

"Although the members of the Executive Board are representative of their respective Governments, they shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole."

(5) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recognized that the members of the Executive Board would sometimes be faced with problems if they were to reconcile the responsibilities they had assumed as mandatories of the Conference as a whole with the instructions they had received from their Governments. He observed that there were precedents for that case. Thus the Security Council, which the United Nations had made primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace, also consisted of representatives of Member States.

(6) Mr. CABOUAT (France) wished to be assured that the word "resignation" appearing in paragraph 4 would under no circumstances enable a government to dismiss its representative. In other words, he wished to be certain that the "resignation" in question could only be accepted if it were put in by the member himself, and not by his government.

(7) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) spoke on a point of order. He asked the Chairman for information on the procedure which the Committee intended to adopt in studying the amendments now submitted for its examination.

(8) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might wish to adjourn for fifteen minutes to study the amendments.

(9) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) formally moved adjournment for a quarter of an hour.

(10) Adopted.

(11) The meeting having reassembled, the CHAIRMAN called upon the Rapporteur to give some explanations.

(12) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) read out the few formal amendments which it was proposed to make in the French text of paragraph 1. In the third line of the paragraph (document 8C/ADM/1. Annex III, page 4), the words "de l'Etat qui l'a nommé" would be replaced by the words "de l'Etat qui l'avait désigné", and "en cette qualité" would replace "ès qualité".

(13) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) observed that, in the English text, the words "each of whom shall represent the Government of his State" were not sufficiently precise and questions might arise in connexion with people having several nationalities.

(14) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that nothing should normally prevent a State being represented, if it so desired, by a national of another State. The words "of his State" seemed to him therefore to be too restrictive.

(15) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) stressed that at all events the English and French texts should be made to agree with each other.

(16) The CHAIRMAN suggested that a drafting Committee be appointed, composed of English, French and Spanish-speaking members, to bring the three texts into line, as far as was linguistically possible.

(17) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) was not in favour of a drafting committee being appointed and preferred that the Committee should continue its discussion. He therefore invited English-speaking delegates, and particularly the delegate of the United States, to say whether they thought it possible to change the English text so as to bring it into line with the proposed French text, which, he recalled, read as follows: "Chacun d'eux représente le gouvernement qui l'avait désigné."

(18) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) did not quite understand the difference in French between "désigner" and "nommer". In English, it would be perfectly correct to say "the government of the State which has nominated him". There was no need to substitute "designated".

(19) In reply to the United States delegate, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that there was no basic difference between the words "désigner" and "nommer", which could both be translated into English by "appoint". However, the word "nominate" meant for the French putting forward a candidate's name.

(20) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) asked if the point under discussion were whether or not a government could nominate a national of another country, or whether it was merely a question of reconciling the English and French texts.

(21) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) said that the problem was as follows: the Administrative Commission had approved two texts in English and French which were not in line with each other. The question therefore was to decide which of those two texts the Legal Committee would choose.

(22) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) remarked that the original language of document 8C/ADM/1 was English, so that any adjustment should be in the French text.
(23) Drawing attention to paragraph A.2 of Article V of the Constitution, where it was stated that "Not more than one national of any Member State shall serve on the Board.....", he thought that it was quite clear that the person nominated had to be a national of the country which nominated him.

(24) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) was against restricting the freedom of Member States to nominate nationals of other countries, if they so desired. He was therefore in favour of the words suggested by the delegate of the United States of America, namely "the government of the State which has nominated him", which would not restrict that freedom.

(25) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) thought that the point was substantive rather than legal. He suggested that the Legal Committee might outline the difficulty and prepare two alternative texts, one reflecting

the intention of the United States delegation and the other that of the delegate of Egypt, for consideration by the Administrative Commission.

(26) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought that, if the Committee decided, as the United Kingdom delegate had suggested, to submit two different texts, it should none the less express a preference for one or the other.

(27) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) observed that, if the proposed French text were agreed upon (i.e. "Chacun d'eux représente le gouvernement de l'Etat qui l'avait désigné"), the situation would be as follows: each State would be free to nominate any one of its delegates as a candidate to the Executive Board; however, in order to conform to paragraph A. 2 of Article V, States would in fact be obliged to avoid appointing as their representatives on the Board persons who were not included among their nationals. For that paragraph stipulated that "not more than one national of any Member State shall serve on the Board at any one time, the President of the Conference excepted".

(28) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) supported Mr. Merminod's point of view.

(29) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) was in agreement with the United Kingdom delegate in thinking that it would be preferable to draw up two different texts and try to reach agreement on one of them. The best way of doing that seemed to him to draft a French text corresponding exactly to the English version and an English text corresponding exactly to the French version.

(30) At the suggestion of Mr. WEST (United Kingdom), it was agreed to adjourn for five minutes in order to work out texts satisfactory to all delegates present.

(31) The meeting having reassembled, Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) read out the following text, on which there was a large measure of agreement among the English-speaking delegations: "The Executive Board shall be elected by the General Conference from among the delegates appointed by the Member States and shall consist of twenty-two members, each of whom shall represent the government of the State of which he is a national. The President of the General Conference .....etc."

(32) It appeared that an almost word-for-word French translation would be satisfactory to French-speaking delegations.

(33) Mr. West had one reservation to express in connexion with States which allowed people to have more than one nationality. In the case of a person with more than one nationality, it would have to be clear that, in representing one of the States whose nationality he possessed, he was choosing for that purpose the nationality of that State and could not, by so doing, debar the second of the States whose nationality he possessed from being separately represented by one of its own nationals.

(34) Mr. CABOUAT (France) was prepared to approve the text proposed by the United Kingdom delegate, the French equivalent of which would be: "Chacun d'eux représente le gouvernement de l'Etat dont il est le ressortissant".

(35) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) suggested that in the English text the number 22 should be written not in figures, but in letters as it was in the French text.

(36) That proposal was approved.

(37) The Committee finally approved the following text for paragraph 1:

"The Executive Board shall be elected by the General Conference from among the delegates appointed by the Member States and shall consist of twenty-two members, each of whom shall represent the Government of the State of which he is a national. The President of the General Conference shall sit ex officio in an advisory capacity on the Executive Board."

(38) The CHAIRMAN then invited the Committee to examine paragraph 4 (document 8C/ADM/1, Annex III, page 4).

(39) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) read out the few changes which it was proposed to make to that paragraph, the chief of which would be to replace the words "En cas de décès ou de démission d'un des membres" by the words "En cas de décès d'un des membres ou en cas de démission présentée par un des membres". That would avoid any interpretation to the effect that resignations might be brought about not by the member himself, but by his Government.

(40) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) thought that it would be better to make the English text perfectly clear by amending it as in the French text to read: "In the event of the death of a member, or the presentation of his resignation by a member of the Executive Board....." That would make it clear that it was a question of the individual himself resigning and not of the government's withdrawing him.

(41) In reply to the Egyptian delegate, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) observed that in English the word "resignation" was sufficiently precise and sufficiently different from the word "dismissal" for it to be unnecessary to amend the English text.

(42) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) strongly endorsed the remarks made by the Legal Adviser: resignation could only be a voluntary act on the part of the individual, so that the two texts were the same; however, he would be prepared to accept the Egyptian amendment, if the rest of the Committee so agreed.

(43) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) observed that only death and resignation were dealt with in paragraph 4, while disablement was not considered. He drew the Committee's attention to the problems which might arise in the case of, for instance, insanity.

(44) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed that, theoretically, it was possible that a member might become insane and still insist on attending meetings of the Executive Board, but that

danger had always existed; it was to be hoped that the Board would continue to be protected from such a misfortune.

(45) In view of the remarks by the Legal Adviser and the delegate of the United Kingdom, Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) agreed to withdraw his amendment to the first line of paragraph 4, on the understanding that it would be recorded in the minutes.

(46) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) proposed that the words "le Conseil" should be replaced by "le Conseil exécutif" in the first line of paragraph 4 (French text).

(47) That proposal was accepted.

(48) The Committee finally approved the following text for paragraph 4.

"In the event of the death or resignation of a member of the Executive Board, his replacement for the remainder of his term shall be appointed by the Executive Board on the nomination of the Government of the State the former member represented. The Government making the nomination and the Executive Board shall have regard to the factors set forth in paragraph 2 of this Article."

(49) The CHAIRMAN then invited the Committee to examine the texts proposed for paragraphs 12 and 13.

(50) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) said that the word "remanié" should be deleted from the third line of the new paragraph 13 (Transitional Provisions, French text).

(51) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) observed that the word "revised" should also be omitted in the English text.

(52) Agreed.

(53) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) moved the addition of the word "General" before "Conference" in the second line of the English text of the new paragraph 12 (former paragraph 11 of document 8C/ADM/1, Annex II).

(54) Agreed.

(55) In connexion with paragraph 13, Mr. Haguiwara raised the question of the re-eligibility of former members.

(56) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) considered that former members should, according to the proposed texts, be eligible for re-election provided their governments reappointed them.

(57) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question was whether to disregard all that had happened in the past, so that a member of the Board who had exhausted his two consecutive terms of office would still be re-eligible as a representative of his government. He asked the Committee whether it considered that the position should be made clear in the Constitution, or whether it thought that the question could be dealt with under the Rules of Procedure.

(58) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) observed that the conditions for re-eligibility were defined in paragraph 3. The provisions of that paragraph, which had remained unchanged, should therefore be followed during the transitional period.

(59) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) drew the Committee's attention to the unfortunate situation that might arise, during the transitional period, if paragraph 3 were applied too strictly. He wondered whether it would be possible to insert provisions allowing of a more flexible procedure during that period, in the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference.

(60) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) replied that that question should be raised before the Administrative Commission.

(61) The CHAIRMAN observed that nothing new was involved. When the Executive Board had been established in 1946, some members had been drawn by lot to serve for one year only, which meant that, if re-elected, they could serve for only three years altogether. He asked the delegate of Japan if he would be content to have his statement recorded in the minutes.

(62) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) said that he would be prepared, if the Committee thought it possible, to submit a text to the Administrative Commission to have provisions inserted in the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, so as to ensure greater flexibility in the conditions of re-eligibility laid down in paragraph 3 during the transitional period.

(63) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) doubted whether it would be possible, by amending the Rules of Procedure or by any other means, to alter provisions which, like those at present being examined by the Committee, had already been approved by the Administrative Commission.

(64) The CHAIRMAN thought that the feeling of the Committee was that there was no need to insert a special provision to cover that point, either in the Constitution or in the Rules of Procedure.

(65) It was agreed that Mr. Haguiwara's suggestion should merely be recorded in the minutes.

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE – COMPOSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD (document 8C/ADM/3 (II), Add.1)**

(66) The CHAIRMAN stated that the United States delegation had also submitted draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure concerning the composition of the Executive Board. The United States amendments to paragraph 3 of Rule 30 and to Rule 96 having been withdrawn, the only Rules to be examined by the Committee were 95, 95A and 98. He asked the Committee to consider the United States' amendments in document 8C/ADM/3 (II).

Rule 95 (Elections)

(67) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) observed that, in view of the changes just made in Article V of the Constitution, Rule 95 of the Rules of Procedure should be amended as follows: (a) in paragraph 1, "ten members" should be replaced by "eleven members"; (b) paragraph 2 should read as follows: "Only a delegate nominated by the Government of the State of which he is a national for election to the Executive Board may stand for election."

(68) The changes suggested by Mr. Haguiwara were approved.

(69) The Committee then examined Rule 95A (document 8C/ADM/3 (II), Annex I).

(70) The CHAIRMAN indicated the changes which should be made in the figures contained in that Article.

(71) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) drew the Committee's attention to a mistake he had noticed in the third line of the English text of the paragraph, where the words "shall be elected by Executive Board" should be replaced by "shall be elected to the Executive Board".

(72) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) remarked that that was obviously a clerical error. He suggested that the text might be amended to read: "twenty-two members shall be elected by the General Conference pursuant to the provisions of Article V of the Constitution....".

(73) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) preferred to keep to the words of the Constitution (Article V, C. 13 revised), which were: ".... shall be elected to the Executive Board pursuant .... etc."

(74) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) withdrew his suggestion.

(75) Mr. CABOUAT (France) remarked that the proposed English text of Rule 95A of the Rules of Procedure exactly reproduced the text which had just been approved for the new Article V, C. 13 of the Constitution. He thought therefore that the Committee need now do no more than bring the French texts of the two rules into line with each other.

(76) The Legal Adviser and the Rapporteur approved the remark made by Mr. Cabouat.

(77) It was agreed that Rule 95A, in English, French and Spanish, should reproduce the wording of Article V, C. 13 of the Constitution, as amended.

Rule 98 (death or resignation)

(78) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that the situation here was exactly the same: Rule 98 in English was an exact reproduction of Article V, A. 4 of the Constitution as amended; the French and Spanish texts also should therefore be the same in both cases.

(79) Agreed.

(80) The CHAIRMAN stated that the Rapporteur would report the results of the Committee's work to the Administrative Commission.

(81) Mr. JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia) suggested that, although the Spanish text had not been examined, the respective documents should be altered to conform with the terms used in English and French, in those parts on which agreement had been reached.

(82) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Colombian delegate's suggestion should be accepted.

(83) Agreed.

(84) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) asked if the Committee would authorize him to inform the Administrative Commission in his report only of those texts which had been more or less changed and which had been finally approved by the Committee.

(85) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) proposed that the Committee decided to authorize Mr. Baugniet to submit his report in the form which he had just suggested.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p. m.

# FOURTH MEETING

*26 November 1951 at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AWAD (Egypt)

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE V, PARAGRAPH 9, AND ARTICLE VI, PARAGRAPH 3, OF THE CONSTITUTION, PROPOSED BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL** (documents 8C/ADM/2 and 8C/ADM/2, Add.1)

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider item 9.3.2 of the revised agenda dealing with amendments to Articles V and VI of the Constitution, and requested the representative of the Director-General to introduce the question.

(2) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that item 9.3.2 dealt with a question which had been discussed in a general way; the solution proposed in the documents had been approved in principle by the Administrative Commission. The system at present in force needed standardizing.
(3) Under the present provisions of the Constitution the Director-General had to draw up one report covering the activities of the Organization between sessions of the Conference and another relating to the activities of the Organization during years when the Conference did not meet. Those reports had to be submitted to the Board, which could make comments on them.
(4) The Board had considered it materially impossible to examine reports to be sent to Member States during years when no session was held, and to respect the proposed time-limits for despatch. That being so, it had been proposed that the Director-General should draw up a report every year on the activities of the Organization from 1 January to 31 December; such reports would be sent direct to Member States without passing through the Board.
(5) The Board, on the other hand, would draw up and submit to the General Conference at each of the latter's ordinary sessions, its comments on the annual reports drawn up by the Director-General since the preceding session and on any interim report which had had to be made to cover the activities of the Organization during the first months of the year in which an ordinary session was held.
(6) With regard to the amendments proposed by the delegation of the Union of South Africa (document 8C/ADM/2 Add. 1), the representative of the Director-General stated that there was no reason why the first amendment (amendment to paragraph 9 of Article V) should not be adopted; i.e. delete the words "since the last ordinary session of the Conference" and substitute "which he is required to prepare in terms of Article VI, paragraph 3".
(7) With regard to the second amendment, Mr. Saba saw no reason for deleting the words "if necessary" in paragraph 3 of Article VI, as the need for an interim report depended upon the exact date of the session.

(8) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) wished to know if, under the new provisions, the annual reports by the Director-General would or would not be checked by the Executive Board, and what the Board's rôle would be in its relations with the Director-General when he sent out his report. If that point were not cleared up, it would seem that the Board would only be able to make its comments every two years.
(9) Such comments required an examination of the Director-General's reports and therefore implied a certain check on them.
(10) The delegate of Greece concluded by stating that the Executive Board, whose task it was to supervise the execution of the programme adopted by the General Conference, must be able to make its comments on the Director General's annual report.

(11) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that the Executive Board would not be thereby deprived of its supervisory function, which extended to the whole of Unesco's activities between sessions of the General Conference. All that would be affected would be the dates for drawing up the reports and the dates on which the Board would make its comments. Moreover, the proposal under examination had been made by the Executive Board and the Board would comment on the annual reports.

(12) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) observed that it was the Executive Board which submitted the Director-General's report to the General Conference, with or without comments. In the years between Conferences the Executive Board had theretofore communicated the report to Member States and enclosed its comments, if it so desired. As now proposed, it was the Director-General who both drew up the report and circulated it to Member States. It could be agreed that he would communicate his report to the Executive Board, as well as to Member States, but he would not wait for a session of the Board before sending it to the various governments.
(13) It was therefore not only a question of correcting the former text but of introducing new ideas into it.

(14) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) observed that the amendments submitted were the result of the Executive Board's deliberations and seemed to reflect the wishes of the General Conference. He recalled that, under the current provisions, the comments made by the Executive Board on reports submitted during years when no ordinary session was held had to deal particularly with the activities to be undertaken by Unesco during the ensuing twelve months. In point of fact, when the two-year principle had been adopted, there had been no question of fixing an exact time

schedule for executing a programme which was thenceforth to be carried out over two years. At that time it had been thought advisable for the Director-General and the Board to draw up that schedule during the two-year period and that Member States should receive information and comments from the Board concerning activities proposed for the second year. However, the General Conference had decided, upon the proposal of the Administrative Commission, that the draft two-year budget should be divided into annual sections and should include a time-schedule of the Organization's activities. That meant that the General Conference had in advance all necessary information concerning proposed activities.

(15) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that different reports were involved: (1) the Director-General's report, on the Organization's activities since the holding of the last Conference, referred to in the amendment to Article V, paragraph 9; (2) a report on the Organization's activities covering the period 1 January-31 December each year, mentioned in the amendment to Article VI, paragraph 3; and (3) a report, "if necessary" to cover the period following the preceding General Conference; that third report was mentioned in the last sentence of the amendment to Article VI, paragraph 3. The Chairman suggested that the Committee might consider the relative positions of those various reports.

(16) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) explained his point of view; the Director-General's report had to be circulated to Member States as soon as it was printed, i.e. without awaiting the next session of the Executive Board. But the report, once printed, had to be communicated to the Executive Board at its next session so that the Board might study it. Mr. Haguiwara suggested that the words "shall communicate to Member States" should be followed by "and to the Executive Board" in the proposed text of paragraph 3 Article VI. As the Director-General always sent his report to Board members, that addition could be considered as no more than a drafting change.

(17) Mr. CABOUAT (France) wished to clarify the Committee's deliberations. He thought that the Committee should not be more royalist than the king in opposing the proposal made by the Executive Board itself. For that reason the delegation of France was in favour of the proposed amendments.
(18) He raised the question of the number of reports which the Director-General should draw up. If the Conference adopted the proposed amendment, it seemed that between the eighth and ninth sessions of the General Conference the Director-General would have to prepare and distribute three reports:

(1) from the end of the session to the end of the year;

(2) for the year in which there was no session;

(3) for the period between 1 January and the beginning of a new session of the General Conference for the year in which the General Conference met.

(19) Mr. PAGE (Canada) assumed that there would be no period of the Organization's activities which would not be covered by a report and upon which the Executive Board would not be able to comment. If that were so, his delegation proposed that the amendments under discussion should be adopted. As long as the implications of paragraph 9 of Article V were kept in mind, the authority of the Executive Board would be safeguarded without any increase in administration.

(20) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) considered the Committee's discussion to be very useful.
(21) The proposed amendments would in no way prejudice the Executive Board's right to make comments. It was a question not only of communicating reports to Member States and the Executive Board, but also of relieving the Board of the duty of communicating them to Member States.
(22) There was one report every year which was called the annual report. There might also be an interim report covering that part of the year previous to a session of the Conference.

(23) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) agreed with the remarks made by Mr. Saba. It must be made clear that no repetition of reporting was contemplated. A satisfactory solution might be found on the basis of the proposal submitted by the United Kingdom delegation in the Administrative Commission, to the effect that the Constitution should contain only a statement of the principle involved and that the detailed references to the matter on which reports should be submitted should be made the subject of a separate resolution. The general principle could be included in the Constitution in the form of the first sentence of paragraph 9 of Article V; the detailed procedure could then be made the subject of a separate resolution based on the amendment to paragraph 3 of Article VI, on the following lines:

"The General Conference decides,

That the Director-General shall prepare and communicate to Member States a report on the activities of the Organization covering the period from 1 January to 31 December of each year. In those years during which the General Conference shall meet in ordinary session, the Director-General shall prepare, if necessary, a report covering the activities of the Organization from the end of the preceding year. As contemplated under Article V, paragraph 9, the Chairman of the Executive Board shall present, on behalf of the Board, to each ordinary session of the General Conference, with or without comments, the above report of the Director-General."

(24) The last sentence would show that only the reports already contemplated would be submitted to the General Conference, and that the Director-General would not be required to prepare any others.

(25) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) thanked the United States representative for his support of the United Kingdom proposal. He fully agreed with his views.

(26) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) expressed doubts concerning the Executive Board's future powers. In the past it had not represented Member States; if it had made no objection to the adoption of the resolution submitted to the Committee, there were particular reasons for it. Thenceforth members of the new

Executive Board would represent the governments of Member States and the situation might be entirely different.

(27) The delegate of Greece wondered whether the adoption of the proposed text would not diminish the Executive Board's authority by establishing a direct link between the Secretariat and Member States without the Executive Board being able every year, to make its opinion heard.

(28) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) suggested that the United States proposal be adopted but would recommend use of the word "reports".

(29) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium), speaking in the name of his delegation and not as Rapporteur, disapproved of the United States proposal, explaining that in his view the Director-General's report was a juridical obligation and that the statutory text establishing it must specify how often it should be submitted. He did not think that the new draft of Article VI in accordance with the Director-General's proposal could be altered frequently and considered that the proposal made for stability.

(30) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked the Committee to come to a decision so as to shorten the debate.

(31) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) pointed out that the proposal to adopt a resolution rather than to amend Article VI of the Constitution was not intended to encourage the General Conference to make frequent modifications in the procedure to be followed. That would be most unsatisfactory. The main object of that proposal was to ensure maximum flexibility and to make it easier for the General Conference to modify procedure if the need arose.

(32) While fully appreciating the legal aspects of the question, he recalled that the United Nations Economic and Social Council dealt with similar cases by means of resolutions. There was no absolute necessity for Unesco to adopt the same method, but it might serve as a useful indication.

(33) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) agreed with the previous speaker. There was clearly a need for stability, and the business before the Committee showed that amendments to the Constitution provided no guarantee of such stability. A resolution by the General Conference should be considered valid and should remain in force without further action being taken by the General Conference at either its month or any subsequent sessions. It was bad policy to issue new editions of the Constitution for any changes of detail that were introduced.

(34) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) thought a compromise solution should be proposed, as, in his view, it should be laid down in the Constitution that the Director-General was responsible for presenting the report but that its frequency could be laid down in the Rules of Procedure in order to avoid taking an identical decision at each biennial Conference.

(35) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) supported the Japanese delegate's proposal, provided that reports were submitted to the Executive Board, which was Unesco's second constitutive body.

(36) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) supported the proposal of the representatives of Japan and Greece. It would simplify matters with regard to the Constitution, it would safeguard the legal point of view and ensure the greater flexibility for which the United Kingdom delegation was concerned.

(37) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference set out to lay down procedure for its work and debates. They could not therefore include provisions relating to reports to be submitted by the Director-General in the intervals between sessions. There remained the choice between a constitutional provision and a resolution. At the stage they had reached the Chairman of the Committee should perhaps call for a vote on the question.

(38) In reply to a question by the Lebanese delegate, who wished to know if a resolution could modify the Rules of Procedure in the same way as an amendment, Mr. Saba stated that he thought the obligation to present reports could usefully be included in the Constitution, which could also specify that it was the Conference's task to decide by a simple resolution on the form and frequency of such reports.

(39) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) thought that the proposal by the representative of Japan was a valuable compromise. A very general statement on the reports might be included in the Constitution, and the details dealt with elsewhere. The Japanese proposal also avoided delay in the distribution of the reports while waiting for the comments of the Executive Board.

(40) The sentence enbodying the general principle, to be included in the Constitution, might be drafted as follows:

"The Director-General shall prepare reports on the activities of the Organization, which shall be communicated to Member States and to the Executive Board."

(41) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) thought that Article V, paragraph 9, should be left as amended, but that Article VI, paragraph 3, should be simplified.

(42) The CHAIRMAN took it that the representative of the United States had withdrawn his original proposal. He therefore proposed that a drafting committee, composed of the Rapporteur and the representatives of the United States and Japan, prepare a compromise draft based on the Japanese proposal.

(43) He adjourned the meeting for ten minutes.

(44) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) read out the text of paragraph 9 of Article V of the Constitution as amended by the delegate of the Union of South Africa:

"9. The Chairman of the Executive Board shall present, on behalf of the Board, to each ordinary session of the General Conference, with or without comments, the reports on the activities of the Organization which the Director-General is required to prepare in accordance with the provisions of Article VI. 3(b)."

(45) After a discussion, this draft was adopted.

(46) The CHAIRMAN, turning to the amendments to Article VI, paragraph 3, said the drafting committee proposed that the following text be added to the body of paragraph 3 as contained in the Constitution:

"The Director-General shall prepare and communicate to Member States and to the Executive Board periodical reports on the activities of the Organization. The General Conference shall determine the periods to be covered by these reports."

(47) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that reports to Member States could be communicated only by the Director-General of Unesco, while any other member of the Secretariat, appointed by him, could replace him at all official meetings.
(48) He also suggested that the proposed amendment to paragraph 3 of Article VI should form a separate paragraph 3b.

(49) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) was not opposed to the proposal of the Legal Adviser. The new sub-paragraph, however, had little relation with the first part of paragraph 3, and it would perhaps be more satisfactory to include it in Article VI as a separate paragraph 7. That would avoid any change in the numbering of the other paragraphs.

(50) The CHAIRMAN, taking into account a suggestion by the representative of France, said that the proposal before the Committee was that the existing text of Article VI, paragraph 3, be renumbered 3a, and the new text submitted by the drafting committee added as paragraph 3b.

(51) The proposal was unanimously adopted.

(52) With regard to the resolution to be submitted to the General Conference, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee would have to inform the Conference, through the Administrative Commission, that it wished it to determine the periods to be covered by the reports.
(53) The draft text of the resolution as submitted by the drafting committee was as follows:

"The General Conference, having considered Article VI, paragraph 3b, of the Constitution, decides:

That the Director-General shall prepare and communicate to Member States and to the Executive Board

(1) A report on the activities of the Organization covering the period from 1 January to 31 December of each year;

(2) In those years during which the General Conference shall meet in ordinary session, if necessary an interim report covering the activities of the Organization from the end of the preceding year."

(54) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) asked that the Executive Board be placed before the Member States in the passage dealing with the sending of the Director-General's report. He explained that that was a question of fact and form which should be respected.

(55) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) preferred the reverse order.

(56) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) thought the drafting committee had agreed that the words "if necessary" in the last part of the resolution, should come immediately after the words "an interim report".

(57) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought that the alteration proposed by the Greek delegate should not attempt to determine the order of presenting reports.
(58) He thought that the Board should appear after Member States as it was to them that the Director-General's reports were addressed. Member States should for that reason be considered as the addressees of those reports.

(59) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) said he fully understood the point of view of the Legal Adviser. All he feared was that the reports would be sent direct to the governments of Member States, avoiding the intermediary stage of the Executive Board, which represented the General Conference. That would mean that the Executive Board no longer exercised any check.
(60) Mr. Photiades added that he had no fears as regards the existing Director-General but that permanent rules should be drawn up so as to eliminate possible mishaps in the future.

(61) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) was frankly of the opinion that reports were addressed to Member States. They would also be communicated to the Board, which could comment on them, if it wished.

(62) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) wanted to be sure that the distribution of the reports would not be delayed while waiting for the Executive Board to meet. If the reports were published in January, and the Executive Board only met in May, the reports would be distributed on publication and the Board would comment on them when it met and circulate its comments to Member States. That was his understanding of the situation.
(63) It should furthermore be made clear that the interim report would also be communicated to Member States; both reports should be prepared by the Director-General and communicated to Member States and to the Executive Board.

(64) The CHAIRMAN replied that the points raised by the United States representative were covered by the draft text of the resolution submitted by the drafting committee. He invited the Legal Committee to vote on that draft resolution.

(65) The draft resolution as submitted by the drafting committee was unanimously adopted.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

# FIFTH MEETING

*26 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt)

**DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND OTHER PROVISIONS, CONCERNING THE WITHDRAWAL OF MEMBER STATES** (documents 8C/ADM/6 and Add.1, 2, 3, 4)

(1) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that the General Conference at its second extraordinary session, in July 1953, had decided that Unesco should follow the example of other Specialized Agencies by inserting in its Constitution a clause concerning possible withdrawals by Member States.
(2) In accordance with a General Conference resolution and a recommendation by the Executive Board, the Director-General had therefore submitted to the Conference, within the regulation time-limit, two draft amendments to Article II of the Constitution. The first of those resolutions envisaged unilateral withdrawal, i.e. that the Member State concerned should simply give notice of its withdrawal, The second resolution stipulated that a withdrawal must be accepted by a two-thirds majority of the General Conference.
(3) As the Administrative Commission had decided that the first draft alone should serve as a basis for a Constitutional amendment, the second did not need to be examined, nor did the Cambodian delegation's proposal to amend it.
(4) Mr. Saba read out the first draft, which appeared on page 2 of document 8C/ADM/6, and said that it had given rise to three proposed amendments, submitted by the Belgian, United States and Australian delegations respectively. The third of these proposals had been withdrawn.
(5) The Belgian delegation's draft amendment provided for the withdrawal of a Member State on 31 December of the year following that during which notice was given. The United States delegation's amendment stipulated that the financial obligations of the State should continue throughout the financial period in which its withdrawal took effect.
(6) Mr. Saba said that those two drafts were in keeping with the spirit of the draft amendment to the Constitution. He added that, in conformity with the Financial Regulations and the Constitution, Member States were required to pay the contributions due for the whole financial period, and he asked the Committee to examine the Belgian and United States drafts in turn.

(7) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) supported the first draft of Article II. 6 as it appeared on page 2 of document 8C/ADM/6, and, subject to an explanation of the Belgian amendment, was willing to accept it with the exception of one small point, to which he would refer later.

(8) Mr. BAUGNIET (Belgium) said that, in submitting its draft resolution, the Belgian delegation had aimed at simplifying procedure. As Unesco had adopted the calendar year for the division of its work, it seemed to him that it would be easier if the obligations of a Member State which had given notice of withdrawal were to cease with the end of that year.
(9) The Belgian delegate thought that the ideal solution would doubtless be to take the end of the budgetary period as the end of a State's obligations but, since that period might extend in extreme cases to four years, it seemed unlikely that such a solution could be adopted.

(10) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) believed that his interpretation coincided with the explanation given by the delegate of Belgium. It appeared also to coincide with the substance of the United States amendment.
(11) He asked how long the period of financial obligation would last. The question of financial obligation should be considered at the same time as the question of notice and one phrase should be found to cover both questions.

(12) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) thought that the delegate of the United Kingdom was correct in suggesting that the two questions should be considered together. The United States delegation supported the Belgian proposal. It felt that the two questions should be synchronized and that the financial obligation cover the same period as the notice, while the State concerned would still be effectively a Member of the Organization. Any withdrawal from the Organization should not affect financial obligations to the Organization up to the effective date of that withdrawal.

(13) The Legal Committee agreed to accept the principle of the Belgian amendment, and Article II. 6 would be amended accordingly.

**PROPOSAL ON THE WITHDRAWAL OF MEMBER STATES SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** (document 8C/ADM/6 Add.2)

(15) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) formally withdrew the United States proposed amendment, but suggested a slight change in the text of Article II. 6 as it stood in document 8C/ADM/6. He proposed that the last sentence of the first paragraph of that Article should read "no such withdrawal shall affect the financial obligations owed to the Organization on the date the withdrawal takes effect".

(16) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) pointed out that the word "State" after the words "Associate Member" should be deleted.

(17) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) read out the version of Article II. 6 resulting from the proposed amendments.

"Any Member State or Associate Member State of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization may withdraw from the Organization by notice addressed to the Director-General. Such notice shall take effect on 31 December in the year following that during which the notice was given. No such withdrawal shall affect the financial obligations owed by the State concerned towards the Organization at the date when the notice takes effect. Notice of withdrawal by an Associate Member State shall be given on its behalf by the Member State or other authority having responsibility for its international relations."

(18) Approved.

**DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE (document 8C/ADM/3 (III))**

(19) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that at its sixth session the General Conference had adopted a resolution granting to Associate Members the same rights as to full Member States, except for voting rights, but that it seemed necessary to bring the Rules of Procedure into line with that decision, and that was the purpose of document 8C/ADM/3 (III).

(20) The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee if it approved the procedure suggested by Mr. Saba.

(21) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) suggested that it might save time if only amendments to which there was an objection were discussed. It would of course be necessary to discuss any amendments to which further amendments had been submitted.

(22) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate in thinking that, once the principle had been admitted, the addition of the words "and Associate Member States" after "Members" need not be examined in detail rule by rule. But, with regard to Rule 24, he thought it advisable to discuss the proposed amendment; some members might doubt the need for it, as it would give an Associate Member the right to oppose the admission of a representative to the Conference.

(23) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) considered that, since the Rule had been altered to include Associate Members, if the word "Member" appeared on its own, the intention was not to include "Associate Members".

(24) Mr. CABOUAT (France) wished to know whether the Conference, when determining the status of Associate Members, had intended to give them the same powers as full Members, except for voting rights.

(25) Reverting to the text of resolution 41.21, adopted by the General Conference at its sixth session, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that in principle an Associate Member had the right to submit suggestions and to oppose certain motions, which implied that it could express disapproval of the admission of a representative; only voting rights were denied.

(26) Mr. Saba explained that he had merely wished to draw the Committee's attention to Rule 24, but that he would raise no objection if it were decided to include the proposed amendment.

(27) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) thought it preferable to adopt that amendment, for in his opinion it was advisable to state exactly what would happen if an Associate Member questioned the qualifications of a representative; otherwise it might be supposed that Rule 24 would not apply when the opposition came from an Associate Member, and that the delegate whose qualifications were questioned could not take his seat at the Conference, even provisionally.

(28) Mr. CABOUAT (France) agreed with the Belgian delegate's point of view.

(29) All the amendments providing for the addition of the words "and Associate Member(s)" after "Member(s)" were approved.

Rule 30

(30) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that it had appeared necessary to add a new paragraph to Rule 30 in order to reserve to representatives of Member States alone the posts of president and vice-president of the General Conference together with those of chairmen, vice-chairmen and rapporteurs of commissions and committees.

(31) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) suggested that in this new paragraph the word "other" before "subsidiary bodies" should be deleted.

(32) With this modification the amendment to Rule 30 was approved.

Rule 47

(33) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that, as Rule 30 had been amended, it also seemed necessary to amend Rule 47 dealing with the election of various officers on the General Committee of the Conference. However, in place of the amendment suggested in Annex I of document 8C/ADM/3 (III) and that submitted by the delegation of the Union of South Africa, he would prefer another amendment, consisting in the addition to Rule 47 of a new paragraph as follows: "The provisions of Rule 30, paragraph 4, shall apply to the present Rule."

(34) The Legal Committee adopted this proposal.

(35) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) asked whether the Committee had intended to agree to the amendment to Rule 94 proposed by the South African delegation, to which Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) replied that the

amendment proposed by the South African delegation was divided into two parts. The Committee had dealt only with the part referring to Rule 47.

Rule 69

(36) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) thought the amendment was unnecessary since paragraph 1 had not been amended.

(37) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) drew attention to the fact that the United Kingdom proposal, which would have had the same effect, had been missed out of the list of amendments submitted. He agreed that the proposed amendment to Rule 69 was unnecessary.
(38) The United Kingdom delegation had proposed a further amendment to paragraph 2 of Rule 69. It was a question of drafting, involving the use of the English word "constitute". In English the word "constitute" would refer to all persons taking part in the Conference, when what was actually meant was all full members. Associate Members could not be counted towards a quorum. He proposed that the words "are members of" should be substituted for the word "constitute" in paragraph 2.

(39) Agreed.

Rule 78

(40) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom proposal contained in document 8C/ADM/3 (III) Add. 2 was to delete the amendment proposed to Rule 78 (document 8C/ADM/3 (III)Annex I).
(41) That proposal had been made by the United Kingdom delegation because it felt that, if there were no mention of Member States in a Rule, it was not necessary to make specific reference to Associate Members. If Associate Members were not specifically excluded, the Rule would apply to them as well as to Member States.

(42) The proposed amendment to Rule 78 was rejected.

**DRAFT SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED KINGDOM TO AMEND CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE PROPOSED IN DOCUMENT 8C/ADM/3 (III) ANNEX 1**
(document 8C/ADM/3 (III) Add.2)

Rules 3(1) and 5(1)

(43) At the request of Mr. CABOUAT (France), the Committee again examined the amendments proposed to Rules 3(1) and 5(1).

(44) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) said that the effect of the amendments proposed by the British delegation would be to deny Associate Members the right to invite the General Conference to hold a session on their territory, or to be included among States allowed to request that an extraordinary session be convened.
(45) The Belgian delegate thought that in the first case, which was not connected with voting rights, it was difficult to give a negative reply; on the other hand, the convening of an extraordinary session of the Conference was closely connected with voting rights, and Mr. Baugniet thought that the Associate Members should not be allowed to make such a request.

(46) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) supported the mention of the Associate Members.

(47) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) remarked that the United Kingdom delegation was not raising policy objections to an Associate Member's being given the right to invite the General Conference to hold a session in its territory, but had been obliged to consider whether the proposed amendment to paragraph 1 of Rule 3 was consistent with the terms of the resolution adopted by the General Conference which governed the rights of Associate Members. That resolution referred clearly to the conduct of business of meetings, but did not contain any clear provision on the prior question of where meetings should be held. Certain practical difficulties might arise, e.g. of a legal character, concerning such matters as the guarantee of privileges and immunities to representatives of Member States if meetings should be held in territories not responsible for their own international relations. The United Kingdom delegation had therefore proposed the deletion of the amendment to paragraph 1 of Rule 3, but it had no strong feelings on the question.
(48) In answer to the delegate of France, who had asked his opinion on the principle that Associate Members should only be permitted to extend such an invitation through the power responsible for their international relations, Mr. West said that he would have preferred notice of such a question, but it occurred to him that some might argue that, if Associate Members were given the right to issue invitations, they were entitled to issue them direct. The United Kingdom would not agree with such a view, but in any case thought that the right to issue invitations was clearly meant under the Constitution to apply only to Member States, and, if the United Kingdom amendment were accepted, the point referred to by the delegate of France would not arise. If, on the other hand, the United Kingdom's interpretation of the Constitution were not accepted, it would be necessary to amend Rule 4 consequentially to refer to Associate Members. The United Kingdom delegation proposed however that Rule 4 should remain as it was and that no reference should be made to Associate Members in paragraph 1 of Rule 3.

(49) The United Kingdom proposal was adopted, the delegate of Egypt opposing it.

(50) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) said that a different point arose in paragraph 1 of Rule 5, if the words Associate Members were added. If Associate Members were to be allowed to form part of the one-third of Members requesting an extraordinary session of the General Conference, it would amount to giving them the right to vote. He supported the principle that Associate Members should be allowed to express opinions on any matter, but doubted whether it had been the intention to give them what was in the case in point tantamount to the right to vote. He did not feel strongly on that point,

however, and, if necessary, was prepared to withdraw his proposal.

(51) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate and wished to add a legal argument to the reasons the latter had put forward. If it were decided that the Conference should put Associate Members on an equal footing with Member States with regard to convening extraordinary sessions, not only would Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure have to be amended, but the Constitution as well. He regretted that that point had not been borne in mind when the draft amendment was presented, and advocated that Rule 5 be retained in its existing form, adding that the General Conference could at its next session consider amending the Constitution on that point.

(52) The United Kingdom delegate's proposal was approved.

Rule 28

(53) In reply to Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America), who asked whether the Committee had examined the draft amendment submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, proposing that the words "and Associate Members" be added after "Member States" in paragraph 1 of Rule 28, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that in practice the Credentials Committee examined the credentials of delegations from Associate Member States as well as those from Member States. However, he realized that it would be wise to state that specifically.

(54) The draft amendment concerning Rule 28 was approved.

Rule 94

(55) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled the terms of Rule 92, which dealt with the acceptance by any State, not a member of the United Nations but wishing to become a Member of Unesco, of all the obligations of membership.
(56) He said that their acceptance was necessary a fortiori on the part of an Associate Member, which did not have to ratify or sign the Constitution, and that was the reason for the proposed amendment; it seemed to him logical and necessary.

(57) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) pointed out that, in view of the decision of the Committee concerning Article VI of the Constitution, which had been taken at the morning meeting (document 8C/JUR/SR. 4), the numbering of the new Rule 94 A was wrong.
(58) He did not think that the new Rule should be part of Rule 94 and it was not quite the same as Rule 93. He suggested that the new Rule 94 A should be numbered Rule 93 and that all subsequent Rules be renumbered.

(59) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought that in that case it would be better to add a paragraph to Rule 92, which would consist of two sections:
(a) the existing paragraph which dealt with States not members of the United Nations;
(b) the new paragraph, dealing with Associate Members.

(60) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) accepted Mr. Saba's proposal.

(61) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) did not think that it would be wise to use the letters (a) and (b) for numbering the paragraphs, as the only paragraphs so numbered in the Rules of Procedure were concerned with transitional measures. He thought that the paragraphs should be numbered in conformity with existing practice, namely, (1) and (2).

(62) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) suggested that Rule 92 be entitled "Requests for admission" and that paragraphs 1 and 2 be headed "States not members of the United Nations" and "Associate Members" respectively.

(63) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) pointed out that, if Rule 92 were entitled "Requests for admission", confusion might arise with regard to Rule 93 "Consideration of applications". In his opinion the new paragraph might be 92 a, which would show that it was an additional clause, independent of what followed.

(64) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) pointed out that Rule 92, and the new paragraph which it had been proposed to add to Rule 92, were on the same subject; he proposed that the heading to Rule 92 should be altered in such a way as to include both cases. It might read: "States not members of the United Nations and Associate Members."

(65) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) supported the United Kingdom proposal.

(66) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) saw no possibility of finding a common title for two such different clauses. He therefore recommended a paragraph 92. 1 with the heading already appearing in the Rules of Procedure, and a paragraph 92. 2 with the heading suggested in the draft amendment.

(67) Mr. CABOUAT (France) observed that, in order to standardize the wording of the document, it would be advisable to put "State" in the plural in the heading of Rule 92 in the French text.

(68) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) said that, if the Legal Committee felt that the two matters were separate, it would be necessary to put them in separate Rules. Subsequent Rules would then have to be renumbered.

(69) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Rapporteur's proposal to number the new Rule 92 bis.

(70) The proposal was rejected.

(71) He then put to the vote the proposal that the new paragraph should be added to Rule 92, that the two paragraphs should be numbered (1) and (2) and that they should appear under one comprehensive heading.

(72) Approved.

(73) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) hoped that the Committee would decide to add the words "and Associate Members" after "Member States" in Rules 103, 104 and 105 and in all draft amendments sent to Associated States.

(74) Approved.

**AMENDMENTS TO RULE 40 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE**
**(document 8C/ADM/3 (III) Annex II)**

(75) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the object of the draft amendment to Rule 40 was to standardize and legalize the procedure followed at the last extraordinary session of the General Conference, when electing an acting President in place of the Conference President, who had been suddenly recalled by his government.

(76) Approved.

**AMENDMENT TO RULE 30 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE**
**(document 8C/ADM/3 (III) Annex III and document 8C/DR/65)**

(77) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the Chilean delegation had submitted an amendment to the draft amendment contained in Annex III of document 8C/ADM/3 (III).
(78) In reply to a question by the French delegate Mr. Saba said he did not know the reason for the Chilean delegation's draft amendment.

(79) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) thought he could explain the intentions of the Chilean delegation be reminding the meeting that the way in which the Nominations Committee had presented its proposals for the different offices on the General Committee of the present Conference had surprised many delegates, and it had seemed necessary to protest against such a procedure.

(80) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) thought that the Nominations Committee had accepted the list of candidates out of convenience. Under the provisions of paragraph 1 of Rule 30, it had the right itself to put forward a list of nominations and was not compelled to adopt the list submitted to it by the Executive Board. The present text of Rule 30 was legally correct.

(81) The CHAIRMAN remarked that he was not a lawyer, but thought that the Executive Board had no supreme powers during a session of the General Conference and that the Nominations Committee should take the initiative in preparing lists of nominations. In practice, however, the position was different. Disappointment had been caused in certain cases through the adoption of the list submitted by the Executive Board.
(82) He supported the Chilean amendment in principle, but thought its preamble too strong.

(83) Mr. PAGE (Canada) asked if it would be possible to hear a statement from the delegate of Chile, who happened to be present, on the basic reason underlying that delegation's proposal.

(84) Mr. VASSALLO ROJAS (Chile), who had drafted document 8C/DR/65, said that it was the result of the experience of the Chilean delegation at the present General Conference. Although Rule 30 seemed to indicate that the Nominations Committee determined the list of candidates, that in fact had not happened at the present session. There was some indication that, in accordance with tradition, recommendations made by the Executive Board had to be accepted. The Chilean delegation submitted its draft resolution to avoid the possibility of incidents of that kind.

(85) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) thanked the delegate of Chile for his statement. It was purely a question of convenience that had made the Nominations Committee adopt the list submitted by the Executive Board.
(86) The proposal amounted to a substantive amendment and, as the Legal Committee was not competent to discuss such amendments, he proposed that it should refer it back to the Administrative Commission and ask for instructions.
(87) This proposal was supported by the delegate of France.

(88) Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) supported the principle of the Chilean amendment. He did not consider that there was any need for the Executive Board to submit a list of nominations.
(89) He proposed that the Legal Committee should report to the Administrative Commission that no legal problem was involved, so that the Administrative Commission could take a decision without having to refer it back to the Legal Committee.

(90) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate with regard to the competence of the Committee.
(91) He observed that, under Rule 30 as it appeared in the Rules of Procedure, the Nominations Committee was completely free to submit to the Conference different proposals from those made by the Executive Board.
(92) He suggested that the purpose of the Chilean amendment could equally well be achieved by a purely formal change in the present text of paragraph 1, which would read as follows: "On information received from the Executive Board, the Nominations Committee shall determine and submit....."

(93) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal made by the United Kingdom delegate and supported by the French and Japanese delegates.

(94) Approved by 5 votes to 3.

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO RULES 25, 26 AND 73**
**(document 8C/ADM/3 (III) Annex IV)**

(95) Approved.

**DRAF AMENDMENT TO RULE 106 (document 8C/ADM/ (I))**

(96) Approved.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

# SIXTH MEETING

*2 December 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman*: Mr. AWAD (Egypt)

**VARIOUS QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PROCEDURE FOR THE ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that the subject had been raised in the General Committee and had been referred to the Legal Committee in its legal aspects. The Secretariat had on the other hand circulated a paper on the conduct of elections by secret ballot, which was submitted for the consideration of the Committee as document 8C/DIV/133.
(2) He invited the Legal Adviser to introduce the subject.

(3) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that, with regard to the procedure for the election of members of the Executive Board, the Legal Committee had been requested to report to the General Committee on the three following questions:
1. Would a ballot paper carrying fewer names than the number of vacancies be valid?
2. In what circumstances could candidates whose names had not been approved by the Nominations Committee, be considered eligible?
3. What action should be taken to remove the contradiction between Article IV. 8. a of the Constitution and Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference?

(4) On the proposal of Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan), the Committee decided to take the third question first.

(5) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that paragraph 2 of Rule 88, and Rule 89, of the Rules of Procedure were not in keeping with Article IV. 3. a of the Constitution, as they permitted the election of candidates in the second ballot who had obtained no more than a plurality, while Article IV. 8. a stipulated that decisions of the Conference should be taken by an "absolute majority", i. e. by 50% plus one of the votes.

(6) Mr. CABOUAT (France) observed that the Constitution took precedence of the Rules of Procedure. He therefore proposed that Rules 88 and 99 of the Rules of Procedure should be amended so as to bring them into line with Article IV. 8. a of the Constitution.

(7) This proposal was seconded by Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan).

(8) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the rules for the conduct of elections by secret ballot adopted by the General Conference at its sixth session laid down that a candidate to be elected needed to obtain the majority required by Rules 88 or 89 of the Rules of Procedure.

(9) Mr. BLANCO ACEVEDO (Uruguay) stated that paragraph 8a of Section C of Article IV of the Constitution required a simple majority, while Rule 88 (2) of the Rules of Procedure said that a relative majority was needed. In view of that discrepancy he recommended that the Constitution should prevail and that the necessary amendment be made in the Rules of Procedure to bring them into line with the Constitution.

(10) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) supported the views expressed by the representative of France.

(11) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Rules adopted by the General Conference for the conduct of elections by secret ballot, with particular reference to the definition of "absolute majority" in the first ballot under Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure. The definitions adopted by the General Conference in 1951 were still binding and it was for the Legal Committee to accept them or alter them.

(12) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the contradiction between Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure and Article IV. 8. a of the Constitution could be removed by the following amendments:
(13) In paragraph 1 of Rule 88, delete the words "in the first ballot". Delete paragraphs 2 and 3 of Rule 88 in their entirety.
(14) In Rule 89, first sentence, delete the words "in the first ballot" and delete the second sentence in its entirety.
(15) In document 8C/DIV/133 (Rules for the conduct of elections by secret ballot, extract from the Resolutions of the sixth session of the General Conference), the last sentence of paragraph 17 should be amended to read:
"Fifty per cent plus one of the votes recorded shall constitute the absolute majority required under Rules 88 and 89."

(16) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed that it was preferable to alter the Rules of Procedure rather than the Constitution. However, in order to avoid an indefinite number of drawn votes, with the votes being continually recast for the same candidates, the most practical solution would be to replace Rules 88 and 89 of the Organization's Rules of Procedure by the corresponding Rules of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of the United

Nations. Rule 88 would then read:

"When only one person or member is to be elected and no candidate obtains in the first ballot the majority required, a second ballot shall be taken which shall be restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If in the second ballot the votes are equally divided, the President shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots."

(17) Rule 89 would read

"When two or more elective places are to be filled at one time, those candidates obtaining in the first ballot the majority required shall be elected. If the number of candidates obtaining such a majority is less than the number of persons or members to be elected, there shall be additional ballots to fill the remaining places, the voting being restricted to the candidates obtaining the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot to a number not more than twice the places remaining to be filled."

(18) The same principle would thus be embodied in both Rules, and the discrepancy between the Constitution and the Rules of Procedure would be eliminated.

(19) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) supported the proposal to adopt the wording of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(20) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) was in favour of radically amending Rules 88 and 89 and the relevant paragraphs in the Rules for the conduct of elections by secret ballot adopted by the General Conference at its sixth session. That would make it possible to avoid the difficulties connected with the notion of "absolute majority".

(21) The CHAIRMAN assumed that the Committee was in favour of substituting the relevant Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of the United Nations for Rules 88 and 89, and invited a drafting committee, composed of the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, France and Japan, as well as of the Legal Adviser and the Rapporteur, to propose an exact text.

(22) He suspended the meeting for 10 minutes.

(23) The meeting having resumed, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) submitted the following proposals which took into account the exchange of views that had taken place:

(24) In paragraph 1 of Rule 88 the words "in the first ballot" would be deleted.

(25) Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the same Rule would be replaced by the texts quoted by Mr. Kotschnig from the Rules of Procedure of the United Nations General Assembly. Mr. Saba read out the texts again, adding that the French version would be brought into line with that of the Rule in question.

(26) Rule 89 would also be replaced by the text proposed by Mr. Kotschnig.

(27) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), supported by the representative of the United Kingdom, proposed that, in order to eliminate entirely the difficulty arising from the notion of "absolute majority", the first sentence of Rule 88 be deleted; he pointed out that it was already implied in the text of the Rule as adopted by the drafting committee.

(28) Mr. CABOUAT (France) remarked that the phrase "absolute majority" was not an appropriate term to designate a number of votes equal to "fifty per cent plus one of the votes".

(29) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) observed that under Mr. Kotschnig's proposal no more than the "required majority" would now be necessary under paragraph 88. He therefore invited the Committee to approve that proposal. In that event the words "absolute majority" should also be deleted from the last sentence of Rule 17 of the Rules for the conduct of elections by secret ballot (document 8C/DIV/133). This sentence should then read:

"Fifty per cent plus one of the votes recorded shall constitute the majority required under Article IV. 8a of the Constitution and Rules 88 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference."

(30) The Committee said it was prepared to approve the amendments just mentioned by Mr. Saba to the following paragraphs or Rules: Rule 89 and paragraphs 1 and 2 of Rule 88 of the Rules of Procedure; Rule 17 of the Rules for the conduct of elections by secret ballot.

(31) With regard to Rule 88, paragraph 3, Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) observed that the drawing of lots between two candidates who had obtained the same number of votes was contrary to the Rules of the Constitution, since ultimately it might lead to the election of a candidate who had not obtained the required majority.

(32) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) considered that legally Mr. Haguiwara was right and that the proposed drawing of lots was not really compatible with the provision that no candidate should be elected without having obtained the required majority.

(33) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that the incompatibility mentioned by Mr. Saba was not absolutely true. The system proposed, if accepted, meant in fact conferring on the Chair a right of vote which the Chair would use in favour of the candidate designated by the draw, thus permitting him to obtain the required majority.

(34) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) observed that the system of drawing lots was sanctioned by numerous precedents.

(35) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) none the less thought it incongruous that a Director-General, for example, might ultimately be elected by drawing lots.

(36) Mr. BLANCO ACEVEDO (Uruguay) agreed with the Japanese delegate. In important votes the final decision should not be left to chance but to the conscience of delegates. It would hardly seem serious to leave it to chance. He preferred and therefore recommended that the ballot should continue until it clearly reflected the opinion of delegations.

(37) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) also shared the Japanese delegate's opinion.

(38) Mr. CABOUAT (France) asked Mr. Saba to describe the practice in other international organizations.

(39) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) replied that, as the United States delegate had already stated, the Rules of Procedure of the United Nations General Assembly permitted the drawing of lots when there was an equal number of votes in the second ballot for two candidates to one post. Not all the Specialized Agencies had adopted that procedure, the ILO, for instance, followed another method.

(40) In reply to a remark by Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) regarding the system used in certain parliaments of giving the Chair an additional vote in case of an equal division in the voting, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that there was a considerable difference between a parliament and an intergovernmental organization. At the General Conference it was States and not deputies who ha he right to vote. But the State to which the President or Chairman belonged already had a vote which was exercised by another member of the delegation appointed to represent it at the Conference.

(41) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) and Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) approved Mr. Saba's observations.

(42) Taking into account the exchange of views which had just taken place, Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) proposed that paragraph 3 of Rule 88 be replaced by a clause stating that in the event of an equal division at the second ballot, further ballots must be held until the required majority was obtained.

(43) Upon the Committee's taking a vote on the Japanese proposal, it was found that an equal number of votes had been cast on either side.

(44) Mr. JARAMILLO ARANGO (Colombia) suggested as a compromise that the Japanese proposal should be discarded in favour of another, viz. that a third ballot should be held and, if both candidates still obtained the same number of votes, then lots should be drawn. He asked the Secretariat to draft a resolution to that effect.

(45) Mr. CABOUAT (France) seconded the Colombian delegate's proposal.

(46) The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the substance of the proposal, leaving it to Mr. Saba to find a suitable draft later.

(47) The Colombian proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

(48) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) explained that in voting against the Colombian proposal he had been prompted solely by a legal doubt, for, as he had already said, he felt that to draw lots was at variance with Unesco's Constitution.

(49) The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to study the second question on which the General Committee had asked it to come to a decision - the validity or invalidity of certain ballot papers.

(50) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) indicated the changes which he thought should be made in Rules 13 and 14 of the Rules of Procedure concerning the conduct of elections by secret ballot.

(51) Mr. Baugniet's proposals were seconded by the United States and United Kingdom delegates and approved.

(52) The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the question as to the conditions in which candidates could be regarded as eligible whose names had not been approved by the Nominations Committee.

(53) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that, in conformity with the decisions recently taken, the clause which stipulated that "Only delegates nominated either by the Nominations Committee or by two delegations, before the ballot, may stand for election (to the Executive Board)" had been struck out from Rule 95 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. That being so, he considered that the rôle of the Nominations Committee was now a purely advisory one and that all candidates nominated by Member States were in fact eligible, irrespective of what the Nominations Committee felt about them.

(54) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) accepted Mr. Saba's interpretation but wished to know until when it was open to Member States to nominate candidates.

(55) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought nominations would be acceptable until the ballot was taken. The second and later ballots could however only apply to those candidates not so far elected who had obtained the largest number of votes in the preceding ballots.

(56) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) added that the number of names on the ballot papers must always be equal to the number of vacancies still to be filled.

(57) The Committee approved the foregoing interpretation of the provisions regarding the nomination of candidates.

(58) The Committee then examined the following question. interpretation of Article V, paragraph 3, of the Constitution (eligibility for re-election of Executive Board Members) (document 8C/JUR/4).

(59) The CHAIRMAN recalled that Article V, paragraph 3, of the Constitution dealt with the re-eligibility of members of the Executive Board. A memorandum had been prepared on the subject by the Japanese delegation (document 8C/JUR/4), which the Committee had before it.

(60) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) had very little to add to the memorandum submitted by his delegation, but thought it desirable that Mr. Saba should offer the Committee his comments.

(61) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that Article V. 3 of the Constitution stipulated that members completing their term of office on the Executive Board were immediately re-eligible for a second term, but that they could not sit for more than two consecutive terms. Having regard to the change in the Board's structure, the question now was whether terms or parts of terms during which any particular individual had sat on the former Board should or should not be taken into account with regard to his re-eligibility to the new Board.

(62) Mr. BAUGNIET (Rapporteur) thought the reply was in the affirmative. He saw no reason for distinguishing between the old and the new Board with regard to re-eligibility.

(63) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, in addition to the two extreme interpretations given in the Japanese memorandum, there was a third interpretation, which, he thought, should be taken into account. That was the case of the member who, at the time of the modification of the structure of the Executive Board, had served only half his term on the Board. He knew of members who were in precisely that situation. In his opinion that should not be counted as a term, and the provisions of Article V, paragraph 3 should not, in that particular case, apply.

(64) Mr. KABIR (Chairman of the Nominations Committee) hoped that the case of individual members would not be taken into account in the discussion. He also pointed out that it would in some cases be difficult to apply such a rule to members elected on a casual basis.

(65) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, after the explanations given by the Legal Adviser, he would be prepared to support the proposal outlined by the Rapporteur.

(66) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought that there might be some doubt as to the effect of the modification of the Board's structure, namely whether the rule of non-eligibility for immediate re-election was applicable to present members of the Board who had so far sat on the Board in a personal capacity. Nevertheless, if it were decided to apply that rule, no distinction could be made between members on the basis of the effective duration of the terms they had already served. A distinction of that kind would not, moreover, remove all unfairness and could not, he felt, be approved without a prior alteration of certain provisions of the Constitution.

(67) Mr. BRIGHT (Liberia) wished to know if under the provision under consideration the members of the Executive Board were individuals or Member States.

(68) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that thenceforward the members of the Board were persons representing States.

(69) The CHAIRMAN thought the Committee agreed that the interpretation given by the Rapporteur, advocating continuity in the Executive Board, was the correct one.

(70) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) pointed out that the Administrative Commission had, in his view, decided in favour of the principle of "discontinuity" between the old and the new Boards The Japanese proposal which the Commission had rejected as being at variance with that interpretation, had, on the contrary, aimed at ensuring a measure of "continuity" between the old and the new Boards by allowing for the re-eligibility of certain members whose term had been curtailed as a result of the changes in the Board's structure.

(71) Mr. WEST (United Kingdom) had the impression that the Administrative Commission, while accepting the principle of discontinuity in the membership of the Executive Board on a purely legal basis, had, from the point of view of personalities, been in favour of continuity. That was shown by the fact that under the new system the members of the Board, who were now representing their governments, would still be considered as individuals. They could for example resign personally but could not be recalled by their governments.

(72) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the principle that any previous term served by a member of the Executive Board should be taken into account with regard to his re-eligibility to that body, any part of a term being counted as a full term.

(73) The principle, as enunciated by the Chairman, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

(74) The Committee went on to consider the amendments to the Rules of Procedure resulting from the adoption of Russian as a working language of the General Conference.

(75) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that the amendments in question would inevitably affect Rules 52, 55 and 60, in which Russian would be included among the working languages enumerated, unless the list of working languages were dropped in accordance with the solution already adopted for Rules 57, 59 and 78, where mention was made of the working languages but without any list.

(76) In reply to a question from Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), Mr. MONTAGNIER (Chief of the Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) said that, when the General Conference was held away from headquarters, it would be difficult to have the Conference Journal printed in Russian, but the Russian edition might perhaps be replaced by a shorter, unprinted version got out with whatever duplicating apparatus might be available.

(77) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation would not object to the proposals outlined by the Head of the Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services. It would thenceforward be necessary to interpret Rule 55 in the light of what Mr. Montagnier had said.

(78) After a brief discussion it was decided to add Russian to the list of working languages at present appearing in Rules 52, 55 and 60.

(79) Upon the proposal of Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan), it was also decided that the heading of Rule 53 should be amended to read "language of the country in which the Conference is being held" instead of "Additional working languages".

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

# SEVENTH MEETING

*2 December 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AWAD (Egypt)

**DRAFT RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FINANCIAL REGULATIONS** (document 8C/DR/90)

(1) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller), referring to the proposal contained in paragraph 4 of the Spanish resolution that the Director-General should submit a revised version of the Financial Regulations to the General Conference at its ninth session, pointed out that the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies had held a series of meetings three years previously to try and agree on uniform financial regulations. Financial regulations common to the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies, with variations only in accordance with their various Constitutions, had been finally agreed upon. Those regulations had been submitted to and adopted by the General Conference at its sixth session. Slight modifications had been made by the General Conference at its seventh session, but they did not alter the substance of the regulations.

(2) He submitted that it would be difficult for the General Conference to revise the Financial Regulations without going through the machinery of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies.

(3) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) added to the remarks made by the Comptroller and said that one of the provisions of the draft resolution (first paragraph) would be difficult to apply. It was stipulated that thenceforward no decision of the General Conference should be valid if it was contrary to the provisions of any part of the Financial Regulations. As it was the Director-General and the Secretariat who were responsible for executing the decisions of the Conference, that provision would put the Director-General in a difficult position by obliging him to interpret both a resolution and the Financial Regulations; it might also force him to forbid a particular resolution being executed; he would thus act both as executive agent and final arbiter; Mr. Saba urged the Committee not to impose such a responsibility on the Director-General. He asked the Spanish delegate if he would be prepared to withdraw that provision.

(4) In answer to the CHAIRMAN, who asked what was really expected of the Legal Committee, Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that the Administrative Commission had considered that, as the majority of points in the resolution would involve changes to the Rules of Procedure, it would request the advice of the Legal Committee.
(5) If paragraph 1 became effective, an insertion would be necessary in the Rules of Procedure. Likewise, paragraphs 2 and 3 referred to Rules of Procedure.

(6) The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Administrative Commission had taken no decision on the resolution and it was not yet clear what it wished to do about it. In that case, he thought that the Committee was free to give the resolution consideration along any lines suggested by its members.

(7) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) shared the apprehension of the Legal Committee concerning the impact of paragraph 1 and wondered if the delegation of Spain would be willing to withdraw that paragraph.
(8) In his opinion, paragraphs 2 and 3 presented no difficulties. A financial regulation would not be suspended lightly. He was willing to support the proposals.
(9) Paragraph 4 was not clear. He would agree if the Director-General were asked to make a study of the effectiveness and soundness of the financial regulations and to report to the General Conference at its ninth session.

(10) Mr. FRAGA IRIBARNE (Spain) thanked the Chairman and members of the Committee for allowing him to speak although he was not a member of the Committee.
(11) He said he had listened to the criticism made about the draft resolution presented by his delegation to amend the Financial Regulations and was prepared to withdraw paragraph 1. He thought that paragraph 4 could be altered so as to avoid the disadvantages which had been mentioned; thus paragraphs 2 and 3 would remain; those he wished to maintain as being of value.

(12) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said that the French delegation shared the United States delegate's feelings, and thought that, if the first paragraph were approved, it might put the Conference in an embarrassing position. The French delegation was, however, prepared to support paragraphs 2 and 3. Paragraph 4 would be improved if it were slightly amended so as to leave the Director-General greater latitude in applying it.

(13) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) sympathized with the resolution proposed by Spain. He reminded the Committee that the United Kingdom delegation, in the Administrative Commission, had proposed that the Financial Regulations should be adhered to in financing the 1955-56 programme. It had been grateful for the support of the Spanish delegation.
(14) The resolution submitted by the delegation of Spain, however, contained points to which he could not agree. In the first place, with regard to paragraph 1, he thought that it was highly questionable whether one General Conference could pass a resolution that would commit another one.
(15) He had no objection to paragraph 2.
(16) In his opinion, paragraph 3 itself involved adding a Rule to or amending a Rule of the Rules of Procedure.
(17) He hoped that the delegation of Spain would agree to withdraw paragraph 4 from the resolution. All that was necessary was for the General Conference to agree to adhere to the Financial Regulations.
(18) He thought that the Committee could agree that the basic problem was how to persuade the General Conference that, having adopted financial regulations, it should adhere to them.
(19) He could not support the preamble to the resolution in its existing form; in his opinion, it did not represent an accurate account of events.
(20) He had no specific amendments to propose to the resolution at the present stage and suggested that a small drafting committee be set up to draft a resolution in the light of the discussion which had taken place, for submission to the Administrative Commission.

(21) Mr. CABOUAT (France) repeated that the French delegation was prepared to support paragraphs 2 and 3.
(22) The French delegation would like the third paragraph of the preamble to be deleted. It seemed difficult for the Conference to vote a resolution condemning another resolution taken a few days earlier; in addition, the term "tacitly infringed" was too strong and Mr. Cabouat did not consider its use to be justified; he also failed to see what had been meant by "simple" resolutions and said he was against adopting that term. Mr. Cabouat asked the delegate of Spain if he would consent to the paragraph being omitted, as it added little to the first two paragraphs in which the objectives sought by the Conference in adopting a resolution of the kind were clearly defined.

(23) The CHAIRMAN summarized the objections which had been made to the draft resolution and asked the Committee if it was in agreement with the suggestion of the United Kingdom delegate that a small drafting committee be set up to draft a resolution for submission to the Administrative Commission.

(24) Agreed.

(25) The meeting adjourned for ten minutes and on resumption the CHAIRMAN called on Mr. Saba.

(26) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that the small drafting committee had considered that, instead of proposing the adoption of a resolution, a recommendation should be made to the Administrative Commission to include three clauses in that part of its report dealing with the application of the Financial Regulations. They might be drafted as follows:

"The Administrative Commission considers that:

1. Any departure from the Financial Regulations should be preceded by the preliminary suspension of the provision to which an exception is to be made.

2. No amendment to the Financial Regulations can be examined by the Conference unless the question has been placed on the agenda of the General Conference in accordance with the Rules of Procedure;

3. It would be desirable to insert in the Financial Regulations a provision that the Regulations may not be amended nor the application of a Regulation suspended except by a decision taken by a two-thirds majority."

(27) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) asked what force those three clauses would have if they were included in the Administrative Commission's report. Would they have the force of a recommendation, a resolution or of an amendment to the Financial Regulations?

(28) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that, while clause 2 was the statement of an existing rule, clause 1 was a recommendation and "vceu", linked with clause 3; the latter recommended the introduction of provisions laying down that a two-thirds majority was necessary to amend or cancel the application of any Financial Regulation. The Commission might ask the Director-General to submit a text to the next session of the General Conference, but that would seem unnecessary, as he would normally feel obliged to do do.

(29) Mr. HAGUIWARA (Japan) gathered that that part of the Commission's report would be no more than a recommendation, on which a decision would be taken at the next session of the Conference and that it was not proposed to alter the Financial Regulations forthwith; on that understanding, he supported the drafting committee's proposal.

(30) The Legal Committee agreed to the procedure proposed by the drafting committee.

Draft Resolution 8C/DR/74 rev. and 8C/DR/113: Legal guarantees to be provided nationally for the staff of the Secretariat.

(31) The CHAIRMAN called on Mr. Saba.

(32) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the Legal Committee's task with regard to this proposal had not

been specified (document 8C/DR/74 rev.); it had asked the Chairman of the Administrative Commission for details. The Chairman had replied that his Commission would like the Legal Committee's opinion on the character of the ltr an delegation's proposal and had further asked it to decide whether the Italian text imposed specific obligations on governments or whether it was a recommendation involving no legal obligations. Misgiving had been aroused by the title of the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation to the draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation (document 8C/ADM/113); that title "Legal Guarantees to be provided nationally for the staff of the Secretariat", the Legal Committee was asked to submit a new wording closer to the real meaning of the resolution. The Chairman of the Administrative Commission had made it clear that it was not for the Legal Committee to choose between the Italian and United Kingdom resolutions.

(33) Mr. ARTHUR (United K gdom) explained that there had been a legal reason behind the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation. If the Italian proposal were adopted, the General Conference might impose legal obligations on Member States. The United Kingdom delegation could not agree to any such imposition by the General Conference. The United Kingdom considered each case on its merits and wished to maintain its freedom to do so.
(34) Further, the Italian resolution implied that it was the common practice for Member States not to reinstate their nationals after a term of service with an international organization. There was not sufficient evidence to support such an implication.
(35) He was prepared to see the Italian resolution passed at some future date, after sufficient evidence had been collected to show that the above was indeed the common practice. He suggested that the Director-General might be asked to collect information from Member States as to the practice followed by them in that connexion. Further, in order to obtain that information, the Director-General might write to Member States about individual cases and might also enquire about laws passed and policies adopted in that connexion.
(36) He pointed out that the title to the resolution 8C/DR/74 rev. was that proposed by the Italian delegation. The United Kingdom delegation would suggest as a title: "Secondment of the nationals of Member States for service with international organizations."

(37) Mr. BOW (Canada) was not clear whether the United Kingdom proposal was an amendment of the Italian proposal, as amended by the United States delegation, or whether it was a substitute motion. If it was to be considered an amendment, he was not clear whether the preamble to the Italian proposal was to be added to that of the United Kingdom.

(38) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) indicated that he was not prepared to agree to the last phrase of the Italian preamble, as he considered that the whole question could not be examined until further information had been obtained.
(39) He thought that it might be wise to consider the United Kingdom proposal as a substitute motion, since it made radical alterations to the Italian resolution.
(40) He was prepared to accept the Italian preamble with the exception of the last phrase.

(41) Mr. BOW (Canada) suggested that, if the United Kingdom proposal was to be considered a substitute motion, the United Kingdom delegate should draft the preamble for it.
(42) He further suggested that the two resolutions should be forwarded to the Administrative Commission to decide which should be adopted.

(43) Mr. ARTHUR (United Kingdom) said that, with regard to the preamble, he would be satisfied if the last phrase were deleted and the word "recommends" added after the word "Secretariat".

(44) The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee would agree to forward the two proposals to the Administrative Commission with a statement to the effect that the Legal Committee saw no legal objection to the form in which the Italian resolution had been drafted and suggesting that the United Kingdom proposal should be considered by the Commission if the Italian resolution were rejected.

(45) Mr. MERMINOD (Switzerland) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that, as the Australian delegate had pointed out at a meeting of the Commission, a measure of the kind advocated in the draft recommendation could only have a limited effect in a Federal State; he spoke from experience of his own country.

(46) The CHAIRMAN thought that the effect would be the same in a Federal State as in any other type of State. Unesco could not force governments to pass laws.
(47) The Committee could mention in its report to the Administrative Commission that the resolution should be sent to Member States in the form of a recommendation.
(48) He asked whether the Committee would be prepared to leave the drafting to its Bureau.

(49) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) had no objection to the procedure suggested by the Chairman, but warned the Committee that a similar discussion would take place in the Administrative Commission.
(50) He asked why the resolutions had been referred to the Legal Committee in the first instance, and suggested that the Committee should report to the Administrative Commission that it had been unable to decide what was required of it with regard to the two resolutions.

(51) The Legal Committee agreed to report to the Administrative Commission the substance of the discussion which had taken place.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

# CHAPTER IX

# CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

## FIRST MEETING

*12 November 1954 at 11.45 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BERNAL JIMENEZ (Colombia)

### OPENING OF THE MEETING AND APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN

(1) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL declared the meeting open and called on the Chairman of the Executive Board to propose candidates for the post of Chairman.

(2) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) proposed the appointment of the delegate of Colombia.

(3) Approved unanimously.

### EXAMINATION OF CREDENTIALS

(4) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser), after reminding the meeting of the procedure to be followed for scrutinizing delegations' credentials, said that the secretariat had received a large number of credentials which fulfilled the requirements laid down in Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure, and a number of other credentials which, though they did not strictly comply with the provisions of Rule 22, could nevertheless be considered, under the established procedure, as provisional credentials enabling their holders to be seated in a provisional capacity subject to later submission of final credentials. Lastly, a few delegations had not yet arrived and it was not sure that they would all attend the Conference session. He would make a proposal on that point later on.

(5) Mr. LUSSIER (Secretary of the Committee) read the list of countries which had sent credentials in due form to the Secretariat Australia, Austria, Burma (Union of), Byelorussian SSR Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Guatemala Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Laos, Libya, Monaco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet-Nam, Yugoslavia.

(6) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to make a statement concerning the representation of China. He noticed that the Chinese delegation consisted of persons not appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China, but by the Kuomintang Group. As he had already done in plenary session, he drew the Committee's attention to the anomalous situation with regard to the representation of China in Unesco. The Government of the People's Republic, the only legal government empowered to appoint representatives of China, had not yet been represented in Unesco, where its proper place had been taken by a representative of the Kuomintang régime, which had been deposed by the Chinese people and could not speak on its behalf. Accordingly, the Soviet delegate submitted to the Committee a proposal, the adoption of which would serve the interests, not only of the Chinese people, but of all countries concerned with the development of cultural relations and their contribution towards better international understanding and the promotion of peace. The proposal read

"The General Conference,

Considering the proposal by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning non-recognition of the Kuomintang representatives of the Chiang-Kai-Shek group at the eighth session of the Unesco General Conference,

Decides to consider invalid the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives of the Chiang-Kai-Shek group at the eighth session of the General Conference of Unesco".

(7) Mr. Soldatov explained that his motion had been drawn up with a view to its final adoption by the plenary Conference. However, he was prepared to alter its wording if the Chairman thought necessary by substituting the words "Credentials Committee" for "General Conference".

(8) In reply to Mr. ENVERGA (Philippines), Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that the question was not whether China was a member or not of the Organization - it had been a member ever since Unesco was founded - but of the Soviet delegation's objecting to the admission of the representatives of China. The credentials submitted by the latter were issued by the same authorities who had issued the credentials of Chinese delegations to previous sessions of the General Conference. Since 1950 objections had been raised against those credentials. The General Conference had not accepted those objections at previous sessions. The Conference, on the advice of the Credentials Committee, would have to take a decision on the objection just raised.

(9) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thought that the only point at issue was consideration of the credentials submitted by the only Chinese delegation present at the Conference. He did not consider the Soviet delegate's proposal acceptable and, in order to avoid a lengthy discussion aimed at excluding the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China in favour of representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China - a discussion which, incidentally, should take place in plenary session - Mr. Kotschnig submitted the following motion:

"The General Conference decides to adjourn any consideration at the eighth session of any proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China".

(10) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal of the United States delegate. The question should be adjourned.

(11) Mr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) was also against rejecting the credentials submitted by the delegation of China. As the Legal Adviser had said, it would be contravening the Constitution of Unesco. The credentials had been issued by the same authorities as for previous conferences; those authorities, moreover, were recognized by the United Nations, which had refused to admit the Chinese People's Republic as long as that Government's attitude towards Korea remained unchanged, for it was a government which the United Nations regarded as an aggressor. Owing to the close link between the United Nations and Unesco - their mutual relationship was defined in Article X of the Constitution - Unesco could not admit to membership a government not recognized by the United Nations.

(12) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that a procedural difficulty arose. The United States delegate had proposed adjourning consideration of the Soviet delegation's proposal but he would remind the Committee that acceptance of the United States proposal would mean postponing a decision on the credentials submitted by any delegation of China whatsoever. He personally was in favour of taking a decision at the current session and did not think that the United States delegate's proposal was a procedural motion, since it dealt with a substantive question - adjournment of the question of accepting the Chinese delegation's credentials in general. In conclusion, he asked the Committee to vote on his proposal and, if it were defeated, to vote then on the proposal of the United States delegate. He believed lawyers would understand his point of view, moreover, he was prepared to explain it in detail. He felt he must reply to a point raised by the delegate of Uruguay, namely, whether or not it would be in keeping with Unesco's Constitution to accept the Soviet Union's proposal. He personally thought that, by accepting it, the Committee would be acting consistently with the Constitution. The aim of his proposal was to bring about broader collaboration in the field of international understanding and it did not in any way contravene the Constitution. The fact that the credentials of the Formosan Government's representatives had been accepted in the past meant nothing, mistakes might have been made but there was no point in repeating them. The delegate of Uruguay had raised another point: who was the aggressor in Korea. The Soviet delegate did not think that was a question which the Committee or Unesco itself could decide. The Soviet Union took the view, shared by other States, that the Central Government of the People's Republic had not intervened in Korea. It was only Chinese volunteers who had taken part in the operations; they had had to intervene to defend their homeland when its frontiers had been threatened. His statement was justified by the fact that it was not he himself who had raised the point, but the delegate of Uruguay; he had therefore been obliged to state the Soviet delegation's point of view.

(13) Mr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) explained that he had not said that it was Unesco's duty to decide who had been the aggressor in Korea. That question had been referred to and would have to be decided by the United Nations.

(14) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) regretted that political questions had been introduced into the discussion. The Soviet delegate's proposal had a political complexion and was out of place in that Committee. Mr. Soldatov had said that lawyers would understand his point of view - and he (the speaker) did understand it - but that did not mean that he agreed with the legal interpretation given. The Soviet delegate had argued that Mr. Kotschnig's proposal was not a procedural question. He read it again and asked for the whole discussion to be adjourned. In that connexion, he pointed out that, under Rule 75 of the Rules of Procedure, any such motion took precedence and that, apart from the proposer, one representative could speak in favour of, and one against the motion. In conclusion, he asked for a vote to be taken on his proposal as it was definitely a procedural motion.

(15) Before replying to the points raised by Mr. Kotschnig, Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) enquired in what order the two proposals before the meeting, Mr. Kotschnig's and his own, would be put to the vote.

(16) The CHAIRMAN said he would put them to the vote in the order in which they had been submitted. That would mean taking Mr. Soldatov's proposal first.

(17) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that, under Rule 77, his proposal should have priority.

(18) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought it was an awkward situation. The solution to be adopted depended on the character and nature of the motions submitted. But views differed on their definition. Was the text before the Committee a draft amendment to the report to be submitted by the Chairman, or an independent motion, followed by a contrary motion? If there was any doubt, the Chairman could ask the Committee in which order it wished to vote.

(19) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that he had submitted an amendment to the paragraph in the report mentioning China: he had proposed that the credentials of the delegation of China be considered invalid. In his first statement, the United States delegate had asked for that proposal to be adjourned. It was for the Committee to decide whether or not it wished to consider those credentials valid. If Mr. Kotschnig's proposal were approved, the decision concerning the credentials of one particular country, China, would be left in suspense. He also pointed out that, when he read his motion again, Mr. Kotschnig had further specified that the Conference would reject any proposal to secure the representation of the Chinese People's Republic and had moved the adjournment of the whole question.

(20) Mr. Soldatov pressed for a vote to be taken on his proposal, which constituted a draft amendment to the report. When that was done, other votes could be taken on other proposals.

(21) The CHAIRMAN drew attention to Rule 77 (c), under which motions to adjourn the debate on an item under discussion had priority. He would take a vote on the order of voting. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) felt sure his point of view would prevail and so raised no objection, although he saw no need for such a procedure, since the Rules of Procedure were clear. Mr. Soldatov's proposal was one of substance (exclusion of a delegation), whereas his own (adjournment of the debate) was purely one of procedure.

(22) The proposal to vote first on the proposal of the Soviet Union was put to the vote and defeated by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

(23) Mr. Kotschnig's proposal was reread:

"The General Conference decides to adjourn any consideration at the eighth session of any proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China".

(24) The proposal was put to the vote and approved by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

(25) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what procedure would be adopted for submitting the report and voting on it.

(26) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that the report was not finished. The Committee still had to consider the provisional credentials, the credentials of observers from certain non-Member States and from certain territories and international organizations invited to the Conference.

(27) Mr. LUSSIER (Secretary of the Committee) read the list of countries which had submitted provisional credentials: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, Iraq, Korea, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines and Turkey. Furthermore, credentials for observers had been submitted by Bulgaria, the Holy See, Portugal and Rumania, which were not members of Unesco, as well as by the Saar and the following territories: Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, the British Caribbean group and the Malaya-British Borneo group. Two international organizations - the International Labour Organization and the World Health Organization - had also accredited representatives.

(28) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) further mentioned certain countries which had not yet submitted credentials and recalled the procedure adopted in 1952 and 1953, when the Chairman of the Committee had been authorized to report direct to the Conference on such cases.

(29) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that that procedure be followed, and formally moved the adoption of the report setting forth the information submitted to the Committee by the Secretariat. It would then still be possible to reconvene the Committee in case of need.

(30) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that under Rule 85 parts of a proposal should be voted on separately if a representative asked for the proposal to be divided, and he called for a separate vote on the part of the report dealing with the credentials of the delegation of China.

(31) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) then gave a general outline of the draft report. It would begin with the statement that the Committee had met, that it had appointed its Chairman and considered the documents issued by various States. It would then be indicated that a proposal had been made by the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning the credentials submitted by the delegation of China and followed by a counter-proposal by the delegate of the United States of America, which had been adopted. The list of States which had submitted credentials would then follow, together with the Committee's recommendation that those States be seated at the Conference. In accordance with the request made by the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a separate vote should be taken on the mention of China in that list.

(32) The report would then give a list of the States

which had submitted provisional credentials, followed by the recommendation that they be allowed to take part provisionally in the work of the Conference subject to later submission of credentials in due form. Next would come the list of observers. The report would then state that the Committee had authorized its Chairman to report direct to the Conference on any further credentials that might reach him before the Committee's next meeting.

(33) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the form of the report, as described by Mr. Saba, but asked that mention be made of the first vote taken by the Committee about the order in which the vote on the two proposals was to be taken.
(34) If the part dealing with acceptance of the Chinese delegation's credentials were not omitted, the Soviet delegate would have to vote against the entire report and he asked for an explanation of his vote to be included.

(35) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thought that, to avoid duplication, the statements of Committee members defining their position should be included in the minutes.

(36) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that a record had been taken and would be issued.

(37) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not press for the inclusion of his statements in the report, since a record of the meeting would be prepared; he called for a vote by roll-call.

(38) After a brief exchange of views, the Committee decided to take a vote by roll-call first on the retention of the word "China".
Voted for: Egypt, France, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay.
Voted against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
Abstained: Indonesia.
(39) The result was 6 votes for, 1 against and one abstention.
(40) The vote on the report as a whole was as follows:
Voted for: Egypt, France, Indonesia, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay.
Voted against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
(41) The result was 7 votes for, and 1 against.

(42) Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had been obliged to vote against the report as a whole solely because of the rejection of his proposal to consider the credentials of the Chinese delegation invalid since its members came from a group disowned by the Chinese people and could not represent China in Unesco. He asked for that statement to be included in the minutes.

(43) Mr. HUZAYIN (Egypt) pointed out that the fact of his delegation's having voted for the report as a whole did not imply that it recognized the governments of certain States which had submitted credentials deemed to be valid.

(44) The CHAIRMAN thanked members of the Committee for their readiness to carry out a difficult task.

(45) Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), on behalf of the Committee, thanked the Chairman for his masterly conduct of the Committee's proceedings.

The meeting rose at 2.30 p.m.

# CHAPTER X

# COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF MEMBER STATES

## FIRST MEETING

*12 November 1954 at 6 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

(1) In place of the Director-General, who was detained at another meeting, Mr. CHEVALIER opened the proceedings and informed the Committee that the General Conference had approved the proposal by the Nominations Committee recommending that one of the representatives of Iraq should take the Chair at this Committee: Mr. Al-Hani, the Iraqi delegate, was unanimously elected Chairman

**ITEM 10 OF REVISED AGENDA: ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMEN AND RAPPORTEUR**

(2) Having taken the Chair, Mr. AL-HANI suggested that the delegates of Cambodia and Ecuador should be elected Vice-Chairmen.

(3) Mr. CHIRIBOGA TERAN (Ecuador) thanked the Chairman for his suggestion, but asked that the delegate of the Dominican Republic should be elected in his place

(4) Messrs. Hong Hoeung Doeung (Cambodia) and Pannocchia Alvarez (Dominican Republic), having been proposed by Mr McCULLOUGH (United States of America), were unanimously elected Vice-Chairmen.

(5) The CHAIRMAN then proposed that Mr. Hazoumé (France) should be appointed Rapporteur.

(6) This proposal was adopted unanimously.

(7) The delegates of Cambodia, the Dominican Republic and France thanked the Committee for the honour it had just done them.

(8) In reply to a remark by Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) concerning the procedure for studying the reports submitted to the Committee for examination, the CHAIRMAN observed that that was a question to be discussed at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

# SECOND MEETING

*13 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA** (document 8C/DIV/24)

(1) The agenda was adopted without comment.

**ITEM 10.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS PRESENTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1952-53**

(2) The CHAIRMAN said that the Conference had provided eight meetings for the accomplishment of the Committee's work Fifty of the reports had been submitted within the prescribed time and appeared, in the three working languages, in the printed documents 8C/4; five had been received subsequently and appeared as roneographed documents 8C/4 in the original language only. Another one (Denmark) had just been received and was being reproduced, also in its original language. Although not obliged to do so by the resolution adopted by the General Conference at its seventh session, the Committee might nevertheless wish to examine those last reports.

(3) Mr. FRANCOVICH (Director of the Regional Office for the Western Hemisphere) said that the Director-General would be unable to be present, as he had to attend another meeting, and had appointed Mr Francovich as his representative.
(4) He went on to say that the Secretariat had just received the report from Poland and asked whether it was to be mimeographed.

(5) The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to decide whether it wished to discuss all the reports, including that submitted by the Government of Poland, which was in French.

(6) Mr McCULLOUGH (United States of America), supported by Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom), proposed that the Committee should discuss both the printed reports and the roneographed reports, including the one from the Polish Government.

(7) The proposal was adopted.

(8) In reply to the delegate of the United States of America, the CHAIRMAN said that it would not be possible for the roneographed reports to be translated in time, they would have to be studied in their original language.

(9) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom), referring to the question of distribution of work, suggested that the Committee be divided into five small groups, arranged so as not to contain representatives of the countries whose reports were to be discussed.

(10) Mr. FRANCOVICH (representing the Director-General) said that on previous occasions work had been divided among working groups. Member States' reports had been split up into groups as follows: two for English ones, two for French ones and one for Spanish ones. The same system, already used at other Conference meetings and which had given good results, could be adopted on that occasion

(11) The CHAIRMAN asked whether members had all read the reports, or whether it was considered advisable to set up the working groups proposed by the delegate of the United Kingdom. He drew attention to the plan of work (document 8C/DIV/24) which was being distributed.

(12) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that he had read the reports, but only in a general way. He thought that the Committee's work would be most useful to the Conference if the reports were studied in detail by working groups.

(13) The CHAIRMAN asked members to state the languages in which they wished to work.
(14) The indications given were as follows

| | |
|---|---|
| Austria - absent | Iraq - English |
| Cambodia - French | Luxembourg - absent |
| Dominican Republic - Spanish | Turkey - absent |
| | South Africa - English |
| Ecuador - Spanish | U.S.A. - English |
| France - French | U.K. - English |

(15) As there were 4 English-speaking, 2 French-speaking and 2 Spanish-speaking delegates, it was agreed to set up two English working groups and one each in French and Spanish.

(16) The CHAIRMAN invited the working groups to indicate which reports they wished to study.

(17) On the suggestion of Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) it was agreed that the Secretariat should allocate the reports among the working groups. Each member would have about eight reports to study.

(18) Mr. FRANCOVICH (representing the Director-General) said that the plan had been prepared on the basis of experience gained at previous sessions of the General Conference.
(19) That plan, which could be divided into two parts, would comprise: (A) Factual considerations and form of the reports (a) date received, (b) conformity with the proposed plan (c) general presentation of the

reports, and (B) Content of the reports, in which the distribution of subjects was set forth in accordance with Unesco's activities in different fields. Consequently, the plan laid down the dividing up of reports by subjects, Education, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Cultural Activities, etc.
(20) The activities of the national and the co-operative organizations were also being studied.
(21) Furthermore, the plan laid down the form and content of future reports, and the Committee could make recommendations to improve their usefulness.
(22) He considered that the reports submitted by the working groups should not exceed one page.

(23) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) wanted an item of the work programme to be more precisely indicated. Would the Committee study all subjects country by country, or would it study all the reports taken together subject by subject?

(24) Mr. FRANCOVICH (representing the Director-General) said that, in the past, working groups had referred each report back to the Committee, but that their final report was, naturally, a general report.

(25) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that the delegate of Cambodia had raised an important point. It was essential for the Committee to have a purpose and to know whether the object of its report was to inform the General Conference or to guide it in its decisions on Unesco's work for the coming two years. If the report were only for the purpose of information, the Committee would in effect be redoing the work of the Secretariat, which had already made summaries of the more important parts of the reports.
(26) What he had in mind was that the Committee might, by extracting certain guiding principles from the reports, offer conclusions which would be of real use to the General Conference. There were no doubt many domains in which such action would be useful, but an outstanding example was the development of National Commissions, on which most of the reports had commented.
(27) The working groups would do better and more effective work if they knew exactly what their task was.

(28) The CHAIRMAN asked the Director-General's representative to comment on the United States delegate's remarks, which had raised an important question concerning the plan of work.

(29) Mr. FRANCOVICH (Representative of the Director-General) considered that a plan of work such as was discussed by the delegations of Cambodia and the United States of America would be very useful. In addition to the reports, recommendations ought to be submitted; they would prove very useful for the future. The Secretariat welcomed with genuine interest the suggestions made by Cambodia and the United States of America.

(30) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) asked the Director-General's representative to clear up one point in the proposed plan of work, under Section II appeared recommendations by the Committee concerning the form and content of future reports, and he asked whether that system also enabled recommendations to be made about future activities.

(31) The CHAIRMAN, replying to the delegate of Cambodia, said that it would be in order for such recommendations to be made in the Committee's final report to the General Conference, the word "content" being understood in its broadest sense.

(32) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) said that it would follow from previous statements that each working group should keep certain basic questions in mind. Taking the development of National Commissions as an example, the questions might be:
1. Was the National Commission representative of the main educational, scientific and cultural interests?
2. Was there contact between the National Commission and Unesco?
3. Was the National Commission doing anything to interest the educated public at large in the work of Unesco?
4. What had the National Commission done to advance the main purposes of Unesco?
(33) That method would help the groups in judging the reports and making practical suggestions concerning Unesco's future work.

(34) Mr. FRANCOVICH (Representative of the Director-General) said that reports of Member States should deal with the most important aspects of the work carried out.
(35) As an example, he mentioned the report presented by the United States of America, which contained specific data concerning that country's ratification of various international agreements. That type of information was particularly useful for helping the Committee in its work.
(36) In the same way, reports submitted by Member States should contain suggestions tending to facilitate the carrying into effect of resolutions adopted.

(37) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) appreciated the comments of the Director-General's representative, but re-emphasized the need for a plan of work which would ensure the best and most effective results. He shared the views of the United Kingdom delegate, whose remarks had raised in his mind a question which the Committee might like to consider: whether the Committee served a useful purpose or whether it would be better in future to rely on the Secretariat's summaries of reports. He asked whether it would be possible for the Secretariat to prepare a memorandum setting out first the purpose of the Committee's work, which had never been clearly defined, and then some guiding questions on the lines of the United Kingdom delegate's suggestions.

(38) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) entirely agreed with the opinions expressed by the United States and United Kingdom delegates.

(39) Mr. FRANCOVICH (Representative of the

Director-General) considered that, as far as the aims of the Committee on Reports of Member States were concerned, resolution 30.214 approved at the fifth session of the General Conference, should be read out.

(40) Sir Kenneth GRUBB (United Kingdom) proposed that the Secretariat should prepare a paper on the lines already suggested and submit it to the next meeting. It would then be possible for the working groups to be set up and start work immediately.

(41) The proposal was seconded by Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) and adopted.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

# THIRD MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 10.30 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

**ITEM 10.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS PRESENTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1952-53** (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN said that following the decision taken at the previous meeting, a list had been prepared (document 8C/DIV/75) naming the members of the working groups and the reports which each would have to study. He proposed that the delegate of Turkey, who had just arrived, be included in the French-speaking group The paper was before the Committee for comment.

(2) In reply to a question from the delegate of France, the CHAIRMAN said that each group was free to arrange its own methods of work.

(3) Document 8C/DIV/75 was approved without further comment.

(4) Mr. FRANCOVICH (Representative of the Director-General) announced that the report from the Government of Brazil had just been received and asked whether the Committee was prepared to accept it as it had the other reports which arrived after the prescribed date.

(5) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey), speaking as former Chairman of the Committee, proposed that the report be accepted, in accordance with the practice followed at the previous session of the General Conference.

(6) The proposal was seconded by the delegate of the United States of America and adopted.

(7) The CHAIRMAN said that the report was in English and would accordingly be assigned to one of the English-speaking groups.

(8) He drew attention to the typewritten document which the Secretariat had prepared following the statements by the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States of America on the purpose and task of the Committee.

(9) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) complimented the Secretariat on the document and said that it would help to secure uniformity of the working groups' reports.

(10) The document was approved.

(11) The CHAIRMAN announced that the next meeting of the Committee was due to take place on Wednesday 17 November at 3.30 p.m. He asked whether that would give the working groups enough time to prepare their reports, and pointed out that it would not be necessary for all of them to be ready for that meeting.

(12) Mr. TERAN ROBALINO (Ecuador) considered the time too short and asked if the meeting could be postponed until Thursday or Friday.

(13) Mr. HAZOUME (France) asked whether the meeting could be deferred until Friday, as his group had sixteen reports to study

(14) The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had informed him that, for administrative reasons, a meeting could be held on Thursday but not on Friday.

(15) Mr. TERAN ROBALINO (Ecuador) said that the report of the Spanish-speaking group could be ready by Thursday.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.

# FOURTH MEETING

*18 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

**ITEM 10.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS PRESENTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1952-53** (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN called on the delegate of Ecuador to present his observations on the reports submitted by the Spanish-speaking Member States.

(2) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) suggested that it would be more convenient that delegates belonging to the same working parties should sit together during the discussion of the various Member States' reports. The Committee could revert to its normal seating arrangements, in alphabetical order, for the general discussion of the final draft report.

(3) That suggestion was seconded by Mr. HAZOUME (France) and was approved unanimously.

(4) Mr. TERAN ROBALINO (Ecuador) said that, in compliance with the recommendation of the delegates from the Spanish-speaking countries, three reports had been drawn up on the reports submitted by the Spanish-speaking Member States:

(1) That submitted by the delegate of the Dominican Republic on the reports of Chile and Ecuador;

(2) That submitted by the same delegate on the reports of Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic;

(3) That submitted by the delegates of Ecuador and the Dominican Republic on the reports of the other Spanish-speaking countries.

Each of the reports had been rearranged under three main heads:

(a) Structure and layout

(b) Contents

(c) Conclusions

(5) Mr. Teran Robalino then read out the reports on Argentina, Colombia, Cuba, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, El Salvador, Spain and Uruguay. He added that the conclusions drawn from them were as follows:

(6) With regard to Argentina, it was most desirable that in future the reports from that progressive South American country should conform as closely as possible to the mutually agreed layout so as to enable the Organization to appreciate to what extent that country was adhering to and collaborating in Unesco's programme.

(7) One point which should be specially brought out was the effort to make education more democratic by the use of certain fundamental measures such as free education from the kindergarten to the university. Similarly, the educational reforms introduced by the Argentine Government deserved a special mention, they bore chiefly on matters in the social and professional field and represented a valuable contribution to Unesco's lofty aims.

(8) With regard to Colombia, mention should be made of that country's brilliant collaboration in the attainment of Unesco's high objectives. The working party considered that the legitimate aspirations conveyed by Colombia in its report should receive the most favourable consideration possible.

(9) The Cuban report left a favourable impression and testified to that country's genuine desire for closer relations with Unesco. Attention should be directed to the work of the Autonomous National Commission, an experiment that would undoubtedly fulfil the hopes inspired by that sort of organization.

(10) Special attention should be drawn to the importance of the report submitted by Spain, being the first which that country had presented as a Member State of Unesco. It bore witness to the significance attached by Spain to its relations with Unesco. Spain's contribution would be a valuable one having regard to its cultural heritage and tradition which had survived every change of fortune and persisted throughout the centuries. Spain's achievements since its recent entry into Unesco were of the highest significance, and its report afforded clear testimony of its intention of co-operating in Unesco's lofty aims.

(11) Haiti had given a particularly important place to Unesco activities. Every encouragement should be given to that country's efforts on behalf of culture, education and science at the national level.

(12) The report submitted by Honduras clearly brought out that country's anxiety to collaborate in Unesco's aims. It should receive more and more encouragement for the energetic action it was taking to that end.

(13) In Mexico praiseworthy progress could be recorded, and a clear account emerged of that country's valuable contribution to Unesco's objectives.

(14) Nicaragua should be recommended to make its future reports more explicit and complete, particularly having regard to the goodwill shown by that country in its relations with Unesco.

(15) Panama should in future submit reports in accordance with the proposed layout, and it should include a full, if summary, review of the various measures adopted with regard to Unesco programmes, agreements and conventions.

(16) The suggestions made to Panama should be repeated in the case of El Salvador.

(17) Uruguay's valuable contribution to Unesco's objectives deserved the fullest appreciation. The increasingly good relations between that progressive country and Unesco called for special mention.
(18) Mr. Teran Robalino suggested that the present session of the General Conference should congratulate the Government of Uruguay on having formed the Specialized Commissions which had done so much to facilitate the work of the Executive Committee of the National Commission in preparing for the eighth session of the General Conference. The Specialized Commissions also should be congratulated on the excellence of their services and their efficient collaboration in organizing the work of the Conference.

(19) That suggestion of the delegate of Ecuador was seconded by the delegate of the Dominican Republic.

(20) The CHAIRMAN, after thanking the delegate of Ecuador for his report, said that a few Spanish-speaking countries remained to be reported on at the afternoon meeting, at which the Committee would doubtless wish to consider the suggestions made by the delegate of Ecuador in connexion with the report by Uruguay

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

# FIFTH MEETING

*18 November 1954 at 3.45 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

**ITEM 10.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS PRESENTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1952-53** (continued)

(1) The CHAIRMAN declared the meeting open and said that the reports submitted by the delegates of Ecuador and the Dominican Republic would now be heard; those were the reports dealing with the last of the Member States' reports which the Spanish-language working party had been appointed to study.

(2) Mr. TERAN ROBALINO (Ecuador) submitted the report by the delegate of the Dominican Republic dealing with the Member State reports from Chile and Ecuador. He also presented his own report on the reports from Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic. The conclusions were as follows:
(3) Chile had shown goodwill in implementing the programme proposed. However, it should be recommended to submit fuller reports.
(4) As regarded Ecuador, projects should be stimulated, particularly in the national field.
(5) Costa Rica had carried out useful activities.
(6) The Dominican Republic, according to its report, was making "real conquests in the field of education", and future reports should deal with all points connected with Unesco's programme, agreements and conventions.

(7) The CHAIRMAN thanked the delegates of Ecuador and the Dominican Republic for their reports. He asked the Committee whether it would prefer to hold a discussion after each group of reports, or wait until they had all been heard. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the debate would take place on 29 November, when all reports had been submitted and, if necessary, a further meeting could be held between that date and 6 December, when the final report was to be drawn up for presentation to the General Conference.

(8) Miss BISHOP (United Kingdom) presented the comments of the first English-speaking group on the reports of the following Member States:
Afghanistan
(9) The report did not follow the proposed plan and dealt principally with the general state of education in the country, emphasizing the need for assistance from "foreign organizations". Although assistance from Unesco had been limited, Afghanistan was grateful for the few measures already taken in various fields.
(10) Afghanistan, Miss Bishop noted, had taken part in the regional education conference in New Delhi, and in the scientific conference at Karachi.
(11) Assistance might be assumed to be needed in the training of National Commission personnel and in the execution of programme activities. Public relations were of lesser importance.
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
(12) No information was given on the ratification of international conventions and very little about the implementation of Unesco resolutions.
(13) Unesco was criticized for lack of assistance to that Member State. The only project in which the Organization collaborated was the women's training college. The Courier had been actively distributed, but dissatisfaction had been felt over an article on Israel. Jordan also regretted the cancellation of the Regional Conference of National Commissions.
(14) Up to the present, the Ministry of Education had acted as National Commission, but the creation of a new National Commission, of which the Minister of Education would be Chairman, had been discussed

with the Unesco External Relations Officer for the Middle East.

Korea

(15) Three agreements were at present being studied: the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials, the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, and the Convention on the International Computation Centre.

(16) No specific information was given on the implementation of Unesco resolutions.

(17) The report contained useful general information on educational reconstruction, but it was not always easy to perceive how much had been done by the Government alone, and how much in combination with the Specialized Agencies. Korea was, however, concerned with international understanding, the exchange of persons, and the preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind. It was trying to reduce obstacles to the free flow of information. A serious need was felt for translations of the world's classics.

(18) General educational reconstruction had been assisted by Unesco. The National Commission had been organized in January 1954 with a Government grant. It had 60 members, 35 being appointed by organizations designated by the Minister of Education, and the others directly by him. The Minister was Chairman.

Libya

(19) The report contained much interesting information on the general development of education in the country, but that did not concern Unesco in the executive sense. Special reference was made to the Education Act of 1952, and to the conclusion in 1953 of a Cultural Agreement between Libya and Egypt.

(20) No information was given on the ratification of international agreements, on the implementation of Unesco resolutions or on the National Commission.

Philippines

(21) The Philippines had previously ratified the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials. They had now adopted Act No. 871 on tax exemption. Some efforts had been made with regard to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character. The Philippines was not a signatory to the Universal Copyright Convention adopted in Geneva in 1952.

(22) Interesting but incomplete information was given on the implementation of Unesco resolutions.

(23) The National Commission had been fully re-established in 1951-1952 with a Government subsidy of 100,000 pesos and a staff of 11. It published the Philippine Unesco News.

(24) The report, Miss Bishop concluded, gave a general impression of renewed activity and interest, but contained no complete information on the specific planning and execution of programme activities. Nothing was said about public relations.

Thailand

(25) No information was given on the ratification of international agreements. As to the implementation of Unesco resolutions, close co-operation existed between Thailand and Unesco, which had been cemented by the recent visit of the Director-General, Sir Ronald Adam and other members of the Executive Board. On that occasion a service contract had been signed, establishing a research and training centre in educational psychology.

(26) The report included much material on general educational development, including adult education.

(27) The National Commission had taken an active part in the promotion of the Unesco programme.

(28) The report, Miss Bishop concluded, gave the impression of very fruitful co-operation between Thailand and Unesco. Probably it would be best to leave existing measures to mature before further advances were planned on a large scale.

German Federal Republic

(29) Preparatory steps had been taken for that country's accession to the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials. A law allowing accession to the Universal Copyright Convention was to be submitted in due course. Germany was prepared to accede to the Agreement on the Establishment of the European Organization for Nuclear Research. It had shared in the preparatory work on the International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

(30) The report, Miss Bishop stated, gave the impression of considerable activity, much of which had developed only recently.

(31) The National Commission had held a conference in January 1952 with the Director-General of Unesco. It had set itself three initial tasks: the development of public libraries, the production of an international book of folk songs, and the improvement of school textbooks. Co-operation with Unesco headquarters had increased considerably and relations had been established with it by several government departments.

(32) The National Commission pleaded for the employment of more Germans in the Secretariat.

(33) Finally, the report contained full information on the structure and activities of the National Commission.

India

(34) The Visual and Auditory Materials Convention was under consideration. It had not been possible to ratify the Importation Agreement. The Computation Centre Agreement was under study and, with regard to the Copyright Convention, India was considering the introduction of a bill to amend the existing law.

(35) The accent in the report was on the implementation of the Unesco programme, of which a detailed account was given in the various fields.

(36) The National Commission had been put on a permanent footing in 1952. It had three sub-committees devoted to education, science and culture respectively. The Executive Board consisted of 11 members.

(37) In general, Miss Bishop concluded, India gave proof of great interest in Unesco. The need was felt, however, for more than the aid of experts. An Educational Development Fund was required, and the Fundamental Education Programme was in need of revision and enlargement. The significance and purpose of natural sciences should be more widely popularized. Unesco, too, was in need of decentralization, and should devote more of its attention to creating a better appreciation of Eastern culture, particularly of Eastern classics. It would seem that the whole relation of Unesco to India would benefit from very careful study, in view of the importance of India in Asia, and of the

interest that country had taken in Unesco.
Netherlands
(38) The report mentioned signature of the Copyright Convention and contained information on the implementation of Unesco resolutions.
(39) The National Commission was clearly very active. The Netherlands Unesco Centre, working under its auspices, dealt with problems of mass communication. It issued press releases, published a monthly news bulletin and promoted the sale of Unesco publications.
(40) The Netherlands acknowledged assistance from Unesco after the flood disaster. Money raised by the Gift Coupon Scheme had aided educational reconstruction.
(41) The working party, Miss Bishop concluded, stressed the importance of a statement made in the report to the effect that it was found difficult to present Unesco to the general public as a living reality. The Netherlands felt that the Centre should devote its attention to forming an improved information service.
New Zealand
(42) New Zealand had decided not to sign the Visual and Auditory Materials Agreement, but its ratification of the Importation Convention was expected in the near future; the Copyright Convention was being considered.
(43) Interesting information was given on the implementation of Unesco resolutions.
(44) The National Commission was mainly concerned with stabilizing work done in the different fields.
Union of South Africa
(45) The attitude of this Member State to the Visual and Auditory Materials Convention was not clearly stated. It had been decided not to sign the Computation Centre Agreement. The Union of South Africa, being a member of the Berne Convention, did not feel bound to sign the Copyright Convention.
(46) Unesco resolutions had been implemented in various fields (education, natural science and cultural activities).
(47) The South African National Commission was still an interim body. It worked largely through the National Advisory Council for Adult Education and its standing committees for arts, science, adult education and physical education. There was little public interest in the work and purposes of Unesco.
Indonesia
(48) Although the Importation Convention had not been signed, facilities had been granted for the importation of scientific equipment. The Copyright Convention had not yet been adequately considered by the National Commission. The Government was in favour of joining the Berne Convention.
(49) As to implementation of Unesco resolutions, close co-operation was kept up with Unesco through the Unesco Affairs Section of the Ministry of Education. The National Commission did not however keep Unesco sufficiently informed of operations. Several Unesco officials had visited the country. Unesco's help was found particularly useful over technical assistance.
(50) The National Commission, formed in 1951, now consisted of 33 members, under the chairmanship of the Minister of Education.
(51) Some work had been done to promote understanding of the United Nations and of Human Rights.

(52) The CHAIRMAN thanked the delegate of the United Kingdom for the report, which, although nominally representing the joint work of the Iraqi and United Kingdom delegations, had been produced entirely by herself.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

# SIXTH MEETING

*22 November 1954 at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

**ITEM 10.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS PRESENTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1952-53** (continued)

(1) Mr. HAZOUME (France) said that, having been chosen to submit to the Committee observations on the reports from Cambodia, Laos, Lebanon, Viet-Nam and Poland, he had decided that the best method was to take each section of the plan sent to Member States in December 1953 (CL/867, Annex) and to make a statement on the activities of the first four States under each section. As the document sent by Poland differed substantially from the others, it would be presented separately. He was therefore submitting his report in six sections as follows:
I. Introductory comments (Unesco membership of each State).
II. Information concerning the efforts made by each Member State concerned, in the fields of education, science and culture.
III. The international conventions accepted by those States either officially or unofficially during the period 1952-53, and the efforts they had made to give effect to international recommendations.
IV. Action taken to implement the resolutions of the Unesco programme, with its sub-sections on education,

exchange of persons, natural sciences, social sciences, cultural activities and mass communication.
V. National Commissions and all other co-operating bodies, and their activities.
VI. Measures taken on behalf of organizations other than those recognized by Unesco to associate them in the execution of the Unesco programme.
(2) In the second part of his remarks, dealing with the report submitted by Poland, the French delegate said that that country, which had been a foundation member of Unesco, had later suspended and only very recently resumed its collaboration. In his opinion, its most recent report was much more a document containing information on Poland's activities in the educational, scientific and cultural fields, than a report sent in reply to the Director-General's request in accordance with the proposed plan.
(3) By way of concluding his analysis of the reports, he said that, while they fulfilled their purpose, they gave few or no particulars at all under certain headings which Unesco rightly regarded as very important. That remark applied especially to the Polish report.
(4) He drew special attention to the relative silence concerning mass communication questions.
(5) He considered that the reports did not adhere closely enough to the plan proposed for their preparation, with the result that the information supplied was sometimes confused or obscure.
(6) Generally, he thought that the Secretariat should do some preliminary work on the reports so as to produce an overall picture of the various activities listed in them, in relation to Unesco's general and special activities.
(7) That was the method of work he had himself adopted for the reports he had examined, but he feared the drafting of the Committee's general report would not be lightened by the fact that other rapporteurs had felt constrained to submit their observations on each report individually, that being the method employed by previous committees.

(8) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia), submitting the reports presented by Austria, Greece, Iran, Syria and Turkey, said that his method had been to deal with each report section by section in accordance with the following scheme:
I. Structure and layout of the report;
II. Content of the report (comprising in whole or in part the sections proposed by the Director-General);
III. His own conclusions.
(9) He thought that from the Austrian report there emerged an impression of hard work and of optimism as to the future relations between that country and Unesco. The recommendations and general resolutions of the sixth and seventh sessions of the General Conference had been put into effect, the National Commission was active and well organized.
(10) The report showed that Austria was taking more and more interest in its membership of Unesco, and an effort of that kind for revival of cultural activities immediately after a destructive war deserved every encouragement.
(11) The report from Greece contained important and fairly complete information on the progress achieved. It showed that the Greek Ministry of Education had been very active, but there was nothing to indicate to the General Conference the extent, unquestionably considerable, of the Ministry's collaboration in Unesco's work.
(12) The report on Iran conformed by and large to the plan proposed by the Director-General. It set out in six sections the activities of the National Commission and its sub-committees in giving effect to the different points in the Unesco programme.
(13) He considered that Iran's effective collaboration in Unesco's work was due to the essentially sound organization of its National Commission, the Iranian Government's resolute co-operation, and the support given by cultural and social organizations.
(14) The Syrian report followed the proposed plan fairly closely and gave a general picture of Syria's participation in Unesco's work; it also gave particulars concerning the implementation of certain parts of the programme.
(15) He thought that Syria and Unesco should be in even closer contact than at present in the implementation of the General Conference's resolutions.
(16) The Turkish report was, generally speaking, in accordance with the plan suggested by the Secretariat, and certain of the five chief sections with which it dealt were adequately developed.
(17) The Secretariat should make a special note of the particularly satisfactory results achieved by the Turkish National Commission, whose close collaboration with the Unesco Secretariat promised to be even more fecund in the future. It was to be hoped that the National Commissions of the other countries would achieve similar results and that they would be helped to do so by even more watchful attention on the part of the Secretariat, as had been the case in Turkey during the implementation of certain points in the regular programme and the Expanded Technical Assistance Programme.

(18) The CHAIRMAN thanked the delegates of France and Cambodia for their detailed analyses of the reports.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

# SEVENTH MEETING

*23 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

**ITEM 10.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS PRESENTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1952-53 (continued)**

(1) The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting and invited the delegate of Turkey to present his statement on the six reports with whose study he had been entrusted - those of Belgium, France, Italy, Monaco, Switzerland and Yugoslavia.

(2) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) first expressed the satisfaction he had felt upon reading those reports, which, in their form and content, adhered generally to the plan proposed by the Director-General and to the recommendations of the Committee.
(3) The Belgian report - which might be criticized for exceeding the number of pages prescribed - showed very clearly that the Belgian public displayed interest in Unesco whenever the latter intervened in a field of practical interest which demanded international action. Thus an understanding of Unesco's objectives and activities had been greatly promoted in Belgium by the creation of bodies like the European Organization for Nuclear Research, or by the organization of meetings such as the International Conference on the Rôle and Place of Music in the Education of Youth and Adults.
(4) Mr. Tuncel stated that, in the field of fundamental education, the efforts made by Belgium, France, Italy and Yugoslavia merited special attention. Thus, the fundamental education work carried out by Belgium in the Congo and Ruanda-Urundi deserved the highest praise. France, too, had tackled the problem courageously. The Fundamental Education Sub-Committee of the National Commission was particularly active, and fundamental education experiments in the French territories of Central Africa had finally resulted in the creation, in French West Africa, of the Centre fédéral d'éducation de base (Federal Fundamental Education Centre) at Dakar. The efforts made in Italy by the Italian Central Committee for Popular Education to develop reading centres, and to set up national and provincial information centres for adults, also deserved notice. A special committee for fundamental education and the study of its social and cultural problems had been set up within the Italian National Commission, independently of the Adult Education Committee which had proved very effective. Lastly, Mr. Tuncel said, note had to be taken of the efforts of the sub-committee set up within the Yugoslav National Commission to deal with all fundamental and adult education problems.
(5) Mr. Tuncel then passed to the question of education for living in a world community, in connexion with which steps of many different kinds had been taken in Belgium; those steps were bound to help very considerably in spreading and extending a spirit of international understanding. In that context Mr. Tuncel recalled that it was Mr. Verniers who had taken the Chair in July 1953 at the Expert Committee which had been convened at Unesco House to study the principles and methods of education for living in a world community.
(6) The French National Commission had for its part issued a certain number of publications which might prove very useful for instruction about living in a world community; the Italian National Commission had also helped in developing international understanding, and particularly in bringing Italian and foreign youth closer together, by presenting a collection of children's drawings from some sixty countries.
(7) In the same field, it should be mentioned, continued Mr. Tuncel, that 5,000 copies of an issue of the Courier devoted to Human Rights (December 1953) were distributed through the good offices of the Swiss National Commission. On the occasion of Human Rights Day, 10 December, that Commission had also granted subventions to certain educational reviews, which made it possible for them to publish special numbers. In Yugoslavia, Mr. Tuncel added, measures had also been taken with a view to improving teaching about the United Nations and Human Rights.
(8) Mr. Tuncel went on to say that very useful work had been done, in the six countries under consideration, to assist the teaching and dissemination of science. In that respect he made special mention of the activities of the Commission scientifique des programmes (Scientific Programme Committee) under the chairmanship of Mr. P. Rivet, and of the Comité scientifique (Science Committee) under the chairmanship of Professor Laugier. He particularly drew members' attention to the value of the national and international symposia which had been organized in 1953 by the Centre national de la recherche scientifique (National Centre for Scientific Research). As regarded the popularization of science, the efforts made during that same year by the Palais de la Découverte and the French Broadcasting and Television Service could also be quoted as examples.
(9) In the case of Belgium, Mr. Tuncel continued, the following were the principal facts to be mentioned with regard to the teaching and dissemination of science: publication of a guide for the preparation of authors' abstracts, ratification of the Convention establishing an International Computation Centre, and of the agreement setting up a Council of

Representatives of European States for Nuclear Research; and measures taken by the National Association of Mathematics Teachers, the History of Science Museum at Ghent, the Science Club at Liège, the Royal Natural Science Institute and the Zoological Garden at Antwerp, for the popularization of science.

(10) Yugoslavia had for its part contributed usefully to the development of international scientific co-operation by publishing, in two of Unesco's working languages, a review giving a general idea of scientific activity in that country. Finally, in Monaco the National Commission was at present examining the desirability of drawing up multilingual dictionaries of terms used in oceanography, palaeontology and exotic botany.

(11) In the field of cultural activities, the six countries under consideration had done much brilliant work calculated to promote international co-operation. Thus, in 1953, Belgium had set up a National Music Council and a National Council for the Visual Arts. A Belgian theatre centre had also been formed to act as an international information service. The travelling exhibitions prepared by Unesco had been shown in approximately 50 places in Belgium during the last two years. Lastly, the first International Poetry Biennale, held at Knokke in September 1952, had brought together two hundred poets from thirty countries.

(12) In France, Mr. Tuncel continued, the National Commission had given generous aid to international organizations endeavouring to bring about collaboration between the various countries in cultural activities and humanistic studies. The authorities also wished to enable all sections of the French population to participate in the community's cultural life, and for that purpose they sought to develop rural community centres, youth and culture hostels, radio clubs, ciné-clubs and, above all, regional drama centres.

(13) Mr. Tuncel then enumerated the chief events to which Italy's keen interest in cultural activities had given rise: the reception in Venice of the International Conference of Artists; the creation of the National Committee of Visual Arts; the making of colour reproductions of a certain number of characteristic works painted, since 1860, by Italian artists; the organization of lending library services in the provinces, and the formation of a National Bibliographical Committee.

(14) Mr. Tuncel observed that the interest which H.S.H. Prince Peter of Monaco took in arts and letters had particularly encouraged the development of cultural activities in Monaco; the literary prize "Rainier III" was still awarded every year.

(15) Mr. Tuncel mentioned the creation in Yugoslavia of a vast network of cultural and artistic societies, which, through the organization of choral singing and concerts, helped to raise the level of the whole population's artistic education. He also stressed the very important part played by the Yugoslav Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. That Commission had assisted a large number of Yugoslav painters to exhibit a selection of their works abroad. It had also been responsible for sending to foreign capitals the magnificent national ballets from Belgrade and Zagreb.

(16) Mr. Tuncel concluded that the six countries in question could be regarded as having implemented Unesco's programme very satisfactorily, and that in each of them the National Commission had duly performed its tasks as a body for advice and liaison.

(17) Having recognized that the account he had just given could furnish no more than a general picture of the activities undertaken in those countries in the various fields of interest to Unesco, Mr. Tuncel said he wished to inform the Committee of two suggestions which he had received from the Italian National Commission.

(18) That Commission desired, in the first place, that the International Social Science Bulletin should devote more space to legal questions; in particular, it suggested that Unesco should enlist a certain number of legal experts to make, for publication in the Bulletin, studies on the constitutional crises of our time.

(19) Secondly, with regard to Unesco Coupons, the Italian National Commission mentioned that the dilatoriness shown by certain suppliers in sending the books which had been ordered from them was likely to harm the system by discouraging buyers. The Commission therefore suggested that the necessary steps should be taken to remedy that situation.

(20) The CHAIRMAN called upon the representative of the United States of America to present his report.

(21) Mr. CONNORS (United States of America) said that Mr. McCullough, who was the Executive Secretary of the United States National Commission, regretted that the Commission had been unable to submit the report of the United States of America in time for it to be included with the reports of the other Member States in the printed volume (document 8C/4). Mr. McCullough was unfortunately detained in the Working Party on Decentralization and had asked Mr. Connors to take his place in presenting to the Committee the brief report he had prepared.

(22) Mr. Connors then proceeded, on behalf of Mr. McCullough, to present to the Committee a brief account of the reports of Australia, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom, which were in close conformity with the form and structure requested by the Director-General, and on the report of the Union of Burma. The latter provided interesting data on the remarkable progress in Burma in the extension of education at all levels, on the participation of Burmese representatives in Unesco conferences, and on certain projects in Burma receiving Unesco assistance. It did not, however, conform to the outline suggested by the Director-General, nor did it make clear to what extent its educational programme related to Unesco and its programme.

(23) The report of Australia could be cited as a model of conciseness and relevance to the Unesco programme. It stressed the benefits Australia had derived from participation in Unesco seminars, conferences and meetings of experts, to which representatives of Australia themselves had made substantial contributions. The Government or the National Advisory Committee for Unesco had organized regional and national conferences to extend

to a wider audience an understanding of the matters discussed at Unesco conferences. The report revealed Government and National Advisory Committee initiative in undertaking projects responsive to Unesco resolutions. An example was the preparation of a travelling exhibition of Australian Aboriginal culture, which was received with great interest in the United States of America and which would soon be available to other countries.
(24) The report suggested that more Unesco projects should be designed so as to allow a larger measure of co-operation by National Commissions.
(25) The report of Canada stressed the development of closer co-operation with Unesco, the assistance given by national organizations in carrying out work related to Unesco's aims, and "growing public consciousness in Canada of the importance of the arts". Examples of that upsurge of interest in the arts were included in the report. The difficulty of complying with some of the requests received from the Secretariat were set out.
(26) The absence of a National Commission in Canada was mentioned as one handicap, but recognition was given to the generous support of co-operating agencies and organizations.
(27) The report of Denmark stressed the action undertaken to implement Unesco resolutions and provided useful information about the Danish National Commission.
(28) The report indicated notable progress in the development of bilateral studies of textbooks. It described several activities to make Unesco better known in Denmark, especially through projects offering an opportunity for popular participation, such as the Unesco group travel plans and the coupon programme.
(29) The report of Japan indicated unusual activity closely related to resolutions of the General Conference. Japan had undertaken important exchanges of art exhibitions with a number of other Member States, and great interest had been aroused in Japan by travelling exhibitions prepared by Unesco.
(30) Education for international understanding, including programmes both for children and adults, was a matter of particular interest. Public knowledge of Unesco had been promoted through publications, seminars and the use of the media of mass communication. Japan had been an active participant in Unesco seminars and conferences, both as host and by sending its experts to meetings in other parts of the world.
(31) The Japanese National Commission was an effective participant in those activities. It was well organized and well staffed, with a recognized rôle in promoting both specialized and popular interest in Unesco's work.
(32) The report of Norway indicated the establishment of a permanent secretariat to the National Commission during the 1952-53 period and an extensive and balanced attention to the wide range of work in which Unesco was engaged.
(33) A lively interest in education for living in a world community was indicated by the number and variety of projects undertaken in that field.
(34) A number of Norwegian workers participated in Unesco group travel schemes during the period. Particular mention should be made of progress in Norway in the field of applied social sciences, an area of work mentioned by few Member States.
(35) The report of Sweden recalled that its National Commission was responsible for all official relations with Unesco. Thus its report was largely an account of activities carried out under the auspices of the National Commission, which had the status of a governmental body under the Ministry of Education. Those activities included projects in almost every field of Unesco's interest. Sweden, like a number of other countries, had associated with its work a large number of non-governmental national organizations, and was increasingly informing its people about the work of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies through every medium of mass communication.
(36) The report of the United Kingdom provided an excellent example of the ways in which a highly developed country benefited from its participation in Unesco, while at the same time making major contributions to the implementation of Unesco's programme in other parts of the world.
(37) For example, Unesco's programme for international understanding stimulated the preparation of a new publication in the United Kingdom called Teaching for International Understanding. That publication was not only of value in the United Kingdom, but had served as a guide to certain other countries in the preparation of similar materials on teaching for international understanding.
(38) Another example was its participation in seminars and meetings of experts, both as host and by sending distinguished experts to meetings in other areas of the world.
(39) While the national bodies which co-operated with the National Commission of the United Kingdom had been generous in their interest and participation in Unesco work, the report pointed out the continuing lack of general public knowledge and appreciation of what Unesco was and what it was trying to do, and the National Commission accepted the responsibility for improving that situation.

(40) The CHAIRMAN called upon the representative of South Africa to present his report.

(41) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) said that the report of Ceylon showed a keen awareness of the necessity for disseminating information concerning the aims of Unesco and indicated that the problem was being energetically tackled. It was noted particularly that efforts had been made by the authorities in co-operation with the National Commission to include material on the United Nations and Unesco in the curriculum of both primary and secondary schools.
(42) The report of China showed that, in conformity with the Unesco programme for 1952-53, much progress had been made in education and the social sciences. Efforts were being made to spread knowledge of Unesco through the media of mass communication.
(43) The report of Egypt showed great activity in fundamental education. One of the most impressive developments in that field was the establishment of the first Arab States Fundamental Education Centre, the administration of which had been entrusted to

Unesco. Keen interest had been displayed in seminars and conferences. Much progress was also recorded in the field of adult education.
(44) The report of Iraq reflected the energetic efforts of the authorities to implement the aims of Unesco, more particularly in the field of primary education, where impressive results were being achieved. Iraq had shown great interest, and had participated, in almost every cultural conference and seminar organized by Unesco. With the help of a Unesco mission a vigorous approach had been made to the problems of adult and fundamental education.
(45) The report of Israel indicated the existence of a highly organized and very active National Commission. A particularly interesting aspect of its work was noted in connexion with the use of the media of mass communication to give publicity to the work and aims of Unesco.

(46) The CHAIRMAN thanked the representatives of Turkey, the United States of America and South Africa for their reports, which provided a valuable contribution to the study of the matter under consideration. The first stage of the Committee's work had been completed.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

# EIGHTH MEETING

*24 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

(1) The CHAIRMAN invited the delegate of the United States of America to introduce his proposals for the Committee's report.

(2) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) asked if he might first submit his comments on the report of the Brazilian Government.

**ITEM 10.2 OF REVISED AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS PRESENTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1952-53 (continued)**

(3) Mr. McCullough said that the report of the Brazilian Government which had been presented in six sections in accordance with the Director-General's suggestions, showed intensified co-operation between Brazil and the Secretariat of Unesco during the past two years. Of especial interest was an account of the efforts of the Brazilian Institute of Education, Science and Culture (which was acting as the National Commission) to publicize the Declaration of Human Rights. The work of the Institute had been greatly stimulated by visits from members of the Secretariat, in particular, the Director-General and the Assistant Director-General.
(4) The headquarters of the National Commission was set up in 1952, with a documentation service, and during that year the secretary had spent four months at Unesco headquarters. A budget had been provided for the secretariat of the National Commission since 1953.
(5) Activities included the issue of a monthly bulletin, a number of publications (listed in the report) and co-operation with commissions in other States of Brazil - an interesting experiment in State co-operation in a country with a decentralized government.
(6) The activities of the National Commission and the Brazilian Government on behalf of Unesco had shown a steady increase during the two years under review.

**ITEM 10.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: REPORT TO THE GENERAL CONFERENCE**

(7) Turning to the question of the Committee's report, Mr. McCullough said that the suggestions he had to offer were not intended as a draft, but were ideas which, if approved by the Committee, might serve as a basis for the Secretary and the Rapporteur in preparing the report. Their adoption would necessitate some modification of resolution 60 of the seventh session of the General Conference.

Form and Content of the Reports

(8) Mr. McCullough said that, in the first place, it was essential to find a more efficient method of work for the Committee. To that end he hoped that for the next General Conference the Secretariat would be able to prepare an analysis of the reports so that the Committee would not have to spend time on a detailed study of the individual reports but would be able to start immediately on its real task of formulating proposals to guide the Conference in framing policies relating to Member States.
(9) As to the form in which Member States should submit their next set of reports, he proposed that they should be in four main sections, with two obligatory annexes. The four sections would contain: (1) an introductory comment; (2) information

on action taken to implement the resolutions of the seventh and eighth sessions of the General Conference (formerly Section 4); (3) information on measures to establish, promote and assist the National Commission or other co-operating bodies, and a survey of their activities (formerly Section 5); (4) information on measures to assist and develop other organizations and associate the appropriate national groups or institutes with the execution of Unesco's programme (formerly Section 6). The obligatory annexes would deal with the most important changes in laws and regulations affecting education, science and culture (formerly Section 2); and action taken on international conventions and recommendations adopted by the General Conference (formerly Section 3).
(10) A specific outline should be provided by the Secretariat for those annexes in order to permit the Member States to submit their information in a uniform way, which would be of greatest use to the Secretariat and to each other.

(11) Miss BISHOP (United Kingdom) agreed that the task of the Committee was not to conduct a detailed examination of the reports, but to draw conclusions from them. She therefore supported the proposal that the Secretariat should be responsible for studying the reports and pointed out that a change of procedure for the Committee would be involved.

(12) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) thought that the Committee agreed in general with the United States proposals, which could be usefully inserted in the Committee's final report.
(13) He had however additional suggestions to make. The Committee might with advantage be enlarged, as he had already recommended on behalf of the Turkish delegation during the general discussion of the Director-General's report. The Committee should be in a position to play a more important rôle and give effective help to the Executive Board in drawing up the draft programme.
(14) Member States' reports were a valuable source of information on their real needs and should be taken into consideration in planning the draft programme. He was therefore in favour of increasing the membership of the Committee and widening its competence.

(15) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) seconded the Turkish delegate's proposals, since in his view the programme should primarily be based on Member States' reports. The Committee should perhaps meet a few days before the opening of the Conference, in accordance with the practice adopted for the Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.

(16) The CHAIRMAN asked for comments on the proposal of the Turkish delegate that the Committee's membership be increased and its powers extended.

(17) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) said that he entirely agreed with the proposals for increasing the membership of the Committee and adding to its powers.

(18) In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) suggested that the number of members of the Committee be increased from, say, 11 to 18.

(19) Miss BISHOP (United Kingdom) asked the delegate of Turkey what would be the advantage of increasing the membership of the Committee. She doubted its efficacy in ensuring attendance at meetings, since many delegations found it difficult to supply members for all the working bodies of the Conference.

(20) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) thought that a larger Committee would find it easier to go through Member States' reports. In the current year the Committee had been in some difficulty owing to the increased number of reports to be reviewed. His proposal had the purely practical object of allowing a more penetrating analysis of Member States' reports.

(21) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that the proposal of the Turkish delegate touched on one of Unesco's main problems, which was how to secure an objective account of the way in which Member States implemented Conference resolutions. With regard to the review of work by Member States, it was inevitable that members should emphasize achievements rather than omissions.
(22) If a more important function could be formulated for the Committee, especially with regard to National Commissions and Member States, its status would be enhanced in the eyes of the Conference and delegations would be obliged to appoint members.

(23) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) asked for the Secretariat's opinion.

(24) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) thought that the increase in the membership of Unesco made it reasonable to contemplate enlarging the Committee. It might therefore be advisable to bring in two or three more members.

(25) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) suggested that, to avoid causing the Conference any anxiety, the Committee should recommend increasing its membership to fifteen.

(26) The delegate of Ecuador supported that proposal.

(27) In reply to Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia), Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) said that the volume containing the reports received by the Secretariat within the time-limit was sent to governments seven weeks before the Conference opened, but the main question to be settled was that of reports arriving late. The Committee knew from experience the difficulties to which that gave rise, and a solution would be all the more necessary if the Secretariat was to be asked to make a more thorough preliminary analysis of the reports.

(28) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) was averse to taking a

decision with regard to reports received late. There was always such a possibility, but it should be regarded as exceptional and no provision should be made for it in advance.

(29) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) felt that attention should nevertheless be drawn to the need for observing the time-limit, since the Secretariat would otherwise be unable to make the proposed analysis of the reports and the Committee itself would have to review late reports, as it was doing that year.

(30) The CHAIRMAN thought it would be helpful to insist upon the time-limit being observed, and asked whether the Committee would agree to insert a recommendation to that effect in its report.

(31) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) pointed out that the Committee was responsible for an exhaustive analysis of the reports; and he felt it would be better not to spend too much time on the question of late reports. He was not however, opposed to inserting in the report a recommendation on the observance of the time-limit.
(32) Reverting to the Cambodian delegate's proposal, which he willingly supported, he feared that in practice it might prove very difficult for Member States to send representatives to Committee meetings before the General Conference opened.

(33) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) thought it would be possible to convene the Committee in the very first days of the session so that it could circulate its report to the Programme and Budget Commission at an early date, before submitting it in plenary session.

(34) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) agreed with that solution on condition that the Programme and Budget Commission only met after the Committee for the review of Member States' reports.

(35) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that it would assist the work of the Committee at the next Conference if the fifteen members could be designated before the end of the present Conference, and if each country would undertake to reply to the Director-General's letter, sent together with his observations on the reports of Member States, and submit proposals for the Committee's agenda.

(36) The proposals of the delegates of Turkey and the United States of America were approved.

(37) On the proposal of the United States delegate, it was further agreed to include the following sentence in the Committee's report: "The Committee notes with satisfaction the increased number of reports received on time this year and urges Member States to comply with the regulations".

(38) The discussion having reverted to the form of future reports, Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) recalled that in Section 2 of the plan proposed by the Director-General (document 8C/4, page 5), Member States were invited to supply "information on the most important changes made in laws and regulations relating to education, science and culture". In most of the reports the following note appeared in Section 2: "The information supplied under this heading has been sent to the Clearing House of the Department of Education in Unesco".
(39) As those reports were finally intended for the general public, he thought that Member States should treat that part of their report with the attention it deserved.

(40) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) agreed that it was essential to retain in the reports a compilation of information on the most important changes in laws and regulations affecting education, science and culture, and also that the Committee should be given a summary of the contents of that part of the report. He had proposed it as a separate annex because of its importance and because it did not fit into the framework of the first four sections.

(41) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) explained that he was willing to agree to the information in question appearing as an annex, or in any other form in reports framed in accordance with the new plan that had been suggested.

(42) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the reasons for deleting Section 2 were set out in the introduction to the volume containing Member States' reports. The available appropriations were insufficient to allow publication of the total content of reports in one volume and it had therefore been necessary to pass the information under Section 2 to the Clearing House of the Education Department. She added that Member States had been requested to keep their reports within 5 to 15 pages of typescript, but in many cases they had greatly exceeded those limits.

(43) The CHAIRMAN asked for a decision regarding the four sections proposed in Part 1 of the United States delegate's suggestions.

(44) Approved.

(45) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) pointed out that the four sections (with the two annexes) were equivalent to the six sections under the Director-General's existing plan.

(46) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) asked whether the Committee wished the compulsory annexes to be published in the same volume as the reports or as separate documents. A budgetary problem was involved.

(47) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) thought it necessary to limit the length of reports. If all Member States kept within the fixed limits, it should be possible to avoid the difficulties of publication and yet have available all the information required.

(48) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America)

supported the Turkish delegate's plea for the size of reports to be limited. As, however, it might be difficult for Member States to condense that information in the reports themselves, he proposed that it be contained in compulsory annexes, with summaries of them prepared by the Secretariat and incorporated in its analysis of the reports.

(49) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) urged that the annexes too should be as short as possible.

(50) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia), while agreeing that the number of pages should be limited, pointed out that that might inconvenience Member States who wanted a little more space. The necessary funds might be found in, for example, the budget of the Department of Mass Communication, where some publications seemed to overlap with others.

(51) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that the sums intended for the publication of Member States' reports appeared in the General Conference budget. It was impossible to take funds from the budget of other departments.

(52) The CHAIRMAN asked for comments on the two proposals:

1. That a limit be set to the number of pages.
2. That, if Member States exceeded the limit, only a summary of their reports would be included.

(53) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) proposed including a suggestion in the Committee's report that sufficient funds be available for the publication of the reports and that the Director-General be authorized to have summaries made where necessary.

(54) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) would not oppose a limitation on the number of pages but hoped that the maximum allowed would be, say, 15.

(55) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that Member States had been asked to keep to an average of 10 pages, but all the reports received contained at least 15. For practical reasons, therefore, it would be better to fix a pretty strict limit.

(56) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) remarked that the National Commissions of small States were anxious to obtain publicity for those of their activities which they considered the most interesting. Their publication funds being inadequate, such information had to be included in Member States' reports and an adequate number of pages was needed for that purpose.

(57) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that, if the question were that of periodical reports concerning National Commissions, there already existed in Unesco's Official Bulletin a special section dealing with the Commissions Other information on their activities appeared in the Courier, Unesco Features, etc. Several Commissions also published their own bulletin.

(58) Miss McPHEE (Secretariat) said that one of the chief difficulties facing the Secretariat in relation to Member States was the lack of information about them and interest on their part. It was difficult to find interesting information for the Official Bulletin, and, if reports of activities were forthcoming, the Secretariat would be glad to publish them in the Official Bulletin and in the Courier and the Radio Review.

(59) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) pointed out that many National Commissions had been founded very recently and often had no news to publish. It might be a useful suggestion that the Official Bulletin should publish, in the issue preceding the opening of the Conference, fuller information on the work of the various National Commissions.

(60) After mentioning that the problem of periodical news about the activities of National Commissions was entirely different from that of Member States' reports, Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) said that, as editor of Unesco's Official Bulletin, she would be glad to publish in it any news from National Commissions.

(61) Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey), reverting to the question of the size of reports, suggested that the limits laid down for the present session of the Conference be retained. It could, however, be stated, without causing inconvenience, that the maximum number of pages should be between 10 and 15.

(62) The CHAIRMAN summarized the points on which the Committee had agreed: 1. That reports from Member States should not exceed 15 pages. 2. That, if any Member State exceeded the limit, the Secretariat had the right to summarize that report. 3. That the two annexes should be issued as separate documents.

Action Reported by Member States

(63) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that his first proposals dealt with procedures and the form of reports. Those that followed represented conclusions reached after studying the reports of Member States submitted to the present session of the General Conference and concerned the links between the Secretariat and Member States and the need for Member States to assume greater responsibilities.

(64) He suggested that the following points should be emphasized in the Committee's report:

1. The need for continuous communication between the Secretariat and Member States and the value of reporting both failures and successes.
2. The need for closer contact between the Secretariat and each Member State.
3. The need for greater efforts on the part of the Secretariat and the appointment of additional field staff to ensure closer and more effective contact.
4. The need to concentrate effort on activities promoting international understanding and co-operation.

5. The need for more effort to promote public understanding of, appreciation of, and participation in Unesco's work.

(65) The Committee agreed to include the foregoing five suggestions in its report.

The meeting rose at 6.0 p.m.

# NINTH MEETING

*29 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. AL-HANI (Iraq)

(1) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL regretted that he had not been able to attend all the meetings of the Committee. He greatly appreciated its work and in particular approved the general trend of the conclusions it had reached. Since a new tendency of the Organization was to pay greater attention to the needs and activities of Member States, the reports they submitted would acquire greater importance. Member States, he hoped, would take still more care in preparing them and he assured the Committee that the Secretariat would give them the most detailed and thorough consideration.

**ITEM 10.4 OF REVISED AGENDA: REPORT TO THE GENERAL CONFERENCE** (document 8C/REP/1 (prov.)) (continued)

(2) The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider its draft final report point by point:

Study of the Reports submitted for 1952 and 1953

(3) This section of the report was approved without comment, except that it was recommended to include in a footnote the list of the 58 Member States having submitted reports.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee

1. Form and contents of future reports

(4) Miss BISHOP (United Kingdom) feared that there might be some overlapping between Section 2 and Annex II.

(5) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) did not think Annex II overlapped with Section 2. The latter was intended to contain general information on the implementation of the programme resolutions as a whole, while Annex II would deal with only a few specific points.

2. Recommendations concerning the work of Member States

(6) Approved.

3. Procedure for the study of future reports

(7) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) expressed a wish to submit a revised text for the final paragraph of the draft resolution contained in the Committee's report, which would have a bearing on paragraph (a) of the third part of the report. He therefore proposed that the Committee consider first paragraphs (b), (c) and (d), and return to paragraph (a) after approval of the text of the draft resolution.

(8) Agreed.

Paragraph (b)

(9) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) found the phrase "allocating, in future, sufficient funds", a trifle vague and suggested replacing "sufficient" by "more".

(10) Mrs. MALTERRE (Secretary of the Committee) explained that for the current year the funds were rather too small but an increase of only some $1,000 for the two coming years would suffice to overcome the difficulties.

(11) Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) thought it would be necessary to justify the request for more funds by pointing out, for example, that with the entry into the Organization of new States the number of reports being submitted was steadily increasing.

(12) Mr. HAZOUME (Rapporteur) recalled that the Committee was not empowered to fix a figure for increased appropriations, but it could stress the need for such an increase.

(13) He therefore suggested that paragraph (b) be completed by a phrase to the effect that, in consequence of the constant increase in membership, and, consequently, of the total volume of reports submitted and costs of publication, the attention of the General Conference should be drawn to the need for adjusting the amount allotted under that head.

(14) That proposal was approved.

Paragraphs (c) and (d)

(15) Approved.

Draft Resolution

(16) The four first paragraphs were approved.

Fifth paragraph

(17) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) proposed that the word "urges" be substituted for "requests", and Miss BISHOP (United Kingdom) proposed that "strictly" be added before "to observe".

(18) With those amendments the fifth paragraph was approved.

Sixth paragraph

(19) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) said that the Working Party on Decentralization had completed its work and had adopted a report. In that report it called on the Director-General and the Executive Board to carry out a comprehensive study of the methods of co-operation between the Organization and the Member States and of the possible ways of developing it, such a study to be based on a thorough examination of the work of the National Commissions. If that proposal were approved by the Commission on Programme and Budget, the Committee, he thought, should be more specific in the final paragraph of its resolution. He therefore proposed that the text of the sixth paragraph of the draft resolution be replaced by the following:

"Resolves that the Committee be reconstituted for the next session of the General Conference on a broader basis and with enlarged responsibility.

The new Committee, which shall consist of 15 members to be elected at the present session, shall consider the reports of the Member States and the study by the Director-General of the relationships between the Organization and the Member States.

In the light of this examination, it shall make recommendations

(1) On the form and content of future reports and

(2) On the further development of the participation of Member States in the planning and execution of the Unesco programme."

(20) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) said that in the last paragraph he would prefer to say "on the way in which Member States participated ..." instead of "on the further development of the participation of Member States in".

(21) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) pointed out that his amendment was concerned with the final act of the Committee on Reports of Member States at the ninth session of the General Conference, when, after considering the work of the Member States, it would be preparing final recommendations for their fuller participation in the planning and execution of the Organization's programme.

(22) Mr. HONG HOEUNG DOEUNG (Cambodia) thought that the two basic ideas in the last paragraph should be brought out quite clearly, viz.

(1) How Member States had effectively participated in framing and executing the programme;

(2) How they should participate in future.

(23) Mr. McCULLOUGH (United States of America) agreed that the proposal of the representative of Cambodia improved the amendment he had submitted and made it clearer.

(24) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee approve the text of the last paragraph of the draft resolution as submitted by the United States representative and amended by the representative of Cambodia.

(25) He also proposed that the Committee approve paragraph (a) under the heading "3. Procedure for the Study of Future Reports", subject to the Secretariat's making the slight alterations consequent upon the adoption of the final text of the last paragraph of the draft resolution.

(26) Agreed.

(27) Subject to drafting changes to be made by the Secretariat, the draft final report was unanimously approved.

(28) Mr. HAZOUME (Rapporteur) undertook, when presenting the final report to the General Conference, to make no changes except those just approved, though he would include in the introduction a few personal words of thanks to the Government and people of Uruguay for their hospitality.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

# CHAPTER XI

# HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE

## FIRST MEETING

*15 November 1954 at 4 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. KABIR (India)

*later:* Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil)

(1) Mr. KABIR (Chairman of the Nominations Committee) opened the meeting and announced that Dr. Parra-Perez (Venezuela), Chairman of the Headquarters Committee, was unable to attend the eighth session of the General Conference. The Nominations Committee had therefore proposed that the delegate of Venezuela be replaced by the representative of another Latin American country, Professor Berredo Carneiro, representative of Brazil.

(2) Mr. Berredo Carneiro was elected by acclamation.

(3) He was then invited to take the Chair in place of Mr. Kabir.

(4) The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee for electing him. He said that the agenda of the meeting had now been exhausted but added that during the current session of the General Conference the Committee would be holding two or three meetings, the times and dates of which would be announced later.

(5) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) suggested that the meeting approve the summary records of the seventeenth session of the Committee, which had just been distributed (documents 17 HQ/SR.1 (prov.) and 17 HQ/SR.2 (prov.))

(6) The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that approval was included in the provisional agenda of the Committee's next meeting, which he then read out:

1. Adoption of the provisional agenda (document 18 HQ/1).
2. Approval of the summary records of the seventeenth session (documents 17 HQ/SR.1 and SR.2 (prov.).
3. Supplementary report on the accommodation of the European-African Office of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in the permanent Headquarters Building of Unesco (document 18 HQ/2).
4. Supplementary report of the Headquarters Committee and Progress Report of the Director-General (document 18 HQ/3).

(7) The Chairman added that the General Committee would fix the date of the Committee's next meeting.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.

# SECOND MEETING

*25 November 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil)

**ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA** (document 18 HQ/1)

(1) The agenda was adopted.

**APPROVAL OF THE SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION** (documents 17 HQ/SR.1 (prov.) and 17 HQ/SR.2 (prov.))

(2) At the proposal of Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece), the summary records of the seventeenth session were approved.

**REPRESENTATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD ON THE HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE**

(3) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) hoped that the Headquarters Committee would not object if a representative of the Board thenceforth attended its meetings without the right to vote.

(4) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) attached great importance to Sir Ronald Adam's proposal; he thought it essential that the Executive Board should be represented at the meetings of the Headquarters Committee.

(5) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) strongly supported the proposal that a representative of the Executive Board attend the meetings of the Headquarters Committee, without the right to vote.

(6) The proposal was adopted.

**PROGRESS REPORT ON BUILDING OPERATIONS IN PARIS**

(7) In response to a request from Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur), Mr. CALLISON (Chief Engineer, Headquarters Office) gave a progress report on the building operations in Paris. The building permit had been received from the French Government, and the site had been cleared of military buildings and was in a suitable state for excavations to start. Satisfactory international bids had been taken and were being evaluated in detail. A collation of satisfactory bids showed beyond doubt that there would be enough money in the budget to construct the Headquarters Building. Thereafter, the letting of contracts and actual process of construction would be a matter of routine. In conclusion, Mr. Callison said that the site had thenceforth been taken over from the French Government, so that Unesco was entirely responsible for it.

(8) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) thought the news very satisfactory but, as there had been some delay, he wondered if Mr. Callison would outline the proposed stages of work during 1955.

(9) Mr. CALLISON (Chief Engineer, Headquarters Office) explained that the preparation of contracts had been somewhat delayed because it had been necessary to harmonize bids from a number of countries, and that had involved a great deal of comparison. It would be possible, however, to let the first and most important contract (excavation and masonry) in December, and it was expected to take some eighteen months to execute. A series of other contracts (electricity, plumbing, etc.) would then be concluded progressively. It was estimated that the major part of the shell of the building would be up by the end of 1955, there would also be a considerable number of other trades represented during the masonry work. Dates for contractors, with penalties for delay in delivery, would have been fixed. It was expected that the building would be completely finished at the end of December 1956 or in January 1957.

(10) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought it fortunate that it had been decided to hold the ninth session of the General Conference in New Delhi, as the permanent headquarters obviously would not be ready in time. The calendar of work showed over six months' delay in starting the actual construction. With regard to tendering, he had had a rather strong complaint from a British electrical firm and wondered if the specifications had been drawn up in the correct way from the point of view of international competition. He asked if Mr. Callison could throw any light on progress in that aspect of the work. It was important to avoid needless complications, as international competition would certainly be intense and the matter would be complicated enough in any case.

(11) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) felt that the problem raised by Mr. Cowell was an extremely delicate one. It was difficult to ask the Director-General to lay down particular specifications for any given country. It should, however, be possible to draw up technical specifications acceptable to firms in the different countries.

(12) There was, of course, a problem of dimensions and standards. For the provision of electric plugs,

for instance, they would have to abide by French standards, otherwise they would run up against great difficulties later when it came to replacements. In general, however, the Committee could ask Mr. Callison to see that the specifications would be equally acceptable to British firms, or to those of any other country.

(13) Mr. CALLISON (Chief Engineer, Headquarters Office) was aware of the question raised by the British contractor. He explained that the consulting electrical engineer had been replaced, and although, basically, there had been no change in specifications, additional information had been supplied to firms wishing to tender. At all events, the complaint was being investigated.

(14) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) emphasized that the question was more than a technical one. The Secretariat had laid down extremely detailed specifications - too detailed, in the opinion of some firms - and that showed that Unesco's interests had been diligently defended.
(15) Mr. Pompei wished, nevertheless, to be informed about the method used for invitations to tender and the awarding of contracts. With regard to prices, the offers could certainly be worded very briefly and sent in a single envelope. On the other hand, several copies of technical details should be supplied so that they might be examined by all the experts concerned. It would also be useful to deposit in one of Unesco's safes a copy bearing Unesco's seal and the signatures of the members of the Headquarters Building Contracts Committee.

(16) Mr. CALLISON (Chief Engineer, Headquarters Office) replied that the problems mentioned by the delegate of Italy had been anticipated and that all precautions had been taken. The procedure had been that prices had come in one set of sealed envelopes, and technical offers in another. They had been kept under lock and key until all the material was in Unesco's possession. When the deadline for the submission of materials had run out, the tenders had been opened in the presence of the seven members of the Headquarters Contracts Committee; they were at present being examined for accuracy, thoroughness and conformity with the project. The problem of combining contractors of different nationalities was being broached with the utmost care and secrecy. All action would be on record and, when secrecy was no longer necessary, could be verified by anyone. The fact that Unesco, as an intergovernmental organization, enjoyed exemption from certain taxes and import duties had complicated the base offers, and adjustments had had to be made in order to ascertain the exact cost for Unesco.

(17) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thanked Mr. Callison for his explanations. He thought that it would be useful if the Committee could have a document containing a schedule of all the operations described by Mr. Callison. He had no intention of bringing pressure to bear on behalf of any British firm, but he felt justified in pointing out that the invitations to tender had all been drafted in French without any indication that specifications were required; also that the specifications had been changed, not leaving contractors much time afterwards.

(18) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) wished to know what method was used for publishing invitations to tender. Did the Secretariat act through government channels or did it establish direct contact with the firms it thought most competent?
(19) The Belgian delegate also asked whether the Secretariat was going to invite further tenders and, if so, how firms interested could get in touch with the Secretariat to offer their bids.

(20) Mr. CALLISON (Chief Engineer, Headquarters Office) replied that, at the present time, 85 to 90% of the bids had been made. Others would come later, and their scope would be determined to some extent by the initial bidding. As to the results of the bidding, nothing had yet been decided, but successful bidders would be notified in due course. Invitations to tender had been published in the French newspapers and letters announcing the competition had been sent to all National Commissions. Some countries had been very active in passing on the information to their contractors, while others had replied that, in view of the distances involved, it was not an interesting proposition for their firms. All parties interested wrote and secured questionnaires, and replies to 1,500 questionnaires had been received. It was found that there were more qualified contractors than could possibly be used. Those with the best qualifications had therefore been selected and notified that they could bid. All had operated on the basis of identical materials.

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON THE ACCOMMODATION OF THE EUROPEAN-AFRICAN OFFICE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO) IN THE PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS BUILDING OF UNESCO** (document 18 HQ/2 and Add.)

(21) The CHAIRMAN recalled that the question had already been examined at the Committee's seventeenth session and since then had been the subject of direct negotiations between the Director-General and representatives of ICAO. He asked the Legal Adviser and the Rapporteur to explain the present position to the Committee.

(22) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the legal problem raised by ICAO's request was as follows: to construct on a site for which the French Government had granted Unesco a 99-year lease, renewable every 99 years, a building for the accommodation of ICAO, and if necessary, in the upper storeys, for the accommodation of Unesco. The Secretariat intended to safeguard in its integrity Unesco's right of ownership over the buildings. It was therefore proposed to ask ICAO for the sums necessary for the construction of the building to be used as its regional office, and to recognize ICAO's right of occupation for as long as it desired.
(23) The two cases in which ICAO's right of occupation would come to an end had also been envisaged.

(24) 1. If ICAO decided it would no longer maintain a regional office in Paris, Unesco would have a right of pre-emption over the part of the building in question, in return for a payment proportional to the number of years ICAO had occupied the building. ICAO intended to obtain from the French Government an interest-free loan repayable in 30 years. If ICAO were to cease occupying the building after 15 years, Unesco would assume responsibility for the 15 remaining annual instalments.
(25) 2. If Unesco decided to relinquish the buildings on the Place Fontenoy site, the French Government could exercise its right of option by purchasing the buildings. Failing that, Unesco could decide to purchase the site by virtue of the right of option accorded to it. That double stipulation was intended to enable the site and the buildings to be held, if necessary, in the same hands. In those circumstances, Unesco would pay ICAO a reasonable indemnity, but only if ICAO's right of occupation came to an end before 1 January 2000.

(26) The CHAIRMAN considered that the Committee should first decide on the fundamental principle of the building's ownership, so as to be able to give the Director-General the necessary instructions. As a member of the Committee, and in view of the negotiations that had already taken place, he thought Unesco should be given full rights of ownership over the additional building, whatever the circumstances.

(27) Mr. CABOUAT (France) thought that the draft contract outlined by the Legal Adviser constituted the simplest and wisest solution to the problem. Moreover, that solution coincided with the various possibilities offered to Unesco in the lease granted by the French Government. Unesco could not sub-lease a part of the site without the prior consent of the French Government and that would raise complicated problems.
(28) Mr. Cabouat noted, however, that in Annex III of document 18 HQ/2, page 9, paragraph 19, it was stated that "ICAO might transfer the benefit of its contract only to another Specialized Agency of the United Nations", and he wished to know what would happen if no Specialized Agency wanted to succeed ICAO. That was only a hypothetical contingency, but it should not be overlooked.

(29) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) remarked that the Committee seemed to be considering details before the general principle. He proposed that a decision be taken first on the principle before discussing the means of implementing it.
(30) He recalled that the Headquarters Committee, at its seventeenth session, had been informed by the Director-General that ICAO's Council had not finally decided whether or not it wished to have accommodation at Unesco's permanent headquarters. The Committee had therefore agreed that it could not take a decision on a hypothetical request, but had authorized the Director-General to continue negotiations with ICAO, on the understanding that the granting of accommodation would not involve additional cost or delay. The Director-General had further been authorized to submit the plan of the ICAO building to the Panel of Five. Mr. Gardner Davies asked the Director-General to explain what the present position was.

(31) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL hoped that the Committee would approve the principle of granting accommodation to ICAO, while laying emphasis on Unesco's right of ownership. He felt sure that the misunderstanding on the part of the ICAO Council would be cleared up when the French law had been explained to them. He would review with ICAO the question whether the payment of 3% of the maintenance costs by ICAO was too high or too low.

(32) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) seconded the proposal that the Headquarters Committee approve the principle of making accommodation available to ICAO. The Committee could then go on to discuss the details of the bargain.

(33) The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should first take a decision on the principle of concluding a contract with ICAO. It could then discuss the question of Unesco's right of ownership, and the details of the proposed contract.

(34) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) hoped that, when the legal aspect had been discussed, the Committee would have an opportunity to consider the architectural aspect.

(35) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) felt that it was essential to safeguard Unesco's right of ownership.

(36) The CHAIRMAN said he was in favour of stipulating first and foremost the principle of Unesco's right of ownership over any building constructed in agreement with ICAO, whatever the terms of the contract might be.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) likewise accepted that principle.

(38) Mr. CABOUAT (France) said it must be understood that the recognition of Unesco's right of ownership implied the application of the terms of the lease to the whole of the site.

(39) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) entirely agreed with the principle, but wanted to know whether it would be acceptable to ICAO.

(40) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that he believed that the Council of ICAO would accept the principle concerned.

(41) The CHAIRMAN interpreted the principle as a condition sine qua non of a future contract between Unesco and ICAO.

(42) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) emphasized that the principle must also be applied in the event of further storeys being added to the building.

(43) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that was a logical consequence of Unesco's right of ownership, but it would be advisable to stipulate it expressly in the contract.

(44) The CHAIRMAN considered the Committee was agreed in recognizing the need to safeguard Unesco's right of ownership over the building that might be constructed for the accommodation of ICAO. He asked the Committee if it had any objections to the continuation of negotiations between the Director-General and the representatives of ICAO within the framework of the proposed plan and with a view to concluding a contract.

(45) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) took it that the Committee had disposed of the question of joint ownership in paragraph 2 of Annex I to document 18 HQ/2 (page 4). He suggested that the Committee should therefore pass on to consider paragraph 3, i.e. the possibility of ICAO's relinquishing the premises before the complete reimbursement of construction costs.

(46) Mr. CABOUAT (France) wished to repeat what he had already said at the Committee's last session, as representative of the host State: in the light of the experience acquired during the negotiations which had taken place during the last two years, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs hoped that the Director-General, before signing a definite agreement with ICAO, would keep it unofficially informed of the development of the negotiations so that it might, if necessary, give its opinion on any particular point.

(47) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that he would be glad to accept that undertaking.

(48) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) reminded the Committee that it was only an advisory body and that it was for the Director-General himself to report to the General Conference. He presumed, however, that the Committee's recommendations would be annexed to that report.

(49) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with the Rapporteur that the Headquarters Committee's main task was to advise the Director-General, but, as a committee of the General Conference, it should report to the Conference on the advice which it gave to the Director-General. Its report could, as the Rapporteur had suggested, be annexed to his own.

(50) The CHAIRMAN considered that an addendum containing the recommendations adopted during the Committee's current session should be added to the Committee's report to the General Conference.

(51) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) remarked that the French Government had only asked to receive unofficial information about the negotiations between Unesco and ICAO. He asked whether the lease did not contain any clause relating to transactions such as the one under consideration and whether it would not be advisable to associate the French Government more closely in the current negotiations.

(52) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) replied that, under the terms of the lease, Unesco was authorized to let part of the premises to an international organization or Member State. Another clause authorized the transfer of the use of a part of the site to an organization belonging to the family of the United Nations.

(53) The lease also provided that a part of the premises could be let temporarily to organizations not belonging to the family of the United Nations, but it was stipulated that the French Government must be consulted whenever it was proposed to transfer the right of occupation of part of the site.

(54) The clause of the draft contract with ICAO stipulating that ICAO could transfer the benefit of its contract only to another Specialized Agency of the United Nations had been drafted expressly to give every guarantee to Unesco and to the French Government. Habitation of the same site could be harmonious only if the site were occupied by two organizations belonging to the family of the United Nations. Such harmony was all the more necessary as it was proposed to grant ICAO a right of perpetual occupation.

(55) Mr. CABOUAT (France) entirely agreed with Mr. Saba that the clause in paragraph 19 of Annex III of document 18 HQ/2 met the wishes of Unesco and the French Government. His previous remark merely concerned the legal aspect of the question. In a contract of that kind it was advisable to anticipate all possible consequences. In the event of ICAO's relinquishing the premises, and if Unesco did not wish to take them back itself, ICAO should be asked to give priority in the transfer of its contract to another Specialized Agency of the United Nations, or, failing that, to another organization, in agreement with the French Government.

(56) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that he had envisaged such a clause but had not felt it possible to retain it. Certainly, if an organization quite acceptable to Unesco and the French Government offered to succeed ICAO, at a relatively short interval, there would be no difficulty; but it would be better to leave the General Conference complete freedom in the matter and not to introduce too automatic a clause. The General Conference would thus be able, if necessary, to approve a new contract.

(57) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that the Legal Adviser had anticipated most of what he had intended to say. He took it that the conclusion was that the Headquarters Committee should refer in its report to the possibility of ICAO relinquishing the premises before the complete reimbursement of construction costs, recommending that it be left to the General Conference, in consultation with the French Government, to decide what to do in such an eventuality.

(58) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) replied that it would be for the General Conference to authorize the Director-General to recover the premises in question. If such authorization were not granted, ICAO could transfer its right of occupation to another Specialized Agency of the United Nations; failing that, it would be necessary to provide a new contract which would have to be approved by the General Conference.

(59) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) thought that, if the General Conference did not authorize the exercise of the option and if ICAO did not find another Specialized Agency of the United Nations willing to succeed it, Unesco's rights should be safeguarded, for it might be maintained that Unesco, in not exercising its right of option, was renouncing its rights in the matter.

(60) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) asked whether it would be stipulated that, if ICAO transferred the benefit of its contract, negotiations with Unesco would be necessary.

(61) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought it would be useful to obtain particulars concerning the financial aspects of the problem. In fact, it seemed that the contract might entail considerable expenditure on the part of Unesco.

(62) Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that ICAO would be free to transfer the benefit of its contract to any organization belonging to the family of the United Nations, but the French Government maintained a right of control in the matter, since its authorization was necessary for the installation on its territory of the headquarters or regional office of an international organization.
(63) ICAO would obtain the loan already referred to by negotiating directly with the Caisse des dépôts et consignations. Even if ICAO decided to relinquish the premises, it would remain responsible for that debt. Unesco would succeed ICAO only if the General Conference decided to exercise Unesco's right of option.
(64) If it did not exercise that option, the General Conference must not ignore the fact that it was relinquishing certain rights, but there would be no legal void, for ICAO would, in principle, retain the right of occupation of the premises as long as it was unable to transfer it to another organization and it could even decide to maintain a reduced service on the spot or negotiate a new contract in which it would be possible to reinstate Unesco's rights.
(65) Paragraphs 18 and 19 of Annex III of document 18 HQ/2 were merely a preliminary draft. It would no doubt be necessary to stipulate that ICAO must give fairly long notice, 4 years for instance, in order to enable the Secretariat to study all the possibilities in the event of ICAO's departure and to submit to the General Conference all the facts which would help it to take a decision.
(66) Although it might be useful to stipulate that Unesco should be consulted, it would be dangerous to introduce a clause giving Unesco an actual right of veto in the hypothetical circumstances envisaged, since ICAO's possibilities were, after all, fairly limited.

(67) The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in the light of the observations made, the Committee should recommend that the Director-General be authorized to continue the negotiations and conclude an agreement with ICAO. That recommendation would be included in the Committee's final report to the General Conference.

(68) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) approved the proposal provided that a satisfactory solution were found for the architectural problem.

(69) The Chairman's proposal was approved subject to the reservation made by Mr. Gardner Davies.

(70) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) entirely agreed with the Chairman's formula, but proposed adding that the Director-General should undertake the negotiations on the basis of the principles set forth in Annex III.
(71) With regard to procedure for the conclusion of the final contract, he suggested that the General Conference might be requested to authorize the Executive Board to approve the final contract prepared by the Director-General.

(72) The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Cowell if he would agree that the final contract should be approved, not by the Executive Board, but by the Headquarters Committee.

(73) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) replied in the affirmative.

(74) Introducing the discussion on the architectural aspect, Mr. CALLISON (Chief Engineer, Headquarters Office) drew attention to the letter from Mr. Gropius in Annex II to document 18 HQ/2 and to the letter from Mr. Le Corbusier in document 18 HQ/2 Add. 1. Although the proposed new building had been called the building for ICAO, that was not entirely the case. The Headquarters Office considered it also as a building designed for the future expansion of Unesco. It had not been possible to execute the original plan for expansion, and the latest proposal, which fitted in with ICAO's request, would be far more economical. Unesco's future expansion, moreover, would not be affected, whether it was ICAO or another organization occupying part of the building. The architectural plan itself had been prepared by the three working architects and approved by four of the five members of the International Panel. As far as the Headquarters Office was concerned, the plan was entirely satisfactory. Certain aspects of the plan suggested by Mr. Le Corbusier were rather more complicated and costly.

(75) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) recalled that every precaution had been taken at the architectural level during the past two years to ensure that Unesco had the best possible advice on a world-wide basis. Thenceforth, when it was proposed to introduce a large new element, he felt that the same precautions should be taken. He therefore proposed that a meeting of the Panel of Five be convened, if necessary at ICAO's expense, to approve the plans for the additional building before the Director-General was authorized to proceed with construction.

(76) Mr. CABOUAT (France) agreed all the more readily with Mr. Gardner Davies' suggestion as the problem of the building's appearance had raised most of the difficulties in obtaining a building permit.
(77) It was envisaged that the height of the new building might subsequently be increased, but for

some considerable time the building would remain incomplete and the architects should constantly be concerned to give the incomplete building, the plans of which would be submitted to the appropriate French authorities, an aspect not displeasing to the eye.

(78) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL would agree to convening the Panel of Five, but wondered at what stage and by what procedure he would obtain authority to proceed with construction if he did not agree with the Panel of Five.

(79) After hearing the remarks of Mr. Gardner Davies and Mr. Cabouat, Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) felt somewhat uneasy, particularly as paragraph (b) of Mr. Le Corbusier's letter, set out in document 18 HQ/2 Add.1, declared that "the proposed layout of the building ... is quite inharmonious and ... would constitute an eyesore in what has become an harmonious setting". It would be well to put an end to such controversies and request that the relations between the Panel of Five and the Director-General be ensured exclusively through the Chairman of the Panel of Five; otherwise the situation would become very confused.

(80) Baron van der STRATEN WAILLET (Belgium) agreed with the French delegate's remarks. The Place Fontenoy site was in danger of being disfigured, for several years, by the presence of an incomplete and inharmonious building. Moreover, the Committee was faced with two schemes, one in an annex to document 18 HQ/2, the other attached to Mr. Le Corbusier's letter.

(81) It was difficult to form an opinion on the basis of Mr. Le Corbusier's rough sketch, and it would therefore be helpful to convene a new meeting of the architects, as had been suggested by Mr. Gardner Davies.

(82) In conclusion, Baron van der Straten Waillet asked whether there was not a contradiction between the Director-General's words, in paragraph 9 of document 18 HQ/3, to the effect that the proposed project would not involve "any additional expenditure for Unesco", and the fact that Unesco must utilize a part of the basement of the building in question.

(83) The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that some funds would be used which would otherwise have been spent on subterranean space outside the limits of the building itself. As regarded the Panel of Five, provision had already been made in the budget for a meeting in January. If another meeting proved necessary, ICAO might be asked to pay the cost of it.

(84) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) thought that it would be necessary to call a second meeting of the Panel to approve the final plans. Personally, he would not like to have to approve in July plans which had been approved by the Panel only in the preliminary stage.

(85) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) recalled that the Committee had already asked that their meetings, each of which cost $5,000, should be limited in number. He proposed it be decided that the meeting envisaged should be the last.

(86) The CHAIRMAN gathered from Mr. Gardner Davies' suggestions that the Panel of Five would meet at the end of January at Unesco's expense. They would hold another meeting at ICAO's expense in order to examine the draft plans of the three architects. Finally, the Conference would have to authorize the Committee to approve the final plans so that building operations could be started.

(87) The Committee then took note of the Director-General's supplementary progress report (document 18 HQ/3).

(88) The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Rapporteur draw up an addendum to the Committee's report to the Conference and that it should later be submitted to the Committee for approval.

(89) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) agreed with the Chairman. He thought that the Committee's report should contain some draft resolution on the points discussed; he offered to prepare it for approval by the Committee before the report was submitted to the Administrative Commission.

(90) Agreed.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

# THIRD MEETING

*1 December 1954 at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman:* Mr. BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil)

**CONSIDERATION OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE** (document 18 HQ/5)

(1) The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document 18 HQ/5 and suggested an amendment of the English text - replacement of the word "larger" (paragraph 3) by "appropriate".

(2) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested changing the word "one" ("which would at the one time") to "same".

(3) Mr. FERNANDEZ QUINTANILLA (Spain), as a sequel to the Chairman's proposal, suggested changing the words "más amplio" in the Spanish text to "otro".

(4) The CHAIRMAN suggested amending paragraph (c) of the resolution by replacing the present text by the words "to proceed with the actual construction required".

(5) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) explained that the report before the Commission was a supplement to document 8C/ADM/24, which would include both the supplementary report of the Headquarters Committee and its attendant draft resolution and the supplementary report of the Director-General.
(6) He suggested that the Committee review the report article by article and the resolution paragraph by paragraph before forwarding the document to the General Conference.

(7) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked that the word "the" (that the ICAO had formally declared...) be struck out of paragraph 4 of the English version. Incidentally, if ICAO was likely at some future date to discontinue using the prospective building, the position would then have to be considered by Unesco in agreement with the French Government; he wished a reference to that effect included in the report.

(8) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) thought the important thing was to authorize the Director-General to pursue the negotiations and to mention the formal point agreed upon by the Committee and stipulating that the agreement must safeguard Unesco's exclusive title to the premises occupied by ICAO. He felt that the Director-General would obviously be guided by what had been said in the Committee's discussions and saw no need to add to the length of the report.

(9) The CHAIRMAN enquired whether Mr. Cowell agreed with Mr. Gardner Davies' remarks or wished to make a formal statement.

(10) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) appreciated the Rapporteur's point of view but felt that paragraph 5 of the report apparently applied only to the period of actual building, while paragraph 6 only provided for the safeguarding of Unesco's rights of ownership. It would be useful to add to that paragraph a passage recommending that the necessary arrangements be made in case ICAO ceased to occupy the premises.

(11) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) pointed out that the Rapporteur's task was simply to draft proposals; they must in any case be discussed by the Committee.

(12) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) moved the adoption of Mr. Cowell's text.

(13) Adopted.

(14) The CHAIRMAN suggested that they take the draft resolution next.

(15) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) thought it might be preferable to send forward two separate resolutions, the first applying to the general execution of the project for the headquarters building and the second to the building of the ICAO office.

(16) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) thought that the Conference did not need to take any decision about the general execution of the undertaking and should confine itself to noting the progress achieved, on the other hand, it had to give its views on the specific question of the ICAO building.

(17) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) appreciated Mr. Gardner Davies' point of view but feared that the Conference might not fully realize what had already been done by the Headquarters Committee and the Director-General. He therefore suggested submitting two draft resolutions; the first would comprise the first two introductory paragraphs of the present project, plus paragraph 1 and the second the third introductory paragraph, plus paragraph 2.
(18) That, he felt, would make approval of the action taken by the Headquarters Committee and by the Director-General more formal. He also thought a paragraph should be added to the first resolution on the future activities of the Headquarters Committee.

(19) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) suggested two alternative courses. The first would consist in adopting the solution advocated by Mr. Pompei but without adding anything about the work of the Headquarters Committee, which had been laid down by resolution 13 of the second extraordinary session of the General Conference; the second course would be to retain the text of the present draft unchanged and delete only paragraph 1, which could be re-inserted at the request of any of the delegations represented on the Administrative Commission.

(20) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought it would be hard to improve on the Rapporteur's draft. Nevertheless, he was in favour of two separate draft resolutions and thought the words "with satisfaction" in paragraph 1 of the first resolution could hardly be kept, as they seemed to refer to the Headquarters Committee itself; it could left to a delegation to move their insertion.

(21) Mr. KABIR (India) was against splitting up the original draft resolution and suggested keeping only the draft resolution referring to the ICAO building; he felt that the general resolution "notes with satisfaction..." could be moved by a delegation in the Administrative Commission.

(22) The CHAIRMAN thought that two draft resolutions could be submitted, as two separate documents (documents 8C/ADM/24 and 8C/ADM/24 Add.) were going to be presented to the Administrative Commission.

(23) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) considered that the Headquarters Committee should report to the General Conference in plenary meeting and not to the Administrative Commission.

(24) The CHAIRMAN informed Mr. Photiades that the report had to be submitted to the Administrative Commission.

(25) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) did not think that procedure was legally admissible.

(26) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) thought that they could submit to the Administrative Commission a draft resolution dealing solely with the construction of the ICAO building and that one of the delegations present could move a general resolution on the activities of the Headquarters Committee and thus spare the latter's blushes.

(27) The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the Executive Board how he thought the report should be submitted.

(28) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) considered that the Headquarters Committee was a committee of the General Conference on the same footing as the Administrative Commission and could accordingly report to the plenary conference, which could then refer the matter back to the Administrative Commission.

(29) Mr. CABOUAT (France) saw no objection to submitting two draft resolutions and felt that the words "with satisfaction" referred more particularly to the Secretariat and did not imply eulogy of the Committee itself. He was thus in favour of the first solution suggested by the delegate of Italy for submitting two draft resolutions to the General Conference. It would simplify the work of the Administrative Commission if it were given ready-made drafts.

(30) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought it was immaterial whether they submitted one or two resolutions but maintained his proposal to delete the words "with satisfaction".

(31) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) explained that the Headquarters item was on the agenda of the Administrative Commission which had already been adopted by the General Conference. He moved that the text of the resolution be kept as it stood or be split into two and the contents considered in the light of the present discussion.

(32) Sir Ronald ADAM (Chairman of the Executive Board) pointed out that the procedure in question had been adopted to save time. The Administrative Commission undoubtedly contained more experts on matters relating to the new Headquarters than the plenary conference and it was easier for the Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission to cover the matter in his report.

(33) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) said that in 1952 the Headquarters Committee did submit its report, including the draft resolution, to the Administrative Commission.

(34) The CHAIRMAN said he would submit the report to the Administrative Commission but pointed out that that action would not affect the Headquarters Committee's right to report direct to the General Conference.

(35) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) hoped that that procedure would not constitute a precedent.

(36) The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to approve the substance of the report and suggested that, in view of the limited time available for reproduction of the final text, they adopt a version as close as possible to the text, as originally worded, on the understanding that the delegations represented on the Administrative Commission could submit such amendments as they chose.

(37) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) reminded members of the amendments suggested for paragraph 6, and noted that paragraph 2 (b) of the draft resolution did not mention what would be the rôle of the Headquarters Committee.

(38) The CHAIRMAN moved an amendment to the beginning of paragraph 2 (b), to read: "to conclude with ICAO, in consultation with the Headquarters Committee..."

(39) Mr. POMPEI (Italy) suggested that, instead of

that, the amendment should read: "to conclude with ICAO, after approval by the Headquarters Committee...". He also felt that the wording of paragraph 2 (c) "to proceed with the construction of additional building" was very wide.

(40) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) said it was clearly understood that the Secretariat was only authorized to erect that part of the new building which could be used immediately.

(41) Mr. PHOTIADES (Greece) asked whether the Legal Adviser had approved the text under discussion and remarked that the Administrative Commission might very well ask the Legal Committee for its views.

(42) The CHAIRMAN said that the draft report had been communicated to the Legal Committee. He moved the approval of document 18 HQ/5 on the understanding that the draft resolution could be amended by the Administrative Commission.

(43) Adopted.

**ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 25 NOVEMBER**

(44) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) reminded the Committee that it had to approve the provisional minutes of its meeting of 25 November.

(45) The CHAIRMAN moved that formal approval of the minutes in question be postponed till the next meeting.

(46) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) thought that the Committee should decide the date of that meeting.

(47) Mr. LEGUEN (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that, under the rules for the adoption of the minutes of organs of the General Conference, delegates could hand in their corrections to the Secretariat of the Conference within a period of 3 days; that procedure could be applied to the minutes of the Headquarters Committee.

(48) Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) moved the adoption of that procedure.

(49) Adopted.

(50) Mr. GARDNER DAVIES (Rapporteur) moved that the date of the next meeting of the Committee be decided by the Chairman in consultation with the Director-General. He hoped that the Committee would be able to meet at the end of January when the members of the International Panel of Five Architects would be in Paris.

(51) The CHAIRMAN said he would settle that date in consultation with the Director-General.

(52) Adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

# INDEX

## KEY TO THE SYSTEM OF NUMBERS USED

1. Roman numeral: Plenary Meetings, Committees or Commissions (according to the chapters of the table of contents) during whose sessions the subject was discussed.
   - II. Plenary Meetings
   - III. General Committee
   - IV. Programme and Budget Commission
   - V. Administrative Commission
   - VI. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget
   - VII. Nomirations Committee
   - VIII. Legal Committee
   - IX. Credentials Committee
   - X. Committee on Reports of Member States
   - XI. Headquarters Committee
2. Arabic numeral: Actual number of the meeting concerned.
3. Numbers in parenthesis: Paragraphs covering the discussions.

## PART I

Index of subjects discussed, items on the agenda, and questions brought up for consideration.

### A


Abstracts. IV, 15 (78, 81, 100-104), 17 (72-79); VI, 8 (49, 60, 86).
See also: Scientific documentation.
"Académie internationale de la céramique" - representation. II, 4 (8).
—— - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (19, 71-78).
Administrative Commission - reports. II, 11 (28-31), 12, 16 (25-225), 17 (35-41); IV, 9(4-59).
Administrative sciences. IV, 18 (190).
Admission of Associate Members. II, 3 (85-107), 4 (1-5).
Admission of new Members. II, 3 (12-82), 17 (126-146); III, 11 (4, 47), 12 (1), 13 (4); IV, 4 (12); V, 19 (82-90); VI, 19 (100-114), 24 (178).
—— - Bulgaria. II, 3 (62-82).
—— - Paraguay. II, 11 (13-19).
—— - Rumania. II, 3 (13-59).
Adult education. IV, 14 (34-114), 27 (123-126); VI, 5 (5-9), 27 (47).
See also: Consultative Committee on Adult Education. Permanent International Centre for Adult Education.
Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research. IV, 16 (69, 71), 19 (21).
Advisory Committee for Documentation in the Natural Sciences. VI, 8 (52-55).
Advisory Committee on Oceanographic Research. IV, 4 (35, 62), 16 (97).
Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. II, 18 (62); III, 3 (5-18).
—— - reports. IV, 1 (12), 2 (14-57), 3 (1), 4, 5 (75, 82), 6 (1-72), 32 (1-104); V, 6 (3); VI, 21 (12-41), 23 (55-58), 24, 26 (1-13), 37.
Advisory Committee on School Curricula. IV, 3 (23), 12 (23-82); VI, 2 (27), 4 (13-39), 37 (31).
Agenda. II, 2 (38-42), 9 (1-5); III, 3.
Agreements and conventions.
See: Headquarters - agreement with France. International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. Non-Governmental Organizations - agreements, 1955. Technical assistance. Universal Copyright Convention.
Agricultural Institute, Retalhuleu (Guatemala). IV, 4 (66).
"Alliance internationale des anciens de la Cité universitaire de Paris" - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (39-45).
American Education Research Association. IV, 11(9).
Anniversaries. II, 5 (85), 17 (53); III, 1 (47); IV, 25 (107-133), 29 (138-149), 31 (86-99), 35 (16).
Archaeology.
See also: International regulations regarding archaeological excavations. Monuments, artistic and historical sites.
—— - Egypt. II, 6 (107), IV, 24 (110); VI, 5 (101, 102).
See also: Centre of Photographic Documentation on Egyptian Antiquities.
—— - Libya. IV, 24 (91-102, 116, 117, 125).
Architecture - international competitions. IV, 24 (78), 35 (16).

Archives. IV, 25 (60); VI, 7 (26).
See also: Cultural property. History - Latin America.
Arid Zone. IV, 8 (44), 15 (47), 16 (53-74, 108), 35 (11); VI, 8 (90-92, 99, 105), 17 (103-105, 112, 152, 153), 24 (122).
See also: Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research.
Art - dissemination. IV, 4 (42), 29 (19-46); VI, 7 (87-115), 18 (50).
— - reproduction. IV, 29 (21-45); VI, 7 (87-105), 18 (50, 85-93), 29 (11, 14).
— and education. IV, 21 (99), 24 (163-167); VI, 5 (115-124), 6 (60).
Artists - protection. IV, 23 (106-109).
— - representation at General Conferences. IV, 21 (53, 68).
Arts and crafts. IV, 24 (160-166); VI, 5 (115-124), 6 (60).
Assistance to Member States. IV, 2 (11, 13, 21, 26), 4 (20, 21), 5 (86, 93), 6 (16, 32-38), 10 (5), 13 (39-49), 14 (117-122), 16 (2), 19 (30-77), 20 (2-35), 22 (19, 83-85), 24 (114-125, 168), 25 (91-100), 27 (128), 32 (29, 35, 58, 59), 35 (35); V, 10 (89), 11 (45, 65); VI, 3 (23), 4 (86-101), 5 (7-9, 113, 117), 6 (38-39, 60, 113), 7 (50-59), 9 (34, 124), 10 (50), 12 (53-66), 14 (13), 18 (43), 22 (6), 23 (1), 31 (25, 32).
— - programme and denomination. IV, 2 (13), 3 (11, 31), 5 (47).
Assistant Director-General. V, 6 (39-66); VI, 13 (52-54).
— (M. Adiseshiah) - nomination. V, 6 (45).
— (R. Maheu) - nomination. V, 6 (45).
Associate Members. II, 3 (84-107), 4 (1-5); V, 5 (70, 71), 19 (54, 82); VIII, 5 (19-29, 41-53).
Associated youth enterprises. IV, 14 (153), 32 (26-28); VI, 5 (13-16).
Astronomy. IV, 19 (38-77).
Atomic energy.
See also: European Centre for Nuclear Research. Radio-activity. Radio-isotopes.
— - peaceful utilization. II, 5 (82, 135); IV, 5 (5), 15 (17-20, 53), 16 (50-52), 17 (1-71), 19 (31); VI, 16 (77-129), 33 (89-103).
Audio-visual aids. IV, 24 (160), 26 (1, 103), 27 (11, 19, 114); VI, 6 (63-91), 12 (43-48).
See also: Fellowships - fundamental education.
Auditors - report, 1952-53. V, 2 (2-12); VI, 16 (3-12).

## B

Barbados.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Bibliography and documentation. IV, 7 (18-26), 23 (90-105); VI, 5 (75-80).
See also: Dictionaries, multilingual. International Advisory Committee on Bibliography. Scientific documentation.
Bolaña, José Cesar - memorial tribute. IV, 23 (114-118).
Bolivia - right to vote. II, 1 (43); III, 11 (34), IV, 29 (23).
Braille. IV, 27 (107); VI, 12 (28-35), 20 (70-75).
Brazil - representation. II, 2 (7, 19, 20).
Broadcasting.
See: Educational Radio, Sutatenza (Colombia). Radio.
Brunei.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Budget - methods of presentation.
See: Programme and budget - methods of presentation.
— - surplus. V, 2 (44-63), 10 (85, 94-110), 11 (44-69), 13 (46), 14 (5-32).
—, 1955-56. IV, VI.
See also: Programme and budget, 1955-56.
—, 1955-56 - appropriation table. II, 17 (42-124); IV, 32, 34 (4-15), 35 (1-55); VI, 36, 37, 38.
—, 1955-56 - methods of financing. II, 12 (25-51), 13 (1-9), 16 (37); IV, 9 (4-59); V, 10 (80-110), 11 (44-69), 13 (65-81), 14 (1-31).
Budget Committee.
See: Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Bulgaria.
See: Admission of new Members.
Bunche Committee. VI, 16 (96).

## C

Calendar reforms.
See: Symposia - calendar reforms.
Cancer.
See: Cell growth.
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace - representation. II, 4 (7).
Catalogue of Colour Reproductions of Paintings. VI, 7 (87, 104).
Cell growth. II, 17 (60); IV, 4 (61), 5 (14), 15 (30), 16 (111-158, 161), 32 (31-56, 113, 114); VI, 8 (89, 114-121), 9 (1-24), 24 (119-122), 37 (6-30, 46-69).
Centenaries.
See: Anniversaries.
Centre of Photographic Documentation on Egyptian Antiquities. IV, 24 (110); VI, 5 (93, 94).
Children. III, 11 (35-44); IV, 11 (91-100); VI, 3 (79-82).
China - representation. II, 1 (45-50), 2 (17, 22-24, 26, 27, 29-31).
— - right to vote. II, 1 (43, 45-50), 12 (1-24); V, 10 (69-74), 11 (72-76), 12 (1-8).
Cinema and youth.
See: Films, educational.
Civilizations - history. VI, 29 (35-38).
Closing speeches. II, 18 (117-129).
Committee on Contributions. III, 2 (8); V, 1 (15-23).
— - reports. V, 9 (1-90), 10 (1-110), 13 (1-81), 14 (1-31), 20 (4-22).
Committee of Industrial Education, Guatemala. IV, 4 (66), 7 (37).
Committee on Reports of Member States. II, 18 (64).
— - reports. II, 16 (1-24); V, 8 (7), 9 (2-28).
Committee for Technical Co-operation, Africa South of the Sahara. IV, 3 (37, 41), 11 (52-57, 79), 22 (34).
Committees, Commissions and Working Parties. II, 1 (51, 52), 2 (43); III, 1 (9), 2 (7-16), 9; IV, 1, 2 (1-9); V, 1 (1-16); VI, 1 (5-12).

Community development. III, 1 (47); IV, 20 (53), 22 (46-61); VI, 6 (14-23), 16 (64-76), 26 (36-43).
Competitions, international.
See: Architecture.
—, national. IV, 12 (126).
Conference of Internationally-Minded Schools - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (21).
Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations, 4th. IV, 4 (90-96), 18 (72).
Conference on the Public Understanding of Science. IV, 17 (111); VI, 27 (67-71).
Conference on Vocational and Technical Education in Schools for the Arab States of the Middle East. VI, 4 (40-45).
Conflicts, international - analysis. IV, 20 (36), 24 (17), 31 (1-29); VI, 9 (125-134).
Constitution - amendments. V, 1 (24-29), 4 (1-66), 5 (1-66), 7 (1-80), 8 (1-91), 11 (5-33), 19 (38-52); VIII, 2 (10-42), 3 (1-65), 4, 5.
See also: Director-General - reports. Executive Board - composition and functions. Member States - withdrawal.
Consultants - fees. VI, 16 (17), 30 (27, 28).
Consultative Committee on Adult Education. IV, 4 (49), 14 (53, 78-83, 93-114).
Consultative Committee on Youth Work. IV, 14 (138-152).
Contributions - arrears.
See: Contributions - collection.
— - Associate Members. V, 9 (8), 10 (57-68).
— - Austria. V, 9 (7).
— - Bolivia. II, 1 (43); III, 11 (34); IV, 29 (23).
— - Byelorussia, SSR of. II, 12 (43); V, 9 (11-33, 78).
— - China. II, 1 (43), 12 (3-24); III, 2 (8); V, 1 (16), 9 (7, 82-90), 10 (2-35, 44, 53-56), 12 (1-8).
— - collection. II, 1 (13-44), 3 (8-11), 12 (1-24), 16 (33), III, 1 (43-45); V, 11 (44-69), 13 (1-81), 14 (1-31); 20 (4, 9).
— - Cuba. II, 1 (43), 5 (4); III, 2 (1).
— - currencies, 1955-56. II, 16 (58); V, 13 (34, 57-60), 20 (4-8).
— - Czechoslovakia. II, 1 (43), 12 (3-24), 16 (55); V, 1 (17, 18), 13 (1, 8, 11, 20, 40, 49, 52, 53), 20 (6, 7).
— - Hungary. II, 1 (43), 12 (3-24), 16 (5[illegible] 57); V, 1 (19), 13 (1, 12, 20, 40, 49, 54).
— - Jordan. V, 9 (69), 10 (38-42).
— - Netherlands. V, 10 (2[illegible]).
— - new Members. IV, 9 (8-11); V, 10 (85, 91), 14 (22).
— - Non-Member States of the United Nations. V, 10 (46-49).
— - Poland. II, 1 (43), 16 (3-24); V, 13 (1, 13, 20, 40, 49, 55).
— - scale, 1955-56. II, 12 (12, 25-51), 16 (33); IV, 9 (1-59); V, 9 (3-90), 10 (1-110), 11 (34), 13 (1-81), 14 (1-31), 20 (4, 10).
— - special reserve fund. V, 10 (85, 94-110), 11 (44-69), 14 (10).
— - Switzerland. V, 20 (4).
— - Syria. V, 1 (18).
Ukraine, SSR of. II, 12 (43); V, 9 (11-33, 78).
— - USSR. II, 12 (43); V, 9 (11-33, 78).
— - United Kingdom. V, 9 (51-53).
— - United States of America. IV, 9 (7); V, 9 (9, 12, 34-90), 10 (19, 25, 51-56).
Co-ordinating Secretariat of National Unions of Students - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (22).
Copyright. IV, 18 (135-138), 23 (102-106, 111); VI, 5 (81, 82), 7 (142), 8 (4-12), 18 (106-110).
See also: Provisional Copyright Committee. Universal Copyright Convention.
Copyright Directory. IV, 23 (102-106, 111); VI, 18 (106-110).
Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences - agreement, 1955. V, 16 (138).
— - Unesco - grants, 1955-56. IV, 15 (87-91, 102), 16 (137), 17 (72-79); VI, 8 (41-49).
Courier (The). IV, 1 (26), 25 (107), 26 (60, 81-98), 29 (170), 31 (89, 96); VI, 11 (32, 36, 54-63, 74).
Credentials - presentation and verification. II, 2 (1-37), 11 (20-27), 14 (1-7); III, 5 (11); IX.
Credentials Committee - reports. II, 2 (1-37), 11 (20-27), 14 (1-7).
Cuba - right to vote. II, 1 (43), 5 (4); III, 2 (1).
Cultural activities.
See also: Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
— - publications. II, 9 (182-193), 18 (54); IV, 21 (29, 84), 23 (75-82, 90-113), 24 (44, 163), 25 (4, 5, 112, 118); VI, 5 (75-80), 7 (87, 104, 112, 116), 15 (10, 18), 18 (50, 85-87, 106-110).
Cultural agreements. IV, 30 (83-104); VI, 12 (81-99).
Cultural Commission of the Arab League. IV, 29 (55, 64).
Cultural property.
See also: International Centre for the Preservation and Restoration of Monuments and Museum Objects. International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. Manuscripts - Middle East. Regional Laboratory for the Preservation of Monuments and Works of Art of the South Asian Region.
— - preservation. IV, 21 (32), 24 (91-124); VI, 5 (91-102).
— - protection in armed conflict. IV, 24 (37-59), 35 (16), VI, 5 (81, 82, 91).
— - restitution. IV, 24 (39).
Cultural relations. IV, 25 (101, 133), 29 (12-18), 30 (83-104), 31 (1-27); VI, 7 (71-86), 12 (81-99).
Culture.
See also: International Fund for Education, Science and Culture. World Culture, Science and Education Week.
— - dissemination. IV, 29 (138-149); VI, 18 (48-84).
Cultures - comparative study. IV, 3 (27, 30), 4 (73), 21 (98); VI, 7 (71-85), 33 (70-85).
Current Sociology. II, 9 (182); VI, 9 (119, 120).
Czechoslovakia - right to vote. II, 12 (2-9); V, 11 (71-76), 12 (1, 8).

## D

Dams. VI, 17 (94-116).
Democracies.
See: Symposia - democratic government.

Deputy Director-General.
See: Assistant Director-General.
Dictionaries, multilingual. IV, 15 (99-101), 27 (54); VI, 17 (17).
Director-General - reports. II, 16 (133); V, 3 (26-33), 19 (38-50); VIII, 4 (1-65).
— (L. H. Evans) - report, 1953-54. II, 4 (12-116), 5 (7-143), 6 (2-148), 7 (5-175), 8, 9 (6-195), 10; III, 1 (14-28).
— (J. Torres Bodet) - tribute. II, 10 (81).
— , acting (J. W. Taylor) - tribute. II, 10 (81).
Discrimination. II, 17 (100); IV, 11 (18, 38), 20 (44-103); VI, 9 (135-142), 18 (13-28), 27 (75), 30 (19), 33 (16, 25, 26).
Discussions, 1956 - cultural relations - Asia and America. VI, 7 (73).
Dominica.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Donations. VI, 38 (14).
Double taxation. IV, 23 (102-106, 111).

## E

Education.
See also: Adult education. Fundamental education. International Fund for Education, Science and Culture. Missions. Pre-school education. Programme, 1955-56 - education. Teaching. World Culture, Science and Education Week.
Education Clearing House. IV, 10 (31), 11 (1-33); VI, 3 (6-15), 4 (20, 21), 16 (31-34).
Education, free and compulsory. IV, 5 (1, 12), 7 (73), 8 (18, 36), 10 (7, 9, 16, 31, 38, 44-46), 11 (35, 62), 13 (31); VI, 3 (17-85), 16 (46-49), 20 (38), 21 (9, 20).
See also: Regional conferences on free and compulsory education.
— , higher. II, 17 (24); IV, 8 (18).
— - publications. IV, 4 (72), 8 (5, 49, 52, 55), 10 (47), 11 (16), 13 (103, 110, 132), 14 (31), 25 (4-33), 27 (116-120), 35 (15); V, 11 (45); VI, 6 (24, 74), 7 (1-8, 20).
— , technical and vocational. IV, 7 (9), 8 (5), 10 (10, 16), 12 (83-88), 17 (122, 124, 133); VI, 4 (40-46), 16 (50-53).
See also: Committee of Industrial Education, Guatemala. Conference on Vocational and Technical Education in Schools for the Arab States of the Middle East.
Educational documentation centres. IV, 11 (27); VI, 16 (31-34), 24 (114).
Educational Film Institute for Latin America. IV, 27 (111), 35 (51); VI, 19 (33).
Educational psychology. IV, 11 (91-100); VI, 28 (47-49).
Educational Radio, Sutatenza (Colombia). IV, 8 (59-61).
Educational, scientific and cultural material - free flow. IV, 27 (27); VI, 11 (118-122), 19 (40-44).
Educational statistics. IV, 18 (160-170).
Egypt.
See: Archaeology - Egypt. Centre of Photographic Documentation on Egyptian Antiquities.
Emblem of Unesco.
See: Seal and emblem of Unesco.
Esperanto. II, 18 (39-47); IV, 29 (121-133, 151-155).
Ethnic groups. IV, 20 (50).
European Centre for Nuclear Research. IV, 15 (25, 31), 17 (17); VI, 5 (96).
Evaluation techniques. IV, 4 (8, 24), 22 (73-85); VI, 10 (1-9), 31 (16).
Exchange of persons.
See also: Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons. Teachers - exchange. Workers - exchange. Youth - exchange.
Exchange of Persons Clearing House. IV, 28 (6); VI, 10 (36).
Exchange of persons - publications. IV, 28 (6-18); VI, 10 (37-39, 82).
Executive Board - budget. IV, 12 (2), 32 (23); V, 6 (27-38), 14 (33-99, 119); VI, 13 (87-92), 14 (2-10), 37 (1).
— - composition and functions. II, 11 (28-213), 16 (47-157); III, 2 (15, 16), 4 (1, 37-43), 5 (42-51), 9 (10-25), 10 (30-36), 12 (2-20); V, 1 (24-29), 4 (1-66), 5 (1-66), 7 (1-80), 8 (1-91), 11 (4, 11-33); VI, 28 (2, 9); VIII, 2 (10-42), 3 (1-85).
— - election. II, 11 (189-213), 14 (8-44); III, 9 (10-25); V, 7 (60-80), 8 (8-17, 32-91), 11 (4, 11-33), 24 (21-23); VIII, 3 (1-85), 6 (1-73).
— - election, 1954. II, 15 (1-34, 89-107), 16 (48); III, 5 (42-60), 9 (10-25), 10 (30-36), 11 (3, 8-31).
— - members - allowances. V, 6 (36-38), 14 (53-78).
— - organization. V, 6 (27-38), 14 (33-99, 119); VI, 14 (2-10), 19 (137-140).
— - working languages.
See: Executive Board - organization.
Exhibitions - exchange. IV, 21 (54), 25 (72-81); VI, 7 (46).
Exhibitions, travelling. IV, 17 (107-121), 25 (82-87), 26 (103), 29 (36); VI, 6 (48-59), 7 (49, 51-56, 96-99), 11 (89-94), 27 (65), 29 (5-15), 30 (47-56).
Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation. IV, 8 (1, 2), 13 (13, 14, 20-29), 14 (154), 26 (62, 107), 29 (63, 65), 31 (1-29); VI, 2 (18, 19), 4 (55), 24 (1-6, 71), 27, 28, 29, 30.

## F

Fellowships. IV, 28 (10-52); VI, 10 (21, 32, 41-72), 18 (57), 28 (106-125), 30 (43-46).
— - arid zone. IV, 28 (33); VI, 10 (62).
— - artists. IV, 28 (41-49); VI, 7 (110), 10 (56, 64-68), 19 (60-62), 24 (152).
— - fundamental education. IV, 27 (121), 28 (29); VI, 6 (114).
— - geophysics. IV, 28 (33); VI, 8 (44), 10 (62).
— - librarianship. IV, 28 (50); VI, 10 (64-68).
— - mass communication. IV, 27 (121), 28 (51); VI, 10 (69-71), 12 (66).
— - museums. IV, 28 (50); VI, 10 (64-68), 18 (52).
— - natural sciences - teaching. IV, 15 (57), 28 (33-36); VI, 10 (62).
— - oceanography. VI, 10 (62).
— - social sciences. IV, 28 (40); VI, 10 (63).
— - statistics. IV, 28 (39); VI, 10 (63).
— - teaching. IV, 28 (30).
— - technical assistance. IV, 7 (80), 8 (43, 53, 118).
— - writers. IV, 28 (41-49); VI, 7 (110), 10 (56, 64-68), 19 (60-62), 24 (152).

Fermi, Enrico - memorial tribute. IV, 15 (1-8, 41).
Film libraries. IV, 26 (68), 27 (122), 29 (43-45); VI, 6 (76), 12 (49-52), 18 (136).
Films. IV, 26 (120-128), 27 (10-18), 29 (2-11), 35 (19); VI, 6 (63-67), 11 (95-110), 12 (1-3, 12-27).
Films on art. IV, 27 (109), 29 (38-41); VI, 7 (106), 12 (36-42), 18 (53).
Films, education. IV, 5 (21), 27 (61-84, 89-111); VI, 6 (63, 64, 76-77), 11 (127-139), 12 (6-27), 18 (136), 19 (33), 24 (148, 150).
Financial accounts, 1952-53.
See: Auditors - reports, 1952-53.
Financial regulations - amendments. II, 16 (35, 60); III, 8 (31); V, 2 (52-76), 20 (2), 24 (27-33); VIII, 7 (1-30).
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. IV, 22 (63).
Ford Foundation - representation. II, 4 (7).
Freedom of information. IV, 27 (27-57), 32 (114-127), 33 (1-28); VI, 11 (111-122).
Freedom of movement.
See: Persons - free movement.
Friendship flag and postage stamp. III, 11 (35-44).
Fundamental and Adult Education. VI, 6 (24).
Fundamental education. IV, 7 (8), 10 (31), 13 (86-164), 14 (1-33), 27 (111, 123-126); VI, 6 (2-115), 7 (1-24), 12 (43-66).
See also: Fellowships - fundamental education. Rural teacher training.
— - associated projects. IV, 13 (87, 90, 99, 108, 136), 25 (46); VI, 6 (9), 7 (10-12), 27 (45).
Fundamental education centres. II, 17 (70-73); IV, 13 (88, 142-164), 14 (1-30); VI, 6 (92-112).
— , Arab States, Sirs-el-Layyan (Egypt). IV, 3 (24), 8 (48), 13 (87, 153-157), 14 (14-30), 25 (11); VI, 6 (92-99).
— , Ceylon. IV, 7 (69, 70).
— , Ecuador. II, 7 (16).
— , Honduras. II, 10 (25).
— , Iraq. IV, 8 (4).
— , Latin America, Patzcuaro (Mexico). II, 17 (70, 91, 92); IV, 3 (24, 38), 8 (48), 13 (87, 118, 145, 147, 150), 14 (1-30).
— , Philippines. IV, 8 (8, 10).
— , Thailand. II, 5 (100); IV, 8 (13).

## G

Gandhi. VI, 9 (125-131), 18 (32-37), 24 (138).
General Conference - conduct of business. V, 19 (81).
— - documents. IV, 4 (26), 35 (25, 119-130); V, 19 (81); VI, 25 (84, 86).
— - observers. II, 4 (6-11).
— - organization. III, 1 (2-11), 12 (9-22), 13 (4, 32-35); IV, 30 (70-74); V, 6 (11-26), 19 (57-61), 24 (24); VI, 25 (86, 99).
— - president and vice-presidents. II, 2 (44-53); V, 19 (62-70, 73-80); VIII, 5 (30, 75).
— - rules - amendments. III, 8 (31); V, 5 (67-71), 11 (19), 19 (53-96), 20 (1-3); VIII, 3 (66-85), 5 (19-96).
See also: Associate Members. Executive Board - budget. Executive Board - election. General Conference - conduct of business. General Conference. Nominations Committee. Resolutions - procedure. Working languages.
— - vote. II, 1 (43-50), 3 (5-11), 11 (189-192), 12 (2-6, 10-11), 14 (8-44); III, 1 (43); V, 10 (69-74), 11 (71-76), 12 (1-8), 13 (3, 8, 35, 62), 20 (1-3).
— . Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. II, 17 (64); III, 2 (7), 12 (2, 8-22); IV, 34 (16-108), 35 (56-117); V, 19 (57-60); VI, 37 (124-129), 38 (16-73).
— . Committees and commissions. III, 13 (25-31); V, 19 (57-61, 71, 72, 81); VIII, 1, 2 (1-7); X, 1 (1-8), 2 (2-41), 8 (8, 12-26, 31-36); XI, 1 (1-7), 2 (1-6).
— . Contributions Committee. V, 20 (12-22).
— . Nominations Committee. V, 19 (62-72); VIII, 5 (79-94).
— , 9th session - budget. V, 13 (80); VI, 13 (82-86), 20 (7-8, 14-18, 28).
— , 9th session - organization. II, 3 (1-3, 8-10), 18 (1-15); III, 12 (1-27); IV, 30 (72, 73), 35 (118-131); VI, 13 (82-86).
— , 9th session - seat. II, 15 (35-88), 17 (59); III, 7 (14); IV, 2 (53), 9 (26, 55), 12 (2), 30 (70); V, 6 (11-26), 13 (80); VI, 19 (141-143), 20 (1-37, 53), 24 (73-78).
Geophysical research. II, 6 (9); IV, 2 (31), 7 (67), 15 (22, 96), 28 (33); VI, 8 (39, 43), 17 (50), 24 (117), 27 (58-63), 30 (15-18).
Germany - Unesco Institutes. IV, 4 (79), 10 (97-102, 109-111, 119, 151), 11 (24), 14 (124, 132, 153), 18 (99); V, 15 (91); VI, 2 (27, 30, 40, 66, 68), 5 (17-38), 9 (70-75), 10 (10-17), 25 (65), 27 (15-28).
Gift Coupons. IV, 27 (137-144); VI, 7 (18), 12 (70-75), 19 (18-23), 27 (106).
Gold Coast.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Grenada.
See: Admission of Associate Members.

## H

Handbook on the International Exchange of Publications. IV, 23 (99).
Handbook of National Commissions. IV, 30 (37).
Headquarters. II, 16 (50, 138-144); III, 7 (13); IV, 24 (175); V, 6 (12-21), 14 (9, 18), 23 (1-8); VI, 11 (80-86), 13 (70), 19 (69-80), 20 (4, 16, 55); XI.
— - agreement with France. II, 16 (139-145); V, 23 (9-12); XI, 2 (7), 3 (7).
Headquarters Committee - election. II, 5 (1-3), 7 (3, 4); III, 2 (4).
— - reports. V, 23 (1-12); XI, 2 (7-90), 3.
History - Africa. IV, 29 (52, 61).
— - Latin America. IV, 25 (102), 29 (12); VI, 7 (77-86), 18 (97-102).
Hodson, William - memorial tribute. VI, 1 (2, 24-26, 33, 36, 43, 45), 2 (2).
Human rights. IV, 20 (42, 55-103), 22 (19), 26 (67); VI, 9 (135-142), 19 (1-11).
— - international covenants. IV, 30 (105-112).
— - teaching. IV, 11 (16), 12 (111-129), 13 (1-8, 18), 22 (50-61), 32 (29); VI, 4 (54, 82-85), 16 (54-76), 24 (134, 135), 26 (37), 27 (40-44),

31 (51).
See also: Competitions, national.
Humanistic studies. IV, 4 (71), 24 (126-156), 25 (21, 24); VI, 5 (103-113), 27 (78-85).
Humid tropical zone. IV, 3 (39), 16 (63-93), 19 (9), 35 (11); VI, 8 (96-99, 105, 111).
Hungary - right to vote. II, 1 (43), 12 (2-9); V, 11 (71-76), 12 (1, 8).
Hygiene - teaching. IV, 11 (101-105); VI, 16 (35-38).

## I

Ibarbourou, Juana - tribute. II, 9 (5), 18 (16-38); III, 3 (28-34).
Illiteracy. IV, 3 (26), 13 (93-105, 132), 22 (75); VI, 6 (12), 7 (20, 22).
See also: New literates
Immigrants - assimilation. IV, 22 (6-18); VI, 37 (93).
Impact. IV, 15 (58), 17 (97-105); VI, (26-30), 24 (130-131).
Index Translationum. II, 17 (54); IV, 23 (91-105); VI, 5 (75-80), 7 (112), 18 (87), 27 (87, 90).
Indian Council of World Affairs. IV, 31 (2); VI, 24 (138).
Indian National Committee for Mathematics. VI, 17 (11, 40-58).
Industrial training.
See also: Teachers - training.
Industrialization - social impact. IV, 20 (52), 22 (20-49, 64, 72); VI, 9 (143-155).
See also: International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization in Asia.
Institute of the Hylean Amazon. IV, 16 (80).
Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. IV, 22 (44, 48).
Intellectuals - assistance. IV, 28 (53-63).
Intergovernmental Conference for the Establishment of a Network of Marine Biological Laboratories in Latin America, 1955. VI, 8 (109).
International administrative tribunals. V, 23 (127-152), 24 (1-13).
International Advisory Committee on Bibliography. VI, 5 (75-80).
International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme of Unesco. IV, 15 (26, 55), 16 (35-49, 121), 17 (38), 32 (33); VI, 2 (27), 8 (87), 9 (2).
International Anatomical Nomenclature Committee. IV, 15 (116), 17 (81); VI, 8 (63).
International Association of Agricultural Producers. IV, 28 (76).
International Association of Art Critics. VI, 5 (58), 7 (99).
International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (23).
International Association of Music Libraries - grants, 1955-56. IV, 23 (58, 73, 84).
International Association for Musical Education - Unesco - relations, 1955-56. VI, 5 (115-124).
International Association of Plastic Arts - representation. II, 4 (8).
—— - grants, 1955-56. IV, 4 (31), 21 (39), 23 (27-49), 24 (87-89); VI, 7 (99), 18 (94-96), 24 (139).
International Association for the Teaching of Visual Arts - grants, 1955-56. IV, 24 (10[illegible]); VI, 5 (64, 115-124).
International Association of Universities - agreement, 1955. V, 16 (138).
—— - grants, 1955-56. II, 17 (79, 80, 88); IV, 10 (79-82, 107), 21 (66); V, 15 (27, 92); VI, 2 (61-65), 10 (37), 19 (59), 27 (40), 30 (6, 7).
International Association of University Professors and Lecturers - grants, 1955-56. IV, 10 (107), 28 (10, 90); VI, 19 (49).
International Association for Vocational Guidance - grants, 1955-56. V, 16 (24); VI, 2 (73, 76, 79).
—— - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (24).
International Bibliography of Anthropology. IV, 18 (149); VI, 9 (117, 119, 120).
International Bureau of Education. IV, 4 (83), 10 (4, 78, 85); VI, 3 (39-51), 4 (16-46).
—— - grants, 1955-56. IV, 4 (31), 11 (66-69); VI, 2 (53).
International Catholic Film Office - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (25).
International Centre for the Preservation and Restoration of Monuments and Museum Objects. IV, 24 (90-102); VI, 5 (92-100).
International Centre for Research on Social Problems of Industrialization in Asia. IV, 22 (64-72); VI, 9 (149-155), 37 (94-109, 120).
International Centre of Workers Education. IV, 14 (48, 67, 83-92, 114).
International Civil Aviation Organization. European-African Office. III, 7 (13); V, 23 (1); XI, 2 (21-90), 3 (7-38).
International civil servants. II, 4 (95), 10 (72, 79), 11 (105), 16 (40); IV, 18 (175-188), 22 (1, 2, 5); V, 20 (29, 30); VI, 26 (14-25).
See also: Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
—— - national legal guarantees. III, 5 (37-39), 6 (27); V, 17 (97), 20 (23-32), 24 (33-39); VIII, 7 (31-51).
International Commission on Large Dams. IV, 19 (12); VI, 17 (100).
International Commission for a Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind. IV, 25 (94-100), 29 (75-120); V, 2 (4-11); VI, 7 (70), 16 (4-12).
International Commission for the Translation of the Classics. IV, 29 (51, 55, 64).
International Committee of Comparative Law - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (42, 53); VI, 9 (131).
International Committee on the History of Art. IV, 29 (17).
International Committee on Monuments. IV, 24 (111).
International Committee for Social Sciences Documentation - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (7, 152); VI, 9 (80, 83).
International Computation Centre - grants, 1955-56. IV, 15 (31), 16 (15-34); VI, 17 (59-93), 18 (44), 24 (123-126).
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. IV, 14 (67), 22 (23, 26, 42).
International Confederation of Professional and Intellectual Workers - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (26).
International Conference on Public Education. IV, 10 (39), 11 (66-69), 12 (68); VI, 3 (39-51, 68), 4 (26), 24 (83).

International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. IV, 24 (37-59); VI, 5 (81, 82), 7 (122-142), 8 (1-3).
International Council on Archives - grants, 1955-56. IV, 23 (72).
International Council of Arts and Letters. IV, 21 (39, 48), 23 (85-89).
International Council for Educational Films. IV, 27 (64); V, 16 (27); VI, 18 (127-134).
International Council of Museums - agreement, 1955. V, 16 (138).
—— - grants, 1955-56. IV, 21 (136-148), 25 (76-81); VI, 6 (49), 7 (99), 17 (137-142).
International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies-agreement, 1955. V, 16 (138).
—— - grants, 1955-56. IV, 3 (10), 4 (31, 83), 21 (47, 88, 111-135), 23 (81), 25 (104, 105, 123), 32 (97, 110), 35 (24); VI, 5 (70-72, 104), 18 (72), 37 (111).
International Council of Scientific Unions - agreement, 1955. V, 16 (138).
—— - grants, 1955-56. II, 17 (47, 50); IV, 4 (31, 83), 15 (43, 58, 66, 86), 16 (105), 32 (6-22, 72, 92, 100), 35 (24); VI, 8 (45), 9 (10, 11, 58), 27 (58), 37 (7).
International Directory of Musical Sources. IV, 23 (75-81).
International Directory of Social Science Research. II, 9 (182).
International Economic Association - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (5, 87); VI, 9 (143).
International Economic Bibliography. VI, 9 (119, 120).
International Federation of Art Film. VI, 5 (58).
International Federation of Catholic Youth - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (28).
International Federation of Children's Communities - grants, 1955-56. IV, 10 (106, 114); VI, 2 (69, 73, 76, 79).
—— - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (79-83).
International Federation of Christian Trade Unions - representation. IV, 14 (73), 22 (26, 42).
International Federation for Documentation - grants, 1955-56. IV, 15 (105-108), 23 (71).
International Federation of Library Associations - grants, 1955-56. IV, 15 (107), 23 (50-70, 74).
International Federation of Organizations for School Correspondence and Exchanges - grants, 1955-56. IV, 14 (137); VI, 2 (55-60).
International Federation of the Periodical Press - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (38).
International Federation of Senior Police Officers - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (29-37).
International Federation of Translators. IV, 29 (51); VI, 27 (89).
International Federation of Women Lawyers - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (84-88).
International Federation of Workers' Educational Associations - grants, 1955-56. VI, 2 (76, 79).
International Folklore Congress, 1954. IV, 31 (100).
International Fund for Education, Science and Culture. III 4 (36), 5 (24-35); IV, 11 (70-75, 83-88), 31 (30-54); VI, 3 (52, 68), 20 (38-43, 63), 21 (7-11), 23 (54), 24 (85-106), 31 (21).
International Geophysical Year, 1957-58. IV, 2 (31), 15 (22, 96), 28 (33); VI, 8 (39, 43), 17 (50), 24 (117), 27 (56-63), 30 (15-18).
International House Association - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (39-45).
International Humanist and Ethical Union - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (19, 89).
International Instrument for the Reduction of Obstacles to the Free Movement of Persons Engaged in Educational, Scientific and Cultural Activities. IV, 27 (36, 42-44); VI, 11 (112), 19 (34-39).
International Labour Assistance - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (46).
International Labour Organization. IV, 12 (83-88) VI, 10 (75-80).
International League for the Rights of Man - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (47-52).
International Mathematical Union. IV, 17 (135, 136).
International Museums Agency. IV, 21 (83), 25 (78).
International Museums Day. IV, 25 (71-73).
International Music Council - agreement, 1955. V, 16 (138).
—— - grants, 1955-56. IV, 21 (139-148); VI, 7 (107, 109).
International PEN Club - grants, 1955-56. IV, 21 (125), 23 (10-26).
International Political Science Association - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (78), 22 (52, 53); VI, 6 (18), 9 (144), 26 (37-43).
International Political Science Bibliography. VI, 9 (119, 120).
International regulations regarding archaeological excavations. IV, 24 (61-78), 35 (16).
International relations clubs. II, 6 (19).
International school, Paris, IV, 3 (14, 22), 14 (177-208); VI, 27 (48-57), 30 (22-29).
International Social Science Bulletin. VI, 9 (115).
International Social Science Council - agreement, 1955. V, 16 (145, 146).
—— - grants, 1955-56. IV, 4 (31), 18 (6, 19, 53, 64), 22 (26); VI, 9 (76).
—— - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (53).
International Society of Criminology - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (53, 60, 101-127); VI, 18 (29, 30), 24 (136).
International Sociological Association - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (5, 78-81, 94); VI, 9 (143).
International Statistical Institute - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (98, 192); VI, 9 (80-98, 105).
International students correspondence. IV, 27 (45-56); VI, 18 (120-122).
International Students Movement for the United Nations - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (19, 125-135).
International Theatre Institute - agreement, 1955. V, 16 (138).
—— - grants, 1955-56. IV, 21 (66).
International understanding and co-operation. II, 17 (77-89); IV, 3 (13, 19, 22), 4 (15), 5 (33, 104), 8 (12), 10 (22, 31, 49), 12 (23), 13 (13, 20-29), 14 (135), 20 (40), 26 (25, 39-49, 107), 27 (1-26), 29 (63, 71), 31 (1-29), 32 (115-127), 33 (1-29), 35 (40); VI, 2 (14, 18, 19, 21), 4 (53-58, 85, 102), 10 (73), 11 (10, 32), 18 (32-47), 24 (80), 27 (1-14), 28, 29, 30, 31 (51), 32 (5).
—— - repertory of activities subventioned by Unesco. V, 15 (18, 64).
International Union of Architects - grants, 1955-56.

IV, 21 (66, 149-153), 23 (1-9, 80).
International Union of Biochemistry. IV, 15 (95), 16 (155); VI, 8 (45), 24 (116).
International Union of Local Authorities - Unesco - relations. VI, 6 (18).
International Union of Official Travel Organizations. IV, 28 (7).
International Union for Protecting Public Morality - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (54).
International Union for the Protection of Nature. VI, 17 (100).
International Union of Scientific Psychology - grants, 1955-56. IV, 18 (53); VI, 9 (71).
International Union of Students - representation. II, 4 (8).
—— - Unesco - relations. II, 16 (123); V, 16 (19, 92-106, 110).

## J

Jamaica.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations - grants, 1955-56. IV, 10 (92-95, 126, 148); VI, 2 (35, 67).
Journals of World History. IV, 29 (115); VI, 7 (61-70).
Junior Red Cross. IV, 14 (150).

## K

Kalinga Prize. VI, 18 (116).
Korea - assistance. IV, 3 (32), 13 (77-85), 32 (29); VI, 5 (2, 3), 7 (15-17).

## L

Land reform. IV, 22 (62-72); VI, 6 (22, 23).
Languages.
See also: Esperanto. Publications and documents of Unesco. Seminars, regional - parallel use of Spanish and English. Working languages.
—— - teaching. IV, 12 (95-102), 13 (133, 134); VI, 4 (50, 60-63), 16 (44, 45), 27 (29).
—— , vernacular. IV, 5 (86), 13 (133, 138); VI, 6 (28).
Latin American Fundamental Education Press. II, 6 (113).
Latin American Pilot Centre for the Study of Methods of Teaching Science. IV, 17 (124); VI, 17 (130).
Latin American Regional Centre for Secondary School Teachers. II, 5 (59); IV, 12 (103), 31 (55-85).
Legal Committee. II, 18 (62).
—— - reports. V, 11 (5-33), 19 (38-96).
Librarians. IV, 25 (35-45), 53 ; VI, 7 (26), 15 (14).
See also: Seminars, regional, 1955 - public libraries, Asia.
Librarianship. IV, 23 (93), 25 (34); VI, 6 (36-37).
Libraries. See also: Public libraries.
—— , national. VI, 7 (31-33).
Living conditions. IV, 5 (23), 8 (64), 16 (15-161); VI, 8 (87-121), 33 (86-103).

## M

Manual for the Production by Teachers and Students Themselves of Simple or Improvized Devices. VI, 9 (31-32).
Manual on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. IV, 24 (44).
Manuscripts - Middle East. IV, 24 (113).
Marine biology. IV, 16 (95), 19 (58); VI, 8 (106-113), 17 (154-156).
See also: Intergovernmental Conference for the Establishment of a Network of Marine Biological Laboratories in Latin America, 1955. Oceanography.
Mass Communication.
See also: Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Mass Communication Clearing House. IV, 27 (61, 86); VI, 11 (32-110, 123), 27 (100).
—— - improvement of means and techniques. IV, 27 (86), 32 (105, 115-127), 33 (1-29); VI, 11 (111), 29 (16), 30 (57-60).
—— - publications. IV, 1 (26), 25 (107-118), 26 (21, 60, 81-98), 29 (170), 31 (89, 96); VI, 11 (32, 36, 54-63, 73, 74, 87, 123-126).
Mathematics - teaching. IV, 17 (135, 136).
Medina.
See: Toribio Medina, José.
Member States - reports. II, 16 (1-24); X.
—— - withdrawal. II, 16 (46); V, 3 (34-79), 19 (51-55, 91-93); VIII, 2 (9), 5 (1-18).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary. II, 5 (85), 17 (53); III, 1 (47); IV, 25 (107-133), 35 (16); VI, 20 (44-51), 26 (26-30, 33-35), 37 (94, 104).
Microfilms. IV, 24 (60), 25 (56-60); VI, 7 (34-42).
Migration.
See: Population problems.
Minorities. IV, 20 (55-94), 22 (19); VI, 9 (135-142).
See also: Population problems.
Missions. IV, 7 (18-38, 52, 81), 8 (125, 148), 24 (24-34, 116, 117, 125), 26 (100); VI, 5 (102), 7 (78), 10 (19), 11 (64-72), 12 (53-66), 14 (13), 15 (32, 51), 18 (66, 67).
Monuments, artistic and historical sites. IV, 24 (90-111); VI, 5 (91-102), 18 (80, 81).
See also: Cultural property. International Centre for the Preservation and Restoration of Monuments and Museum Objects. International Committee on Monuments. Regional Laboratory for the Preservation of Monuments and Works of Art of the South Asian Region.
Museum. IV, 21 (29).
Museums. IV, 21 (83), 25 (61-90), 35 (49); VI, 6 (40-59), 7 (43-59), 18 (111, 112).
See also: Cultural property. International Museums Agency. International Museums Day. Pilot projects - museums. Seminars, regional, 1956 - museums.
—— , scientific. IV, 24 (103), 25 (92, 93); VI, 18 (57).
Music. IV, 25 (92, 93), 29 (43-45); VI, 5 (115-124), 7 (87, 107-110), 18 (54).
—— in education. VI, 5 (115, 116).
Musical notation - unification. IV, 23 (83).

## N

National Commissions. IV, 3 (18), 4 (33, 47, 76), 5 (102), 6 (14, 69, 70), 26 (39, 52-66), 30 (18-69), 35 (67); VI, 11 (13-31), 12 (80), 14 (11, 28), 15 (30-88), 19 (115-117), 21 (39-42).
See also: Regional Conference of European National Commissions, 1955.
—— - visits to Headquarters. IV, 30 (37); VI, 15 (40).
Natural disasters. III, 8 (24-30); IV, 33 (30-32).
Natural resources. IV, 16 (36, 159-160), 17 (84), 19 (1-30); VI, 17 (94-129).
Natural sciences.
See also: International Advisory Committee on Research in the Natural Sciences Programme of Unesco. Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences. Symposia.
—— - publications. IV, 15 (58, 93-94), 16 (50, 55), 17 (97-105); VI, 8 (93), 9 (26-34), 24 (130-131), 37 (40-45).
—— - teaching. IV, 17 (85-138), 19 (23-30, 33); VI, 9 (26-34), 17 (11, 117, 130).
See also: Latin American Pilot Centre for the Study of Methods of Teaching Science.
—— - terminology.
See: Scientific documentation.
Neurobiology. IV, 16 (41).
New Education Fellowship - subventions, 1955-56. IV, 10 (85, 104, 134); VI, 2 (54).
New literates - reading material. IV, 4 (72), 8 (5, 49, 52, 55), 10 (47), 13 (103, 110, 132), 14 (31), 21 (104), 25 (4-33), 27 (116-120), 35 (15); V, 11 (45); VI, 6 (74), 7 (1-8, 20).
Nominations Committee. III, 9 (14, 19), 11 (8-33), 13 (25-30).
—— - reports. II, 2 (44-50), 7 (1-4), 15 (1-26), 18 (59-69).
Non-Governmental Organizations.
See also: Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations, 4th.
—— - agreements, 1955. V, 16 (136-146).
—— - grants, 1950-53. V, 15 (16-100), 16 (1-17).
—— - grants, 1955-56. II, 16 (44); IV, 4 (18), 5 (10, 15, 58), 10 (72, 154), 15 (66-98), 18 (53-134), 21 (47, 66, 108-158), 23 (1-89), 24 (36, 141), 25 (76-80, 104, 123), 32 (6-22, 24, 92, 100, 110), 35 (24); VI, 2 (27, 29-83), 3 (1-5), 5 (58-74), 8 (39-48), 9 (70-114), 16 (1, 2).
—— - representation. II, 4 (6-11); IV, 35 (36-39).
—— - token subvention. IV, 23 (12).
—— - Unesco - relations. II, 16 (45, 121-130); III, 3 (21); IV, 5 (108), 6 (17), 10 (72-154), 26 (73); V, 15 (16-100), 16 (18-135).
Non-self-governing territories - education. IV, 11 (59-65).
North Borneo.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Nuclear research.
See: Atomic energy. European Centre for Nuclear Research. Radio-activity. Radio-isotopes.

## O

Observatory, Quito (Ecuador). IV, 19 (38-77).
Oceanography. IV, 4 (35, 62), 15 (45, 46), 16 (95-107), 19 (58), 35 (11); VI, 8 (106-113), 17 (153-156).
See also: Advisory Committee on Oceanographic Research.
Organization of American States.
See also: Seminars, regional - parallel use of Spanish and English.
—— - Unesco - relations. II, 9 (177); VI, 3 (66), 15 (27-29).

## P

Pacific Science Congress, VIIIth. VI, 8 (108).
Palladio, Andrea - reproductions. IV, 29 (14-17); VI, 18 (90-93), 26 (32).
Paraguay.
See: Admission of new Members.
Peace. II, 5 (66, 123); III, 10 (2); IV, 4 (40, 41, 74), 5 (6, 17, 19), 20 (44), 22 (3, 4, 86-96), 24 (1-16), 27 (1-5), 29 (162), 32 (115-127), 33 (1-29), 35 (13, 21, 30); VI, 18 (1-11), 19 (112).
Permanent International Centre for Adult Education. IV, 14 (95-118).
Persons - free movement. IV, 27 (36, 39, 54-57), 28 (82-95); VI, 11 (112-117), 19 (34-39).
Photographic Archives of Unesco. IV, 26 (119); VI, 11 (89-94).
Photo-synthesis. IV, 15 (22), 17 (20).
Physical standards. IV, 27 (35).
Pilot projects - arts - dissemination. VI, 7 (111).
—— - broadcasting. VI, 6 (72-74).
—— - education. IV, 12 (89-94), 32 (25); VI, 4 (47-49).
—— - museums. IV, 25 (61-81); VI, 6 (40-46).
—— - public libraries, Africa. IV, 25 (38); VI, 6 (34-35).
—— - public libraries, India. VI, 7 (21, 30), 23 (38).
—— - public libraries, Latin America. VI, 7 (26, 30), 15 (14).
—— - television. VI, 6 (78-90).
Poland - right to vote. II, 1 (43), 12 (2-9); V, 11 (71-76), 12 (1, 8).
Population problems. IV, 22 (7-19), 31 (1-29).
See also: Immigrants - assimilation.
Postage rates - reduction. IV, 27 (152-156); VI, 19 (40-43).
Pre-school education. IV, 10 (16, 24, 50); VI, 4 (10-103).
Press. IV, 26 (81-98); VI, 11 (42-53).
—— and youth. IV, 27 (72-84); VI, 11 (127-139), 19 (12-16).
Printed Word (The). VI, 11 (122).
Printing methods.
See: Research Centre for the Adaptation of Scripts to Modern Methods of Printing.
Procedure Committee.
See: Legal Committee.
Proceedings of the Symposium on Arid Zone Research. VI, 37 (40-45).
Proceedings of the Symposium on the Formation and Erosion of Soils as Affected by Climatic Factors. VI, 8 (93).
Proceedings of the Symposium on Wind and Solar Energy. IV, 16 (55); VI, 8 (93).
Productivity. IV, 22 (25, 27, 35).
Programme - decentralization. II, 17 (58); IV, 1

(13, 35-44), 2 (5, 55), 3 (16), 4 (23, 62, 70), 6 (26), 19 (98), 30 (1-8, 60), 35 (23); VI, 14 (11-90), 15, 19 (115-117), 23 (34), 32.
See also: Science Co-operation Offices. Secretariat. Regional Office in the Western Hemisphere, Havana.
Programme - priority projects. IV, 2 (49), 3 (16), 4 (1-5, 39), 6 (19, 21, 22); VI, 24 (9-72), 32, 33.
—— - procedures. IV, 33 (33-70); VI, 31 (14, 21), 33 (10-121), 34, 36.
—— - remodelling. II, 17 (42, 61, 121); III, 5 (7); IV, 5 (41-110), 6 (1-72), 9 (49-53), 33 (33-70); V, 14 (42); VI, 22 (1-51), 23, 25 (1-78), 26 (1-13), 28, 30 (25-60), 31, 32, 33, 34, 35.
—— - cultural activities. II, 17 (52, 103); IV, 2 (34), 21 (28-158), 23 (1-113), 24 (35-168), 25, 29 (12-120), 32 (104), 35 (14-17, 49); VI, 5 (46-124), 6 (31-62), 7 (25-142), 8 (1-12), 18 (48-119), 24 (139-143), 27 (78-94), 37 (111).
Programme, 1955-56 - education. II, 17 (46, 48-96); IV, 2 (25-29), 10 (2-154), 11, 12, 13, 14, 31 (30-85), 32 (24), 35 (7, 44); VI, 2 (12), 3, 4, 5 (1-45), 6 (2-11, 24-30, 92-115), 7 (1-20), 13 (3), 16 (31-76), 19 (1-11), 20 (38-43), 21 (7-11), 24 (79-115), 27 (15-57), 30 (5-13), 37 (2-38).
—— - exchange of persons. II, 17 (106); IV, 2 (37), 28, 32 (106), 35 (22); VI, 10 (18-86), 13 (7), 19 (45-62), 24 (152), 37 (113).
—— - mass communication. II, 17 (57, 104); IV, 2 (35, 36), 3 (103), 26, 27, 29 (2-11), 32 (105), 35 (18-21, 51); VI, 6 (63-91), 7 (9), 11, 12 (1-66, 76-79), 13 (6), 18 (135-141), 19 (12-44), 24 (144-151), 27 (95-106), 29 (16), 30 (21), 37 (112).
—— - natural sciences. II, 17 (47, 50); IV, 2 (30-32), 15 (8-122), 16, 17, 19, 20, 21 (1-14), 32 (30), 35 (8-11, 34, 35); VI, 8 (13-121), 9 (1-61), 13 (4, 5), 16 (77-129), 17 (1-156), 24 (116-131), 27 (58-77), 30 (19), 33 (38), 37 (39-89).
—— - social sciences. II, 17 (51, 104); IV, 2 (33), 18, 20, 22, 24 (1-34), 31 (1-29), 32 (103), 35 (12, 13, 48); VI, 6 (12-23), 7 (21-24), 9 (62-155), 10 (1-17), 18 (2-47), 24 (132-138), 27 (72-77), 33 (39), 37 (90-110).
—— - statistics. IV, 18 (156-170); VI, 6 (12, 13), 9 (121-124).
—— - voluntary international assistance. IV, 27 (129-150), 32 (105); V, 15 (1-9); VI, 7 (18), 12 (67-75), 19 (18-23).
Programme and budget - date of despatch. II, 17 (62, 63); IV, 5 (62), 35 (25, 119-130).
—— - methods of presentation. II, 4 (4-35); IV, 2 (57), 4 (26), 5 (62); VI, 16 (16-22).
Programme and budget, 1955-56. II, 13, 17 (42-124); III, 4 (4), 8 (4-22); IV; VI.
Programme and Budget Commission - report. II, 17 (42-124); IV, 35 (1-55).
—— . Drafting Committee. IV, 1 (49-58).
—— . Working parties. IV, 1 (11-58), 2 (1-9, 55, 67, 74, 85, 88, 97).
—— . Working Party on the Administrative Structure of the Department of Mass Communication. III, 1 (9); IV, 1 (13, 25-34), 2 (3, 55), 26 (17-24, 35).
—— . Working Party on Decentralization. III, 1 (9); IV, 1 (13, 35-44), 2 (5, 55), 30 (1-74).
—— . Working Party on International Conventions. IV, 1 (13, 44-48), 2 (7).
Protection of nature. IV, 19 (1-30).
Provisional Copyright Committee. VI, 8 (11).
Public libraries. IV, 25 (38-45); VI, 6 (31-39), 7 (21, 26).
See also: Pilot projects - public libraries.
Public opinion - survey. IV, 20 (40), 31 (6-29); VI, 9 (125-134), 10 (2).
Publications - exchange. IV, 24 (60), 25 (46-51); VI, 7 (27-29).
See also: Regional Conference on the Exchange of Publications, Latin America, 1956.
Publications and documents of Unesco. IV, 2 (39), 29 (164-182), 30 (126-132); 33, 18 (135-138), 32 (107); 35 (22); VI, 11 (19, 32, 36, 73, 87), 12 (101-130), 13 (3, 8, 9), 16 (14, 15), 24 (193), 30 (19), 37 (115).
—— in Arabic. IV, 30 (126-129).
—— in German. IV, 30 (130-132); VI, 19 (125-129).
—— in Russian. III, 1 (37); V, 14 (100-121); VI, 19 (70, 92-99), 25 (84).
—— in Spanish V, 14 (79-99); VI, 19 (64), 25 (84).
Publications Fund. II, 17 (107); IV, 29 (171, 172); VI, 12 (120, 121).

## R

Race problems.
See: Discrimination.
Radio. IV, 24 (157-158), 26 (71, 101), 27 (105); VI, 5 (105-110), 6 (72), 11 (73-88), 12 (7-27).
—— - recorded programmes. IV, 26 (102); VI, 11 (73-88), 12 (76, 77).
—— and youth. IV, 27 (72-84, 115); VI, 11 (127-139), 19 (12-16).
Radio Forum Research. IV, 27 (127); VI, 6 (91).
Radio-activity. IV, 15 (53, 56), 16 (50-52), 17 (8-71); VI, 16 (93-129).
Radio-isotopes. IV, 15 (19, 53), 16 (50-52), 17 (11-71); VI, 16 (77-118).
Radio - teaching. IV, 13 (110, 129, 130); VI, 6 (26).
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East. II, 17 (49, 94); III, 8 (4); IV, 13 (52-76), 32 (29, 110-112); VI, 4 (104-110), 7 (13), 20 (60).
Regional Conference of European National Commissions, 1955. IV, 30 (27, 36, 39, 41-48, 53); VI, 15 (34, 53).
Regional Conference on the Exchange of Publications, Latin America, 1956. IV, 25 (46-51); VI, 7 (29).
Regional conferences of experts on the improvement of textbooks. VI, 4 (63-79), 27 (30-39), 30 (12-14), 37 (38).
Regional conferences on free and compulsory education. IV, 10 (5), 11 (76-89); VI, 3 (63-76), 24 (99, 107-111).
Regional Laboratory for the Preservation of Monuments and Works of Art of the South East Asian Region. IV, 24 (106-109); VI, 18 (80-84).
"Rencontres internationales de Genève". VI, 5 (105-110), 7 (72).
Republic of letters. IV, 33 (16).
Research Centre for the Adaptation of Scripts to

Modern Methods of Printing. IV, 26 (67); VI, 18 (135-141).
Resolutions - procedure. III, 1 (47-53); IV, 2 (50), 4 (47), 35 (26, 119, 126-130); V, 19 (81).
"Revue de littérature comparée". IV, 25 (113, 118, 126).
Rockefeller Foundation - representation. II, 4 (7).
Rumania.
See: Admission of new Members.
Rural teacher training. II, 6 (128), 9 (49); IV, 3 (25), 8 (8), 12 (6-22); VI, 3 (83-85).
Rural-Urban Education Centre, Bayambang (Philippines). IV, 8 (7-10).

## S

School curricula. IV, 3 (23, 39), 5 (35), 12 (23-82); VI, 4 (10-39).
See also: Advisory Committee on School Curricula. Radio. Seminars, regional, 1955-56 - school curricula.
Schools - buildings and equipment. IV, 11 (62).
Science.
See also: Conference on the Public Understanding of Science.
—— - popularization. IV, 17 (85-124); VI, 9 (25-34), 17 (143-151), 24 (128), 27 (61-70).
Science co-operation offices. IV, 3 (16), 16 (103), 18 (46-52), 19 (78-129), 21 (1-14), 30 (9-11), 32 (81-90), 35 (23, 45); VI, 9 (35-53, 152), 14 (11-90), 17 (23-26), 19 (118-124), 24 (117-123), 37 (73-85).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind. II, 17 (55); III, 10 (8); IV, 5 (3), 21 (51, 57), 25 (94-100), 29 (73-120), 35 (16); VI, 7 (91).
See also: Journals of World History.
Scientific documentation. IV, 7 (18-26), 15 (16, 99-122), 16 (2-13), 17 (80-83), 18 (141-155), 32 (30); VI, 8 (49-86), 9 (117-120), 17 (1-24).
See also: Abstracts. Advisory Committee for Documentation in the Natural Sciences. International Anatomical Nomenclature Committee.
Scientific Information Centre of the Municipality of Montevideo. IV, 17 (122); VI, 17 (143-151).
Scientific research. IV, 15 (25-40), 16 (15-161), 19 (104), 32 (30); VI, 8 (89-121), 24 (127).
Scientific, Technical and Economic Documentation Centre, Montevideo. IV, 7 (18).
Scientists - protection. IV, 23 (106-109); VI, 8 (3).
Scripts.
See: Research Centre for the Adaptation of Scripts to Modern Methods of Printing.
Seal and emblem of Unesco. II, 17 (107); IV, 30 (113-125).
Secondary teaching.
See: Latin American Pilot Centre for the Study of Methods of Teaching Science. Latin American Regional Centre for Secondary School Teachers.
Secretariat.
See also: International civil servants.
—— - common service costs. IV, 32 (109); V, 6 (67-81); VI, 13 (70-81), 21 (1-6), 24 (174-187).
—— - general administration. II, 6 (36), 7 (73-76); IV, 32 (108); V, 14 (123, 124); VI, 13, 24 (154-189).
—— - organization. II, 4 (77); IV, 2 (40); VI, 12 (135-154), 13 (1-81), 15 (92-109).
—— - pensions.
See: United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund.
—— - recruitment. II, 6 (95), 7 (20), 9 (105), 16 (39); V, 17 (60-110), 18 (1-105), 19 (1-37), 20 (23).
—— See also: Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
—— - salaries, allowances and leaves. V, 20 (39); VI, 13 (27-41).
—— - staff rules and regulations. II, 16 (40, 66-120); V, 17 (60-110), 18 (1-105), 19 (1-37), 20 (40-79), 21, 22 (1-76), 23 (13-126), 24 (14-20).
See also: Special Advisory Board (Staff Rules).
—— - training programme. V, 20 (33-38).
—— - travels. IV, 9 (15, 16); VI, 5 (51-57, 83-88), (6 15, 16), 8 (32-38), 15 (72).
—— . Appeals Board. II, 16 (42, 119); V, 6 (66-71), 23 (13-126); VI, 21 (1-6).
—— . Bureau of the Comptroller. VI, 12 (132-134).
—— . Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services. VI, 13 (66-69).
—— . Bureau of Legal Affairs. VI, 13 (47).
—— . Bureau of Personnel and Management. V, 14 (123, 124); VI, 12 (135-145), 13 (1-41), 24 (168).
—— . Department of Mass Communication. IV, 1 (13, 25-34), 2 (3, 55), 4 (55-58), 26 (17-24, 35-49), 29 (2-11), 35 (18); VI, 11 (4-8, 21), 30 (57-60).
—— . Documents and Publications Service. VI, 24 (154-164).
—— . Library. IV, 24 (79-84); VI, 5 (83-90).
—— . Medical Benefit Scheme. II, 16 (62); V, 17 (1-15).
—— . New York Office. VI, 13 (46), 14 (19, 23, 28), 15 (89-91).
—— . Office of the Director-General. V, 6 (39-66); VI, 13 (42-45), 24 (167, 169).
—— . Publications Board. IV, 18 (132); VI, 12 (106-112).
—— . Regional Office in the Western Hemisphere, Havana. IV, 30 (12-17), 32 (81-91); VI, 12 (100), 15 (1-29), 37 (114), 38 (14).
—— . Staff Association. V, 6 (67-81); VI, 13 (73-81), 21 (1-6), 24 (165, 166).
—— . staff compensation plan for service incurred risks. II, 16 (63); V, 17 (16-41).
Seminars - international understanding and co-operation. VI, 4 (102), 28 (51-105).
Seminars, 1955-56. IV, 4 (48), 13 (49), 22 (75); VI, 27 (47, 68), 28 (51-103), 30 (35-42).
—— - adult education. IV, 14 (116, 121); VI, 5 (6).
Seminars, regional - parallel use of Spanish and English, America. IV, 12 (97-103).
—— 1955 - public libraries, Asia. IV, 25 (35); VI, 6 (31).
—— 1955-56 - school curricula. IV, 12 (55).
—— 1955-56 - United Nations - teaching. VI, 4 (82-85).
—— 1956 - museums, IV, (82-90); VI, 6 (47, 48-59), 7 (49).
Sierra Leone.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Singapore.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Social sciences.
See also: Programme 1955-56 - social sciences. Symposia.

— - publications. II, 9 (182); IV, 18 (134-142, 149-155, 159); VI, 9 (115-120), 16 (14, 15).
— - teaching. IV, 18 (171-195), 20 (2); VI, 9 (123, 124), 37 (90).
— - terminology.
See: Scientific documentation.
Social Sciences Clearing House. IV, 18 (139-148); VI, 9 (115).
Social tensions. IV, 20 (36-50), 24 (17-34), 31 (1-29); VI, 9 (134), 18 (32-47), 24 (138), 33 (57), 37 (92).
"Société européenne de culture" - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (55).
Special Advisory Board (Staff Rules). V, 22 (53-63), 24 (18).
Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED). IV, 11 (73, 85); VI, 3 (52-62), 21 (7-11).
Sports and education. IV, 14 (156-175); VI, 5 (39-43).
Stamps.
See: Friendship flag and postage stamp. Postage rates - reduction. United Nations stamp honouring Unesco.
Statistics.
See also: Programme, 1955-56 - statistics.
— - teaching. IV, 18 (189, 190), 20 (15-35).
Study Abroad. VI, 10 (37).
Study tours. IV, 28 (53-95); VI, 10 (80), 19 (45-59).
Symposia - calendar reforms. VI, 17 (50-52).
— - democratic government. III, 1 (47); IV, 12 (106); VI, 9 (144), 16 (64-76), 26 (41).
— - economics, Latin America. IV, 12 (47); VI, 9 (144).
— - economics, Middle East. IV, 22 (31, 39, 45); VI, 9 (144).
— - geology and geophysics. VI, 17 (50-52).
— - marine biology. VI, 8 (109-113).
— - modern agricultural techniques, Far East. IV, 22 (47).
— - wind and solar energy. VI, 17 (50-52).

## T

Teachers - exchange. IV, 28 (89-95); VI, 10 (82-85), 19 (45-59).
Teachers - training. IV, 3 (17), 4 (62, 66, 86), 7 (27-38), 8 (4, 6, 44), 10 (7, 11), 12 (6), 33 (54); VI, 3 (83-85).
See also: Latin American Regional Centre for Secondary School Teachers. Rural teacher training.
Teaching.
See also: Audio-visual aids. Education. Regional conferences of experts on the improvement of textbooks. School curricula. Textbooks and teaching material.
Teaching Abroad. VI, 10 (37, 82).
Teaching methods. IV, 13 (129, 130); VI, 4 (40-46), 6 (26-30).
Technical assistance. II, 17 (45); IV, 2 (38), 4 (66), 5 (4, 13, 100), 6 (42), 7 (2-82), 8 (3-148), 9 (16), 13 (149), 15 (64), 24 (24), 31 (77), 35 (4); V, 2 (14-16, 73), 10 (89), 11 (45, 65); VI, 4 (92, 95-97), 10 (3), 16 (19-22), 21 (36), 23 (34), 26 (44-59).
See also: Missions.
— - administration. II, 17 (109-119); VI, 8 (137-142).
— - agreements. IV, 8 (32).
— - reports. IV, 7 (50), 8 (41, 42, 100-102, 104, 105, 125-136).
Television. IV, 24 (157-159), 27 (123-126), 35 (19); VI, 5 (105-110), 6 (78-90), 12 (12-27).
— and youth. IV, 27 (61, 72-84, 89); VI, 12 (6), 19 (12-16, 24-32).
Terminology.
See: Scientific documentation.
Textbooks and teaching material. IV, 4 (64-80), 5 (65), 12 (103-110), 13 (16), 32 (29); VI, 4 (50, 54, 64-80), 27 (30-39), 29 (35, 36), 30 (12-14), 37 (38).
See also: Regional conferences of experts on the improvement of textbooks.
Theatre. IV, 29 (46); VI, 18 (103, 104).
Thibault, Ivan de - memorial tribute. II, 11 (1, 2); III, 5 (1); IV, 7 (1); V, 11 (1-3).
Toribio Medina, José. IV, 25 (56).
Tourist tax. IV, 24 (118).
Town planning.
See: Architecture.
Trade unions. IV, 22 (23-29, 33, 43).
Translations. IV, 3 (15), 4 (73), 15 (114), 17 (74-79), 21 (58), 23 (90-105), 29 (47); VI, 7 (116-121), 11 (15-31), 19 (125-129), 27 (87-94).
Travel Abroad. VI, 10 (39).
Travel grants. IV, 28 (84-95).
Travels.
See: Persons - free movement. Secretariat - travels. Tourist tax. Unesco Travel Coupon Scheme.
Tribute to Uruguay. II, 18 (70-115); III, 12 (1); VI, 1 (7).
Trinidad.
See: Admission of Associate Members.
Trusteeship Council (UN). V, 15 (14).

## U

Underdeveloped countries. VI, 2 (49).
Unesco Bulletin for Libraries. IV, 21 (84), 23 (90, 93); VI, 15 (10, 18).
Unesco Coupons. IV, 27 (129, 145-149); VI, 19 (18-23), 27 (103-105), 30 (21).
— - losses on exchange. II, 9 (1-5), 16 (36, 55, 61); III, 3 (35-38); V, 2 (77-93), 3 (1-25), 15 (1-9); VI, 12 (67-69).
Unesco Friends Clubs. II, 5 (47), 17 (86); IV, 4 (34), 30 (75-82); VI, 19 (130-136), 37 (118, 119).
Unesco prizes. IV, 26 (127-142), 29 (134-137, 156-161); VI, 12 (1-3), 18 (113-119), 24 (141).
Unesco Travel Coupon Scheme. IV, 27 (129).
Unesco weeks. VI, 11 (26), 29 (32, 33).
Unesco World Review. IV, 26 (2); VI, 11 (73, 87).
Union of International Engineering Associations - grants, 1955-56. IV, 15 (93); VI, 8 (41).
"Union internationale pour la liberté de l'enseignement" - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (19, 90).
Union of Latin American Universities - representation. II, 4 (8).
United Nations - teaching. IV, 11 (16), 12 (111-129),

13 (1-14, 17-19), 32 (29); VI, 4 (50, 81-84), 16 (39-43), 27 (41-44), 30 (5).
See also: Competitions, national.
— - Unesco - relations. V, 15 (10-15).
United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund. II, 16 (38, 64); V, 17 (42-59), 24 (40-44).
— . Committee - election, 1954. V, 17 (43-45), 24 (40-44).
United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA). IV, 3 (32), 13 (77-85); VI, 5 (2).
United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA). IV, 13 (53-76), 35 (24); VI, 4 (103-109), 20 (60).
United Nations stamp honouring Unesco. IV, 27 (151); VI, 18 (123-126).
Universal Copyright Convention. IV, 23 (102-106, 111); VI, 5 (81, 82), 8 (4-12).
Universal Declaration of Human Rights. IV, 30 (105-112).
— - commemoration. II, 18 (48-58); III, 12 (1), 13 (6-13).
Universal Esperanto Association - representation. II, 4 (8).
— - Unesco - relations. III, 13 (14-24); V, 16 (56).
Universal Postal Union. IV, 27 (45-53, 153); VI, 18 (121), 19 (41).
Universality of Unesco.
See: Admission of new Members.
University degrees - equivalence. VI, 19 (59).
University grants. VI, 1 (83).
Uruguay.
See: Tribute to Uruguay.

## V

Venezuela - representation. II, 5 (2); III, 2 (1, 2).
Vishinsky, Andrei - memorial tribute. II, 11 (6-9).
Voluntary international assistance.
See: Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Voluntary work camps, international. VI, 27 (47).

## W

Water supplies. IV, 16 (35-37), 17 (84); VI, 17 (94).
Women - education. IV, 10 (51, 52), 11 (18), 14 (44-114), 20 (95-103); VI, 5 (59).
— - political rights. IV, 20 (95-103); VI, 9 (135, 142).
Workers - education. IV, 4 (21), 14 (38-114), 27 (111, 123-126); VI, 5 (5-9), 12 (43-48).
See also: International Centre of Workers Education.
— - exchange. IV, 10 (61), 28 (64); VI, 10 (74-80).
Working Capital Fund. II, 16 (59); V, 2 (17-51, 72, 74), 10 (4-11), 23 (134-152), 24 (1-13).
Working languages - Arabic. V, 14 (110).
— - Russian. II, 3 (5), 5 (5), 16 (49, 51, 147-154, 161-225), 17 (1-41); III, 1 (29-42), 10 (9), 13 (2); IV, 2 (53), 9 (26, 55), 12 (2); V, 6 (14), 13 (80), 14 (100-121), 24 (24-26); VI, 19 (63-99), 20 (18, 53), 24 (183), 25 (78-121); VIII, 6 (75-79).
— - Spanish. II, 16 (224); III, 5 (10, 18); IV, 12 (2), 17 (50-54); V, 14 (79-99); VI, 19 (137-140), 25 (80-82).
World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations. III, 11 (45, 46).
World Braille Council. IV, 27 (107); VI, 12 (28-35), 20 (70).
World Chess Federation - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (57-69).
World Community.
See: Expert Committee on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation. International understanding and co-operation.
World Conference of Organizations of the Teaching Profession - grants, 1955-56. IV, 10 (85, 92-95, 126, 145), 33 (58); V, 16 (94); VI, 2 (67), 37 (2-31, 55).
World Conference on Population. IV, 23 (4).
World Congress of Sociology, 3rd. IV, 18 (84, 94).
World Council for the Welfare of the Blind. VI, 20 (70-75).
World Culture, Science and Education Week. IV, 26 (61, 62), 29 (134-137, 156-161); VI, 18 (113-119), 24 (140, 141).
World Federation of Democratic Youth - representation. V, 4 (8), 16 (19).
— - Unesco - relations. II, 16 (123); V, 16 (92, 107-124).
World Federation for Mental Health - grants, 1955-56. IV, 10 (85, 144); VI, 2 (76, 79).
World Federation of United Nations Associations - agreement 1955. V, 16 (138).
— - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (127-131).
World Health Organization. IV, 16 (121-127, 140, 161), 17 (39); VI, 9 (2-23).
World Movement of Mothers - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (70).
World Organization for Early Childhood Education - grants, 1955-56. IV, 10 (105, 113, 118, 125).
World Organization of the Teaching Profession - Unesco - relations. II, 4 (60).
World Power Conference. VI, 17 (100).
World Union of Catholic Teachers - Unesco - relations. V, 16 (91).
"World Without End" (film). IV, 26 (121), 27 (10), 29 (4); VI, 11 (98-100).
World's Young Women's Christian Association. IV, 28 (84).
Writers - protection. IV, 23 (104-117).
Writing - teaching. IV, 13 (110, 129-131); VI, 6 (26).

## Y

Youth. IV, 3 (22), 10 (28), 14 (123-155), 21 (99), 32 (26-28); VI, 5 (10-16), 27 (47), 37 (62).
See also: Associated youth enterprises. Consultative Committee on Youth Work. Press and Youth. Radio and Youth. Television and Youth.
— - exchange. IV, 28 (84-88); VI, 10 (81).

## Z

Zoology - exchange of species. VI, 17 (137-142).

# PART II

Index of statements, speeches and comments made by delegates, members of the Executive Board, the Director-General and members of the Secretariat. References to remarks interposed by the President, Vice-Presidents, Chairmen, Rapporteurs or Secretaries do not appear in the index.

## REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER STATES


ARGENTINA

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Colombo, II, 5 (27).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Fernandez Moreno, V, 5 (30), 8 (6, 52), 11 (12, 21), 14 (62).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Fernandez Moreno, V, 8 (52).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Fernandez Moreno, V, 6 (23).
Member States - withdrawal.
Fernandez Moreno, V, 3 (55).
Non-governmental organizations.
Fernandez Moreno, V, 15 (72), 16 (47)
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Aftalion, IV, 6 (50).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Astrada, IV, 21 (80).
Cassani, IV, 23 (60), 24 (153).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Cassani, IV, 11 (11, 48), 12 (12, 147) 14 (50).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication
Aftalion, IV, 32 (121).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Cassani, IV, 17 (53, 129).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Aftalion, IV, 18 (109), 20 (73), 22 (12).
Secretariat - general policy.
Fernandez Moreno, V, 14 (62).
Technical assistance.
Aftalion, IV, 8 (83).
Working languages - Spanish.
Fernandez Moreno, V, 14 (62).

AUSTRALIA

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Kelly, V, 13 (58).
Pratt, V, 9 (75), 10 (16, 107).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Pratt, II, 6 (81).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Kelly, V, 4 (26), 5 (45, 47, 54, 63), 7 (20), 8 (14, 44, 64).
Financial Regulations - amendments.
Kelly, V, 2 (56, 65).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Pratt, IV, 35 (83, 99).
International understanding and co-operation.
Gardner Davies, VI, 29 (6).
Member States - withdrawal.
Kelly, V, 3 (50, 52, 54, 65).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Linkson, IV, 25 (129).
Non-governmental organizations.
Kelly, V, 15 (36), 16 (4, 116, 125).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Gardner Davies, VI, 7 (32, 93).
Linkson, IV, 21 (157), 24 (51, 57), 25 (129).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Gardner Davies, VI, 2 (64), 3 (40), 4 (22), 6 (103).
Pratt, IV, 11 (3), 13 (69, 139, 162), 14 (22).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Pratt, IV, 28 (67).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Gardner Davies, VI, 11 (25).
Pratt, IV, 27 (42).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Gardner Davies, VI, 9 (6).
Linkson, IV, 17 (118), 19 (11, 61), 32 (44).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Gardner Davies, VI, 6 (20).
Kelly, IV, 31 (13).
Pratt, IV, 18 (78, 156), 20 (9), 22 (35, 76).
Secretariat - Appeals Board
Kelly, V, 23 (21, 48, 59, 106).
Secretariat - general administration.
Kelly, V, 6 (42, 56, 76)
Secretariat - Medical Benefit Scheme.
Kelly, V, 17 (7).
Secretariat - staff compensation plan for service incurred risks.
Kelly, V, 17 (25).

Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Kelly, V, 18 (14), 20 (56), 21 (23), 22 (24, 32, 43).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Kelly, V, 2 (92), 3 (3, 14).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Kelly, V, 2 (30, 33).
Working languages - Russian.
Kelly, II, 16 (215).

AUSTRIA

Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Löwenthal-Chlumecky, IV, 27 (48).

BELGIUM

Admission of new Members.
Florkin, VI, 19 (108).
Straten Waillet, II, 3 (42).
Auditors - report, 1952-53.
Baugniet, V, 2 (9).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Baugniet, V, 13 (57), 14 (22).
Director-General - reports.
Baugniet, VIII, 4 (29).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Straten Waillet, II, 7 (25).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Baugniet, II, 11 (184, 207); V, 4 (45), 5 (33, 44), 8 (15, 20, 25, 46), 14 (35, 41); VIII, 2 (5).
Hacquaert, VI, 37 (127).
Straten Waillet, II, 11 (155).
General Conference - documents.
Baugniet, IV, 35 (119, 124, 128).
General Conference - quorum.
Baugniet, VIII, 5 (36).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Baugniet, IV, 34 (74), 35 (90, 111).
Hacquaert, VI, 38 (23).
General Conference. Nominations Committee.
Baugniet, VIII, 5 (79, 90).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Florkin, VI, 20 (8, 15, 21).
Straten Waillet, II, 15 (73).
Headquarters.
Straten Waillet, XI, 2 (18, 80).
International administrative tribunals.
Baugniet, V, 23 (150, 152), 24 (2, 7).
International civil servants.
Straten Waillet, V, 22 (9, 60).
International understanding and co-operation.
Florkin, VI, 28 (5, 9, 56, 66, 109), 29 (5, 20, 50), 30 (28, 40, 47).
Member States - withdrawal.
Baugniet, V, 3 (40, 59, 66); VIII, 5 (8).
Non-governmental organizations
Baugniet, V, 15 (48), 16 (39, 41, 119, 132, 134)
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Florkin, VI, 22 (15), 23 (25, 60, 72), 25 (5, 8, 10, 12).
Hacquaert, IV, 30 (27); VI, 31 (27, 59), 32 (9).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Florkin, IV, 23 (41), 24 (66, 90); VI, 18 (63, 70, 86, 88, 104), 27 (91).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Florkin, VI, 20 (40), 27 (25).
Hacquaert, IV, 10 (96), 12 (56), 13 (88), 14 (123, 136).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Hacquaert, IV, 28 (6, 64).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Florkin, VI, 18 (134), 19 (9, 26, 38, 43).
Hacquaert, IV, 26 (39, 53, 90), 27 (13, 68).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Florkin, IV, 16 (73, 153, 159), 17 (81, 117), 19 (1, 26).
Hacquaert, IV, 32 (37, 78, 85, 95); VI, 37 (62).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Florkin, VI, 27 (73).
Straten Waillet, IV, 18 (53, 76, 112, 138), 22 (74).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Florkin, IV, 4 (26); VI, 21 (33), 24 (33).
Straten Waillet, IV, 9 (22).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Baugniet, V, 23 (66, 111, 114).
Secretariat - general administration.
Baugniet, V, 6 (41, 44, 47, 61, 70, 72).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Baugniet, II, 16 (68, 73, 100); V, 18 (27, 42, 52, 59, 66, 101), 24 (14, 16).
Straten Waillet, V, 22 (5, 60).
Secretariat - training programme.
Baugniet, V, 20 (36).
Technical assistance.
Hacquaert, IV, 8 (65).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Baugniet, V, 16 (4).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Baugniet, V, 24 (2, 7).

BOLIVIA

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Sanjines Uriarte, II, 10 (33).

BRAZIL

Admission of new Members.
Carneiro, II, 3 (35).
China - vote.
Carneiro, II, 13 (12).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Carneiro, II, 12 (12); V, 9 (21, 40), 10 (10, 75, 87, 93, 100, 103), 11 (60), 13 (20), 14 (2).
Credentials - presentation and verification.
Carneiro, II, 2 (19).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Carneiro, II, 8 (2).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Carneiro, V, 6 (22, 34), 8 (13, 65), 11 (60), 14 (60, 70).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Carneiro, II, 15 (39); V, 6 (11, 15).
International Folklore Congress, 1954.
Carneiro, IV, 31 (100).

International Fund for Education, Science and Culture.
Carneiro, IV, 31 (31, 43, 50).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Carneiro, IV, 25 (110, 125).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Carneiro, IV, 5 (70).
Costa Ribeiro, IV, 6 (37).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Carneiro, IV, 23 (33), 24 (118), 25 (95, 110, 125).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Carneiro, IV, 14 (84, 173, 184), 31 (65).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Carneiro, IV, 15 (32, 80, 87, 103, 111), 16 (24, 39, 79, 81, 147), 17 (88, 92), 19 (6, 19, 21, 34, 43, 51, 84, 118)
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Brandão Cavalcanti, IV, 18 (65), 20 (6, 79), 22 (21).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Carneiro, IV, 9 (6, 54).
Secretariat - general administration.
Carneiro, V, 6 (40, 54, 73).
Secretariat - general policy.
Carneiro, V, 6 (11, 15, 34).
Technical assistance.
Carneiro, II, 17 (115).
Working languages - Russian.
Carneiro, V, 14 (113).
Working languages - Spanish.
Carneiro, V, 14 (83).

BURMA (UNION OF)

China - vote.
Tha Hla, II, 12 (9).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Tha Hla, II, 12 (9); V, 10 (15), 14 (10).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Tha Hla, II, 8 (107).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Tha Hla, IV, 34 (52).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Tha Hla, IV, 21 (121), 23 (54), 24 (116).
Tha Myat, IV, 21 (59).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Tha Hla, IV, 16 (66, 86, 87, 98, 99), 17 (127).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Tha Myat, IV, 20 (83).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Tha Hla, IV, 3 (15).
Working languages - Russian.
Tha Hla, II, 17 (20).

BYELORUSSIA (S.S.R. OF)

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Kavalevsky, V, 9 (19).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Umreiko, II, 6 (29).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Umreiko, IV, 20 (67).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Umreiko, IV, 5 (11).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Kavalevsky, V, 21 (10, 16, 17).
Working languages - Russian.
Kavalevsky, V, 14 (105).

CAMBODIA

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Nong Kimny, II, 9 (140).
Member States - reports.
Hong Noeung Doeung, X, 2 (23, 30, 38), 4 (2), 6 (8), 8 (15, 17, 34, 50, 54, 56, 59), 9 (9, 17, 20, 22).

CANADA

Admission of new Members.
Pierce, II, 3 (33).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Carter, V, 14 (12).
Director-General - reports.
Page, VIII, 4 (19).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Pierce, II, 6 (48).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Carter, V, 8 (18).
Page, V, 5 (41); VIII, 2 (24).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Bow, VI, 38 (70).
General Conference. Nominations Committee.
Page, VIII, 5 (83).
International civil servants.
Bow, VIII, 7 (37, 41).
Carter, V, 20 (29).
Panneton, VI, 26 (16, 23).
International understanding and co-operation.
Douglas, VI, 28 (111).
Panneton, VI, 27 (13), 28 (62, 78), 29 (36, 38, 44), 30 (35).
Non-governmental organizations.
Carter, V, 15 (41).
Page, V, 16 (75, 95, 115).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Panneton, VI, 22 (49), 23 (42, 77), 25 (49, 54), 31 (13, 35, 50), 32 (17), 33 (33, 105), 34 (44).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Bow, VI, 5 (73, 106), 6 (45), 7 (69).
Panneton, IV, 23 (11), 24 (35, 88, 108); VI, 27 (90).
Stewart, IV, 28 (61).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Arsenault, IV, 13 (3).
Bow, VI, 2 (32, 38, 74), 3 (7, 23), 5 (18, 20, 37), 6 (26, 16, 62), 37 (8, 19).
Carter, IV, 14 (24).
Douglas, IV, 14 (44).
Panneton, VI, 24 (94), 27 (20, 54).
Stewart, IV, 14 (166).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Bow, VI, 10 (31, 57), 19 (51).

Douglas, IV, 28 (33).
Stewart, IV, 28 (61).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Bow, VI, 11 (17, 28, 85, 93), 12 (16, 26, 49, 91), 18 (129).
Panneton, IV, 26 (93); VI, 30 (23).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Bow, VI, 8 (42, 51, 65, 83, 90, 99, 101, 118), 9 (23, 53, 44, 53), 17 (28, 37, 55, 76, 78, 112), 37 (46, 52, 69).
Douglas, IV, 28 (33).
Page, IV, 16 (46, 64, 88, 136), 17 (60, 65, 109), 19 (10, 47, 96), 32 (17).
Panneton, IV, 21 (16, 20).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Arsenault, IV, 18 (91, 149).
Bow, VI, 9 (66, 71, 81, 85, 92, 99, 112, 117, 137), 10 (10, 13), 37 (103).
Panneton, VI, 26 (40).
Stewart, IV, 18 (170).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Arsenault, IV, 9 (14, 17).
Bow, VI, 21 (23, 34).
Panneton, VI, 24 (18, 22, 25, 30).
Science co-operation offices.
Bow, VI, 13 (59, 60, 72, 85, 88).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Bow, V, 23 (64, 76, 95).
Secretariat - general administration.
Bow, VI, 13 (24, 35).
Secretariat - salaries allowances and leave.
Bow, VI, 15 (105).
Secretariat. Bureau of Personnel and Management.
Bow, VI, 12 (140), 13 (18, 24, 35, 59).
Secretariat. New York Office.
Bow, VI, 15 (105).
Working languages - Russian.
Panneton, VI, 25 (89).

CEYLON

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Mendis, II, 6 (11).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Mendis, V, 4 (60).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Abeywickrema, IV, 34 (28, 79).
Mendis, IV, 35 (58, 64, 102).
General Conference, 9th session. Committee on Contributions.
Abeywickrema, V, 20 (13).
Non-governmental organizations.
Abeywickrema, V, 15 (23).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Mendis, IV, 6 (23), 30 (65).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Abeywickrema, IV, 29 (61).
Mendis, IV, 21 (42), 23 (15), 24 (114, 117).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Abeywickrema, IV, 31 (59).
Mendis, IV, 12 (50, 71).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Mendis, IV, 26 (133).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Abeywickrema, IV, 16 (45, 75, 91), 17 (107), 19 (9, 64, 95), 32 (12, 67, 69).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Mendis, IV, 20 (10).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Mendis, IV, 3 (39).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Abeywickrema, V, 23 (70).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Abeywickrema, V, 22 (53, 55).
Technical assistance.
Mendis, IV, 7 (69).

CHILE

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Villalon Galdames, V, 10 (31, 33, 75, 77, 101), 13 (43, 75), 14 (26).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Vasallo Rojas, II, 5 (51).
General Conference - rules.
Villalon Galdames, V, 19 (63).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 34 (30), 35 (97, 110).
General Conference. Nominations Committee.
Vasallo Rojas, VIII, 5 (84).
Ibarbourou, Juana de - tribute.
Barrenechea Pino, II, 18 (22).
International Fund for Education, Science and Culture.
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 31 (48).
Member States - withdrawal.
Villalon Galdames, V, 3 (77).
Non-governmental organizations.
Mardones Restat, V, 15 (71), 16 (85, 141).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 6 (29, 51).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Barrenechea Pino, IV, 23 (43).
Gutiérrez Palacios, IV, 23 (61, 90).
Ibañez Gomez, IV, 21 (64), 28 (46).
Mardones Restat, IV, 21 (149), 23 (3).
Villalon Galdames, IV, 25 (32, 34, 46, 56, 69).
Walker Linares, IV, 29 (69).
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 24 (129).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 10 (13, 115, 117), 11 (7, 60), 12 (35, 89), 13 (113, 150), 14 (13), 31 (56, 78).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Ibañez Gomez, IV, 28 (46).
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 28 (25).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Ibañez Gomez, IV, 26 (38, 60).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Ibañez Gomez, IV, 16 (53, 54, 100), 19 (79).
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 15 (82), 17 (26, 50, 85, 91, 125).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Barrenechea Pino, IV, 24 (7, 12).
Gutierrez Palacios, IV, 22 (22).
Ibañez Gomez, IV, 18 (38).
Walker Linares, IV, 20 (23).
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 18 (60), 20 (77).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Walker Linares, IV, 27 (133).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 4 (59).

Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 29 (105).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Villalon Galdames, V, 18 (12, 22).
Technical assistance.
Zamorano Hernandez, IV, 8 (98).
Working languages - Russian.
Zamorano Hernandez, II, 17 (15).
Working languages - Spanish.
Villalon Galdames, V, 14 (96).

CHINA

Admission of new Members.
Chen Yuan, II, 17 (141).
China - representation.
Hu Ching-Yu, II, 2 (22).
China - vote.
Hu Ching-Yu, V, 12 (4).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Chen Yuan, V, 10 (69).
Hu Ching-Yu, V, 10 (7).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Li Yu-Ying, II, 8 (71).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Cheng Chi-Pao, V, 5 (40).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Cheng Chi-Pao, IV, 6 (46).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Li Yu-Ying, IV, 33 (9).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Li Yu-Ying, IV, 16 (134, 135).
U Tsun-Chen, IV, 19 (126).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Li Yu-Ying, IV, 18 (20).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Li Yu-Ying, IV, 27 (138).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Cheng Chi-Pao, IV, 3 (28).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Chen Yuan, V, 22 (21).
Tribute to Uruguay.
Li Yu-Ying, II, 18 (111).
Working languages - Russian.
Chen Yuan, II, 16 (173), 17 (33); V, 14 (109).

COLOMBIA

Admission of new Members.
Bernal Jiménez, II, 3 (48).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Jaramillo Arango, V, 11 (35).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Bernal Jiménez, II, 8 (44).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Bernal Jiménez, II, 11 (142), V, 7 (41, 45, 73).
Gomez Hoyos, V, 4 (38, 42).
Jaramillo Arango, V, 8 (62), VIII, 2 (31), 6 (44).
Ibarbourou, Juana de - tribute.
Jaramillo Arango, II, 18 (17).
International Fund for Education, Science and Culture.
Gomez Hoyos, IV, 31 (42).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Gomez Hoyos, IV, 23 (93), 24 (146).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Bernal Jiménez, II, 17 (70).
Gomez Hoyos, IV, 31 (61).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Gomez Hoyos, IV, 28 (26).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Bernal Jiménez, IV, 5 (23), 9 (41).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Bernal Jiménez, V, 18 (76).
Technical assistance.
Bernal Jiménez, IV, 8 (57, 82, 97).

COSTA RICA

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Gamez Solano, II, 9 (7).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Trejos Dittel, V, 8 (61).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Trejos Dittel, IV, 5 (101), 30 (26).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Trejos Dittel, V, 18 (16).
Technical assistance.
Trejos Dittel, IV, 7 (52, 58).
Working languages - Spanish.
Duran Masis, V, 14 (95).

CUBA

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Riano Jauma, V, 9 (65).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Ferrara y Marino, II, 9 (26).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Ferrara y Marino, V, 8 (89).
Riano Jauma, V, 7 (65).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Ichaso, II, 15 (25).
Non-governmental organizations.
Riano Jauma, V, 15 (76).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Carbonell, IV, 33 (8, 26).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Carbonell, IV, 33 (8, 26).
Seal and emblem of Unesco.
Carbonell, IV, 30 (123).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Riano Jauma, V, 18 (18), 21 (39).
Technical assistance.
Carbonell, IV, 33 (31).
Working languages - Spanish.
Riano Jauma, V, 14 (85).

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Admission of new Members.
Hájek, II, 3 (19, 79).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Vaněček, V, 13 (11).
Contributions, 1953-54 - Czechoslovakia.
Štěpánek, V, 20 (6).

Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Hájek, II, 9 (81).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Navrátil, IV, 25 (116).
Non-governmental organizations.
Hájek, V, 16 (93, 103, 107, 120).
Stěpánek, V, 16 (57, 59).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Navrátil, IV, 21 (101), 24 (45), 25 (116).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Hájek, IV, 33 (10).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Vaněček, IV, 16 (114).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Hájek, IV, 22 (87), 24 (9).
Pazúr, IV, 22 (32).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Pazúr, IV, 5 (18).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Hájek, IV, 29 (74).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Hájek, V, 21 (55).
Working languages - Russian.
Hájek, II, 16 (184).
Stěpánek, V, 14 (104).

DENMARK

Admission of new Members.
Nielsen, II, 3 (40), 17 (138).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Koch, II, 7 (132).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Nielsen, II, 11 (97); V, 4 (39, 47), 7 (36, 59).
General Conference, 9th session - organization.
Nielsen, II, 18 (2).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Nielsen, IV, 6 (62).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Blinkenberg, IV, 29 (121).
Nielsen, IV, 24 (134, 155), 29 (154).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Nielsen, IV, 10 (80, 118), 11 (35), 31 (67).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Nielsen, IV, 26 (129).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Nielsen, IV, 17 (22, 130), 32 (46).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Koch, IV, 27 (139).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Nielsen, IV, 13 (12).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Nielsen, IV, 29 (89).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Koch, V, 21 (15).

ECUADOR

Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Martínez Cobo, II, 7 (6).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Chiriboga Teran, V, 7 (55).
Martínez Cobo, V, 8 (21), 14 (61).
Teran Robalino, II, 16 (157).
Member States - reports.
Teran Robalino, X, 3 (12, 15), 4 (4), 5 (2).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Montalvo, IV, 23 (96).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Martínez Cobo, IV, 13 (151).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Montalvo, IV, 28 (27).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Montalvo, IV, 19 (38, 66).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Martínez Cobo, V, 17 (90), 18 (94).
Tribute to Uruguay.
Alcivar Zevallos, II, 18 (107).
Working languages - Spanish.
Martínez Cobo, V, 14 (79, 97).

EGYPT

Admission of new Members.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 19 (104, 106).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 38 (30, 56).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
El-Zayat, V, 10 (4, 105).
Huzayin, V, 9 (57), 11 (64), 13 (46, 59), 14 (15).
Credentials - presentation and verification.
Huzayin, IX, 1 (43).
Director-General - reports.
Huzayin, V, 3 (27); VIII, 4 (36, 41, 49).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Awad, II, 6 (100).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Awad, II, 11 (194).
Huzayin, VIII, 2 (27, 38), 3 (24, 40, 45).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 38 (30, 56).
Awad, IV, 35 (109).
Fawzi, IV, 34 (26, 99), 35 (77).
General Conference. Nominations Committee.
Huzayin, VIII, 5 (81).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 20 (29).
Huzayin, II, 15 (58); V, 6 (19).
International understanding and co-operation.
Al-Koussi, VI, 28 (116), 29 (19).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 37 (94, 104).
National Commissions.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 15 (70).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Abdel-Rahman, IV, 6 (38, 56, 71), 30 (40), 33 (61); VI, 14 (8, 20), 22 (11, 47), 23 (27, 30, 32, 46, 61, 67, 69, 76, 82), 25 (2, 15, 19, 37, 44, 51, 61, 66), 31 (8, 15, 23, 28, 45, 62, 71, 76), 32 (24, 47, 68, 73, 85), 33 (28, 34, 40, 100), 34 (13, 17, 26, 47, 53, 67, 75), 35 (6, 19, 24, 39, 51, 60).
Fawzi, IV, 6 (61).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 18 (61, 78).
Huzayin, IV, 24 (65, 93), 25 (11, 42, 53), 29 (68).

Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Abdel-Rahman, IV, 31 (77); VI, 16 (58), 37 (11, 121).
Al-Koussi, IV, 10 (81), 11 (6, 59, 93), 13 (44, 99), 14 (3); VI, 27 (22).
Fawzi, IV, 12 (58), 14 (200).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 19 (58).
Huzayin, IV, 28 (8, 38, 58).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Fawzi, IV, 26 (33, 46).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 8 (81), 9 (50), 16 (83, 93, 102), 37 (47, 65).
Al-Koussi, IV, 15 (41), 16 (6, 104), 17 (76, 102, 131), 19 (54).
Fawzi, IV, 32 (20, 77).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 18 (8, 22, 27), 37 (106).
Awad, IV, 18, (89, 123), 20 (27).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Abdel-Rahman, IV, 3 (34); VI, 21 (31, 40), 24 (9, 11), 36 (9, 12, 15).
Huzayin, IV, 9 (20), 13 (8).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Huzayin, IV, 29 (176).
Science co-operation offices.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 14 (37, 42, 54, 62, 78, 87).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Huzayin, IV, 29 (97).
Seal and emblem of Unesco.
El-Zayat, IV, 30 (118).
Secretariat - general administration.
Abdel Rahman, VI, 13 (62, 65).
Huzayin, V, 6 (48).
Secretariat - general policy.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 14 (8).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Huzayin, V, 18 (8, 38, 46, 50), 19 (25), 21 (44), 22 (61).
Technical assistance.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 26 (49).
Fawzi, IV, 8 (68, 109).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
El-Zayat, V, 2 (82, 87).
Huzayin, V, 15 (3).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
El-Zayat, V, 2 (31, 38).
Working languages - Russian.
Abdel-Rahman, VI, 19 (85), 25 (118).
Working languages - Spanish.
Huzayin, V, 14 (80).

EL SALVADOR

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Bustamente, V, 9 (26).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Bustamente, V, 11 (18).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Marti, IV, 12 (10), 14 (119).

FRANCE

Admission of new Members.
Cabouat, VI, 19 (103).
Mayer, II, 3 (66).
Assistance to Member States.
François, IV, 25 (96).
Associate Members.
Cabouat, VIII, 5 (24, 28, 67).
Clubs of Friends of Unesco.
Cabouat, VI, 19 (134).
François, IV, 30 (80).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Brichet, V, 9 (69), 10 (94).
Cabouat, V, 13 (40), 14 (28).
Cultural agreements.
Cabouat, VI, 12 (93).
Director-General - reports.
Cabouat, VIII, 4 (17).
Juvigny, V, 19 (45).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Berthoin, II, 8 (157).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Berthoin, II, 11 (44).
Brichet, V, 14 (68).
Cabouat, VIII, 3 (6, 75), 6 (28, 38, 45).
Mayer, V, 5 (20), 7 (9, 56), 14 (68).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Cabouat, II, 15 (96).
Financial Regulations - amendments.
Cabouat, VIII, 7 (21).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
François, IV, 35 (65, 82, 100, 104); VI, 38 (32, 45, 65).
Sédès, IV, 34 (19, 23, 92, 96), 35 (73); VI, 38 (54).
General Conference, 9th session - organization.
Laugier, II, 18 (7).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Cabouat, VI, 29 (16).
Laugier, II, 15 (67).
Headquarters.
Cabouat, XI, 2 (27, 38, 46, 55, 76), 3 (29, 34).
Juvigny, II, 16 (139); V, 23 (7, 12).
Human rights - international covenants.
Juvigny, IV, 30 (110).
International administrative tribunals.
Juvigny, V, 23 (148, 149).
International civil servants.
Sédès, VI, 26 (21, 30, 34).
International understanding and co-operation.
François, VI, 27 (11), 28 (4, 36, 40, 53, 64, 76, 93), 29 (11, 23, 28).
Member States - reports.
Hazoumé, X, 3 (13), 6 (1).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
François, IV, 25 (115).
Sédès, VI, 26 (30, 39), 37 (96).
National Commissions.
Cabouat, VI, 15 (43, 55, 61, 81, 87).
Non-governmental organizations.
Bencheneb, V, 15 (31), 16 (35, 50).
Morazé, V, 15 (77).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Brichet, VI, 22 (34).
Cabouat, VI, 23 (51, 59, 78), 25 (42, 52, 73).
François, IV, 5 (63), 30 (47), 33 (46); VI, 31 (10, 19, 29, 51, 55, 70), 32 (5, 10, 45), 33 (12, 16, 24, 44, 54, 57, 66, 72, 113), 34 (30, 33, 36, 46, 57, 68).

Laugier, IV, 6 (48).
Sédès, IV, 6 (31, 35); VI, 25 (20, 30, 38, 46, 48, 65, 74), 26 (8), 35 (27, 50, 56, 65).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Brichet, IV, 21 (119, 137, 147, 151), 23 (1, 30, 46, 57, 74, 91), 24 (58, 92, 97, 101, 157, 160), 25 (16, 40, 64, 77, 115).
Cabouat, VI, 5 (105), 6 (58), 7 (59, 76, 99, 127, 130, 139), 8 (4), 18 (51, 58, 66, 89, 91).
François, IV, 25 (96).
Laugier, IV, 29 (56, 158).
Rivet, IV, 21 (45).
Sédès, VI, 27 (79).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Cabouat, VI, 4 (57, 79), 16 (57).
François, IV, 10 (20, 111), 11 (76, 84, 94), 12 (39, 78, 128), 14 (118, 124, 171, 179, 190), 31 (75), 32 (26), VI, 27 (21, 43).
Laugier, IV, 10 (108, 131), VI, 37 (12).
Sédès, IV, 13 (146), 14 (16, 41); VI, 37 (27, 35).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Cabouat, VI, 10 (28, 39, 47, 60, 67, 70), 19 (53).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Cabouat, VI, 11 (104, 107, 132), 12 (57, 60, 93), 19 (16, 20, 28, 36).
Chayet, VI, 11 (6, 109, 118, 131).
François, IV, 31 (89).
Lefranc, IV, 26 (103, 117, 128), 27 (64, 93).
Sédès, IV, 32 (126).
Terrou, IV, 26 (75), 27 (15, 21, 30, 87).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Brichet, IV, 21 (18).
Cabouat, VI, 8 (57, 67, 69, 74, 79, 93), 16 (89, 94, 126), 17 (16, 35, 45, 66, 82, 110, 113, 121, 126).
François, IV, 32 (35).
Laugier, IV, 15 (83, 110), 16 (29, 115), 21 (26).
Leroy, IV, 15 (71), 16 (55, 57), 17 (14).
Sédès, VI, 37 (57, 68).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Brichet, IV, 24 (17).
Cabouat, VI, 9 (97, 107, 111, 121, 132, 138, 144), 16 (64).
François, IV, 31 (14, 23).
Sédès, IV, 18 (11, 67, 90, 124, 171, 173), 20 (17, 65, 99), 22 (26, 52); VI, 26 (38), 37 (96).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Cabouat, VI, 20 (57, 60, 62, 69), 21 (25, 29).
Laugier, IV, 4 (3), 9 (28).
Rivet, IV, 3 (7).
Science co-operation offices.
Cabouat, VI, 14 (31, 64, 86).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Laugier, IV, 29 (94).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Juvigny, V, 23 (24, 58, 65, 68, 71, 100, 104).
Secretariat - general administration.
Gayet, V, 6 (62, 76).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Cabouat, II, 16 (66).
Juvigny, II, 16 (82); V, 17 (93), 18 (40, 56, 80, 89, 103), 19 (21), 21 (59), 22 (45, 57, 71, 73, 75).
Secretariat. Department of Mass Communication.
Lefranc, IV, 29 (9).
Technical assistance.
Brichet, IV, 33 (30).
Laugier, II, 17 (109), IV, 7 (42, 46), 8 (76, 112, 141).
Sédès, VI, 26 (53, 57).
Working languages - Russian.
Brichet, V, 14 (115).
Sédès, VI, 25 (96, 104).
Working languages - Spanish.
Brichet, V, 14 (86).

GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Hallstein, II, 8 (145).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Löffler, II, 11 (92).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Löffler, IV, 34 (49).
General Conference, 9th session - organization.
Bergstraesser, II, 18 (12).
International understanding and co-operation.
Frey, VI, 27 (14), 28 (124).
National Commissions.
Frey, VI, 25 (47).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Frey, VI, 22 (51).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Bergstraesser, IV, 21 (94, 154), 25 (19).
Schlueter-Hermkes, IV, 23 (111), 24 (137).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Frey, VI, 5 (14, 29), 27 (19).
Löffler, IV, 10 (109).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Frey, VI, 11 (97).
Hardenberg, VI, 18 (129, 134).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Bergstraesser, IV, 18 (120), 20 (29).
Frey, VI, 9 (68).
Hardenberg, VI, 10 (16).
Sternberger, IV, 20 (72).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Frey, VI, 24 (192).
Löffler, IV, 4 (75).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Frey, VI, 12 (109).
Hardenberg, VI, 19 (127).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Graevenitz, V, 18 (31).

GREECE

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Photiades, II, 12 (48), V, 11 (67), 13 (39).
Director-General - reports.
Photiades, VIII, 4 (8, 26, 35, 54, 59).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Photiades, II, 4 (44).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Photiades, V, 14 (38, 40, 44), VIII, 2 (29), 3 (4, 43, 56, 71), 6 (19).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Photiades, IV, 34 (34, 103)

Headquarters.
Photiades, XI, 2 (4, 11, 35, 60, 79, 85), 3 (23, 25, 35, 41, 85).
Non-governmental organizations.
Photiades, V, 15 (57).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Photiades, IV, 24 (52, 75).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Photiades, IV, 15 (31, 70, 84), 19 (53, 85), 32 (64, 76).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Photiades, IV, 4 (83), 9 (45).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Photiades, V, 23 (43, 79, 85).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Photiades, V, 18 (33), 21 (66), 22 (3).

GUATEMALA

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Carrera Molina, V, 10 (89, 92, 102), 11 (46, 69).
Mendoza, V, 2 (46), 13 (69).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Diaz Samayoa, II, 7 (151).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Mendoza, II, 14 (20); V, 5 (8, 64), 7 (68), 8 (9, 43).
Financial Regulations - amendments.
Mendoza, V, 2 (68, 73).
Member States - withdrawal.
Mendoza, V, 3 (45).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Diaz Samayoa, IV, 20 (28).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Diaz Samayoa, IV, 4 (64).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Mendoza, V, 3 (7).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Mendoza, V, 2 (46).

HAITI

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Loiseau, V, 11 (65).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Laleau, II, 4 (105).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Laleau, II, 11 (72).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Faublas, IV, 35 (87).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Faublas, IV, 5 (84).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Faublas, IV, 11 (51), 12 (17), 13 (31, 35, 125), 14 (9).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Faublas, IV, 28 (70, 73).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Faublas, IV, 23 (3).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Faublas, IV, 7 (130).
Technical assistance.
Faublas, IV, 7 (43, 73), 8 (102).

HONDURAS

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Bardalès, II, 10 (19).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Bardalès, IV, 23 (94), 25 (20).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Bardalès, IV, 12 (12), 14 (113).

HUNGARY

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Szabo, V, 13 (12).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Joboru, II, 7 (39).
General Conference - 9th session - seat.
Joboru, II, 15 (78).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Tamas, IV, 25 (127, 128).
Non-governmental organizations.
Tamas, V, 16 (94, 117).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Mihalyfi, IV, 29 (19).
Tamas, IV, 25 (127), 29 (141, 145).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Joboru, IV, 14 (49, 162).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Joboru, IV, 27 (76).
Tamas, IV, 31 (91).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Joboru, IV, 24 (30).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Tamas, V, 21 (18).
Working languages - Russian.
Tamas, II, 16 (199); V, 14 (107).

INDIA

Admission of new Members.
Junankar, VI, 19 (107, 113).
Wadia, II, 17 (126).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Mudaliar, V, 9 (58, 59), 10 (22), 13 (8, 48, 53), 14 (7).
Cultural agreements.
Junankar, VI, 12 (97).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Kabir, II, 7 (88).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Mudaliar, V, 7 (51), 8 (55).
General Conference - documents.
Mudaliar, IV, 35 (126).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Junankar, IV, 34 (43), 35 (30, 38, 74); VI, 21 (19, 26, 40), 38 (19, 57).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Junankar, VI, 20 (1, 11, 24, 36).
Mudaliar, II, 15 (84); V, 6 (26).
Headquarters.
Kabir, XI, 3 (21).
International understanding and co-operation.
Junankar, VI, 28 (97, 100), 30 (43, 49, 55).
Member States - withdrawal.
Mudaliar, V, 3 (42, 76).

National Commissions.
Junankar, VI, 15 (48, 73).
Non-governmental organizations.
Mudaliar, V, 15 (27), 16 (8, 11, 30, 36, 65).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Junankar, IV, 33 (41), VI, 19 (119, 123), 22 (18), 23 (35, 41, 54, 73), 25 (1, 13, 56, 60, 63, 68), 31 (12, 21, 68, 83), 32 (26, 48, 60, 81), 33 (18, 30, 62, 89, 93, 97), 34 (20, 38, 77).
Kabir, IV, 3 (16), 6 (44, 64), 30 (41, 66).
Mudaliar, IV, 5 (57).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Junankar, VI, 5 (103), 6 (33, 53), 7 (55, 91, 105, 117), 18 (49, 60, 74, 79, 82).
Kabir, IV, 24 (79, 105).
Mujeeb, IV, 25 (4), 29 (47, 140).
Wadia, IV, 21 (72), 23 (13), 25 (83, 92).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Arundale, IV, 10 (54).
Junankar, VI 2 (21, 80), 3 (36, 53, 75), 4 (79, 97), 6 (10), 24 (89, 96), 37 (18).
Kabir, IV, 11 (55, 65, 85).
Mudaliar, IV, 13 (159).
Prasad, IV, 10 (78).
Shahane, VI, 27 (18, 23, 37, 52).
Sundaram, IV, 14 (198).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Junankar, VI, 10 (25)
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Junankar, VI, 6 (88), 11 (19, 33, 51, 64), 12 (30, 72, 78, 88, 97), 19 (4, 22).
Mudaliar, IV, 26 (63, 70, 72, 121), 33 (1)
Mujeeb, IV, 31 (87).
Shahane, IV, 26 (35, 41), 27 (92).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Junankar, VI, 8 (20, 82), 9 (25, 32, 41, 47), 16 (104, 114), 17 (4, 7, 18, 22, 29, 41, 70), 37 (61).
Mudaliar, IV, 15 (76, 100), 16 (40, 82, 83), 17 (2), 32 (99).
Prasad, IV, 17 (134), 19 (32, 68, 74, 88, 114, 125).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Junankar, VI, 10 (4), 18 (18, 40, 44), 37 (95).
Mujeeb, IV, 22 (3, 90), 24 (6).
Sundaram, IV, 20 (21, 47, 63, 69).
Wadia, IV, 18 (28, 92), 22 (66).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Junankar, VI, 12 (72).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Junankar, VI, 1 (36), 21 (26).
Kabir, IV, 3 (16).
Mudaliar, IV, 9 (31).
Programme and Budget Commission - report.
Junankar, IV, 35 (30, 38).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Junankar, VI, 12 (115, 119), 19 (128), 24 (160).
Secretariat - general administration.
Junankar, VI, 37 (120).
Secretariat - general policy.
Junankar, VI, 13 (88).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Mudaliar, V, 21 (47).
Sundaram, V, 18 (7, 45), 19 (18).
Secretariat. Bureau of Personnel and Management.
Junankar, VI, 12 (136, 141, 145), 13 (20).
Technical assistance.
Mujeeb, IV, 8 (34).
Universal Declaration of Human Rights - commemoration.
Mudaliar, II, 18 (58).
Vishinsky, Andrej - memorial tribute.
Kabir, II, 11 (8).
Working languages - Russian.
Junankar, VI, 19 (79, 87, 92).
Mudaliar, II, 16 (188), 17 (3).

INDONESIA

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Sudjono, II, 6 (92).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Soebroto, VI, 20 (6, 14).
International civil servants.
Soebroto, VI, 26 (22).
International understanding and co-operation.
Soebroto, VI, 28 (51, 95).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Soebroto, VI, 10 (24).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Soebroto, VI, 6 (85), 12 (73).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Johannes, IV, 16 (10, 44), 19 (31).
Soebroto, VI, 8 (22, 52).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Soebroto, VI, 10 (9).
Science co-operation offices.
Soebroto, VI, 14 (25, 49, 67).
Technical assistance.
Johannes, IV, 8 (17).

IRAN

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Raadi, II, 4 (83).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Raadi, V, 8 (56).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Raadi, IV, 34 (65, 80).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Raadi, V, 6 (17).
Member States - withdrawal.
Raadi, V, 3 (35).
Non-governmental organizations.
Raadi, V, 15 (19).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Raadi, IV, 26 (42).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Raadi, IV, 15 (35, 88), 17 (29, 59, 61), 32 (49, 54, 69).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Raadi, IV, 18 (176, 186), 20 (25), 22 (5).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Raadi, V, 18 (20, 47).
Technical assistance.
Raadi, IV, 7 (76).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Raadi, V, 2 (77, 86, 89), 3 (5, 19).

IRAQ

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Al-Hani, V, 10 (36).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Al-Hilli, II, 9 (43).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Al-Hilli, IV, 25 (18).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Al-Hilli, IV, 10 (120), 14 (19, 105, 107).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Al-Hilli, IV, 9 (48).
Secretariat - general administration.
Al-Hilli, V, 6 (58).
Technical assistance.
Al-Hilli, IV, 8 (3).

ISRAEL

Admission of new Members.
Avidor, VI, 19 (101).
Kubovy, II, 3 (27).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table.
Avidor, VI, 38 (10).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Kubovy, II, 8 (32).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Avida, V, 4 (7, 65), 7 (67).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Kubovy, II, 15 (92).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Avidor, VI, 38 (36).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Avidor, VI, 20 (32).
International understanding and co-operation.
Avidor, VI, 27 (9), 28 (13, 20, 38, 82, 92, 103, 110, 118, 125), 29 (12, 25, 41), 30 (39, 52).
National Commissions.
Avidor, VI, 15 (41, 76, 79).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Avidor, VI, 19 (120), 22 (38), 23 (65), 25 (35, 69), 26 (5), 34 (9, 40, 42, 70), 35 (12, 14, 44, 48).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Avidor, VI, 5 (66, 68, 83), 6 (54), 7 (79, 129), 27 (83, 93).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Avidor, IV, 11 (104), 13 (42), VI, 2 (24, 51), 3 (13, 35, 60), 4 (16, 18), 6 (93, 98), 24 (82, 91), 27 (51, 55), 37 (10, 20, 33).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Avidor, VI, 10 (19, 30, 45, 52).
Sambursky, IV, 28 (20).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Avidor, VI, 6 (80, 83), 11 (30, 58, 62, 91, 101), 12 (59), 19 (5, 15, 89), 30 (22).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Avidor, VI, 8 (18, 80), 9 (5, 20, 22, 37, 48, 59), 16 (92, 110), 17 (14, 36, 51, 148), 37 (49, 51, 64, 84).
Sambursky, IV, 15 (21), 32 (66).
Programme, 1955-56- social sciences.
Avidor, IV, 22 (57, 93), VI, 9 (87, 96, 102, 104), 24 (132), 26 (39).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Avidor, VI, 12 (67, 70).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Avidor, IV, 4 (20), VI, 2 (5, 24), 21 (18), 24 (23, 31, 44, 73, 76).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Avidor, VI, 24 (158).
Science co-operation offices.
Avidor, VI, 14 (22, 43, 48, 84).
Secretariat - general administration.
Avidor, VI, 24 (188, 191).
Secretariat, general policy.
Avidor, VI, 13 (75, 83).
Secretariat. Bureau of Personnel and Management.
Avidor, VI, 13 (22).
Technical assistance.
Avidor, IV, 8 (25).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Avida, V, 15 (2).
Avidor, V, 2 (80).
Working languages - Russian.
Avidor, VI, 19 (89).

ITALY

Admission of new Members.
Badini Confalonieri, II, 3 (56).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Giustiniani, V, 10 (104).
Cultural agreements.
Veronese, IV, 30 (99).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Badini Confalonieri, II, 5 (8).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Badini Confalonieri, II, 11 (79).
Pompei, V, 5 (14).
General Conference - rules.
Calò, IV, 34 (46, 68, 73, 90).
Pompei, V, 19 (57).
Headquarters.
Pompei, XI, 2 (14, 42, 51, 59), 3 (15, 17, 26, 39).
International civil servants.
Pompei, V, 20 (23), 24 (35).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Branca, IV, 25 (113).
Non-governmental organizations.
Paronetto Valier, V, 15 (63).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Veronese, IV, 5 (77), 6 (59), 30 (25, 49), 33(44).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Branca, IV, 21 (108, 144), 23 (53), 24 (87, 101), 25 (27, 57, 70, 112, 123).
Paronetto Valier, IV, 24 (140, 152), 29 (14, 38, 62).
Ungaretti, IV, 21 (36), 23 (28, 85, 88, 110), 29 (28).
Venezia, IV, 29 (24).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Calò, IV, 10 (33, 103), 11 (9, 27, 91, 99), 12 (25, 75, 122), 14 (79, 157, 195).
Vito, IV, 12 (124).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Paronetto Valier, IV, 28 (43).
Vito, IV, 28 (90).

Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Branca, IV, 26 (36, 108, 113, 134), 27 (11).
Calò, IV, 27 (74).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Severi, IV, 15 (66, 114), 16 (16, 26, 27, 70), 17 (32).
Veronese, IV, 32 (36).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Vito, IV, 18 (16, 62, 108, 119, 146), 20 (5, 76), 22 (9, 28).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Calò, IV, 4 (46), 13 (9).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Vito, IV, 29 (80, 93).
Secretariat - general administration.
Pompei, V, 6 (71).
Secretariat. Department of Mass Communication.
Venezia, IV, 29 (8).
Tribute to Uruguay.
Veronese, II, 18 (71).

JAPAN

Clubs of Friends of Unesco.
Sawada, IV, 30 (75, 78).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Haguiwara, V, 9 (82, 85), 10 (23, 40, 45, 53, 61, 95), 11 (37, 74), 13 (24, 32, 72, 77).
Director-General - reports.
Haguiwara, VIII, 4 (12, 16, 28, 34).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Sawada, II, 5 (38).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Haguiwara, II, 11 (168); V, 4 (61), 5 (56), 6 (27), 7 (37, 49), 8 (10, 26, 68), 11 (23, 27), 14 (54, 58, 70); VIII, 2 (14), 3 (7, 13, 15, 26, 35, 46, 53, 55, 59, 62, 67, 73), 6 (31, 35, 42, 48, 54, 60, 70).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Haguiwara, II, 15 (14, 21).
Financial regulations - amendments.
Haguiwara, V, 2 (66); VIII, 7 (29).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Sawada, II, 15 (54).
International administrative tribunals.
Haguiwara, V, 23 (138, 144).
Member States - withdrawal.
Haguiwara, V, 3 (56, 58, 61).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Sawada, IV, 30 (44).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Suzuki, IV, 23 (18), 24 (74), 25 (35, 102), 28 (59), 29 (12, 31).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Morito, IV, 13 (25).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Suzuki, IV, 28 (59).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Sawada, IV, 30 (44).
Suzuki, IV, 26 (45), 27 (125).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Kaya, IV, 16 (95), 17 (8).
Suzuki, IV, 17 (13, 114).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Morito, IV, 18 (31).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Suzuki, IV, 27 (134).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Haguiwara, IV, 9 (49).
Sawada, IV, 4 (33).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Suzuki, IV, 29 (78).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Haguiwara, V, 23 (113, 115, 119).
Secretariat - general administration.
Haguiwara, V, 6 (55).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Haguiwara, V, 21 (2).
Technical assistance.
Suzuki, IV, 25 (35).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Haguiwara, V, 3 (17).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Haguiwara, V, 2 (35, 40).
Working languages - Russian.
Haguiwara, II, 17 (24); VIII, 6 (79).
Working languages - Spanish.
Haguiwara, V, 14 (88, 99).

JORDAN (HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF)

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Salim, II, 12 (36); V, 9 (60, 76), 10 (36), 14 (25).
Director-General - reports.
Salim, V, 19 (46).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Salim, VIII, 2 (36).
Financial regulations - amendments.
Salim, V, 2 (72).
Member States - withdrawal.
Salim, V, 3 (60).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Salim, IV, 5 (92).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Salim, IV, 23 (73), 29 (54).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Salim, IV, 13 (54).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Salim, IV, 17 (128).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Salim, IV, 9 (29).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Salim, IV, 29 (177).
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East.
Salim, IV, 32 (110).
Secretariat - general administration.
Salim, V, 6 (46).
Technical assistance.
Salim, IV, 8 (20).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Salim, V, 2 (81), 3 (1, 8).

KOREA

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Paik, II, 5 (108).

Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Paik, IV, 23 (24).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Paik, IV, 13 (77, 81).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Paik, IV, 27 (137).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Paik, IV, 3 (32, 33).
Working languages - Russian.
Paik, II, 17 (13).

LAOS

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Souvanna Phouma, II, 9 (116).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Souvanna Phouma, II, 11 (175).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Souvanna Phouma, V, 3 (16).

LEBANON

Admission of new Members.
Ammoun, II, 3 (54).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Ammoun, V, 9 (66), 11 (48, 73).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Ammoun, II, 9 (63).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Ammoun, V, 4 (55), 11 (10).
Maroun, II, 11 (118); V, 8 (53); VIII, 2 (21).
Solh, V, 4 (44).
Financial regulations - amendments.
Ammoun, V, 2 (58, 61).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Maroun, IV, 34 (86, 91), 35 (59, 81, 105).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Maroun, IV, 5 (88), 6 (36), 30 (23), 33 (59).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Maroun, IV, 24 (142), 29 (32, 51).
Neffa, IV, 21 (69), 23 (17), 24 (43, 112, 163), 25 (63, 101).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Maroun, II, 17 (94), IV, 10 (3, 135, 142), 11 (13, 38, 96), 12 (6, 34), 13 (34, 40, 58, 74, 89, 112, 116, 122, 124), 14 (14, 60, 128, 142).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Ammoun, IV, 28 (53).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Ammoun, IV, 33 (27).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Maroun, IV, 16 (22, 23), 32 (43).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Maroun, IV, 18 (47, 51, 72), 20 (8).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Maroun, IV, 5 (7), 9 (46).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Maroun, IV, 29 (103).
Secretariat - staff compensation plan for service-incurred risks
Ammoun, V, 17 (34).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Ammoun, V, 17 (72, 74, 81), 18 (68, 71, 73, 87), 19 (34), 21 (33), 22 (74).
Technical assistance.
Maroun, IV, 8 (64, 72, 79, 104).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Ammoun, V, 2 (88).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Ammoun, V, 2 (26).

LIBERIA

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Knight, II, 10 (2).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Bright, V, 7 (28), VIII, 6 (67).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Massaquoi, IV, 34 (57, 84), 35 (70).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Massaquoi, IV, 25 (38, 44), 29 (52).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Massaquoi, IV, 10 (136), 11 (53, 79), 12 (72, 81), 13 (40, 114, 122, 130), 14 (97, 101, 104).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Massaquoi, IV, 16 (84, 85), 19 (121, 128).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Massaquoi, IV, 20 (102), 22 (29).
Railey, IV, 20 (95), 22 (75).
Programme and budget, 1955-56
Massaquoi, IV, 9 (40).
Technical assistance.
Massaquoi, IV, 8 (51, 116).

LIBYA (UNITED KINGDOM OF)

Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Kekhia, IV, 24 (91).
Tribute to Uruguay.
Kekhia, II, 18 (100).

MEXICO

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Sandoval Vallarta, V, 9 (10), 10 (5, 59).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Romano Muñoz, II, 9 (131).
Esperanto.
Sandoval Vallarta, II, 18 (40).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Sandoval Vallarta, V, 6 (30), 7 (43, 77).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Siller, VI, 20 (10).
International civil servants.
Gomez Robledo, V, 24 (39).
International understanding and co-operation.
Siller, VI, 28 (58, 70, 89, 113, 123), 29 (13), 30 (44).
National Commissions.
Siller, VI, 15 (44, 57).
Non-governmental organizations.
Sandoval Vallarta, V, 15 (74), 16 (1, 44).

Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Siller, VI, 14 (26, 35), 22 (27), 23 (34, 43), 32 (7, 15, 70, 72), 35 (22).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Flores Aguirre, IV, 23 (19).
Romano Muñoz, IV, 24 (64), 25 (21, 48, 68, 106).
Siller, VI, 6 (41, 57), 7 (84, 98, 125, 132, 137), 8 (9), 18 (100, 109).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Romano Muñoz, IV, 31 (62).
Sandoval Vallarta, II, 17 (91); IV, 12 (20, 100), 13 (118, 148), 14 (10, 112),
Siller, VI, 2 (59), 3 (45, 47), 4 (69), 6 (100, 110), 24 (95), 27 (56).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Sandoval Vallarta, IV, 28 (35).
Siller, VI, 10 (49, 56).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Sandoval Vallarta, IV, 26 (139), 27 (111).
Siller, VI, 11 (46, 77, 95), 12 (44, 71, 94).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Sandoval Vallarta, IV, 16 (15), 17 (112), 19 (62, 104).
Siller, VI, 8 (92, 107), 9 (46), 17 (89, 106, 133, 145), 37 (40).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Flores Aguirre, IV, 20 (78).
Romano Muñoz, IV, 18 (116).
Siller, VI, 6 (22), 9 (105, 136), 18 (10, 21).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Sandoval Vallarta, IV, 9 (23).
Siller, IV, 3 (38).
Programme and Budget Commission - report.
Sandoval Vallarta, IV, 35 (45, 51).
Seal and emblem of Unesco.
Sandoval Vallarta, IV, 30 (119).
Secretariat - general policy.
Siller, VI, 14 (7).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Gomez Robledo, V, 18 (34).
Secretariat. Regional Centre in the Western Hemisphere, Havana.
Siller, VI, 15 (24).
Technical assistance.
Siller, IV, 8 (105, 119, 128, 131).
Working languages - Russian.
Siller, VI, 25 (81, 91, 99, 102, 120).

NETHERLANDS

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Hoog, V, 10 (19, 27).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Kruyt, II, 7 (102).
General Conference - rules.
Hoog, V, 19 (54).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Bender, IV, 34 (59).
International civil servants.
Hoog, V, 20 (31).
Non-governmental organizations.
Hoog, V, 16 (34).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Kruyt, IV, 6 (40).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Bender, IV, 26 (83, 116), 27 (6), 29 (3).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Kruyt, IV, 15 (72, 81, 105, 119), 32 (10, 72, 92, 96).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Sassen, IV, 22 (48).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Bender, IV, 9 (30).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Bender, IV, 29 (86).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Suchtelen, V, 21 (22).
Secretariat. Department of Mass Communication.
Bender, IV, 29 (3).

NEW ZEALAND

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Forsyth, V, 10 (18).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Beeby, II, 8 (21).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Forsyth, IV, 34 (102), 35 (63, 98, 103, 114, 116).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Forsyth, IV, 5 (106), 30 (51), 33 (58).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Forsyth, IV, 21 (136), 24 (122), 29 (153).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Forsyth, IV, 10 (95), 11 (50), 12 (46), 14 (2, 45, 121, 183), 31 (73).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Forsyth, IV, 26 (85), 27 (102), 31 (95), 33 (24).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Forsyth, IV, 15 (121), 19 (40), 32 (74).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Forsyth, IV, 18 (44, 84), 22 (30, 91), 24 (31), 31 (21).

NICARAGUA

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Barrios, V, 9 (29, 74).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Barrios, V, 7 (64, 70).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Barrios, V, 8 (60).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Sacasa, II, 10 (52).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Barrios, IV, 14 (111).
Secretariat - general administration.
Barrios, V, 6 (50).

NORWAY

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Sommerfelt, II, 5 (92).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Sommerfelt, VI, 38 (28).
International understanding and co-operation.
Sommerfelt, VI, 28 (29, 57, 96, 106).

National Commissions.
Sommerfelt, VI, 15 (37, 68).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Sommerfelt, IV, 30 (39); VI, 14 (23), 22 (43), 23 (64), 32 (82), 33 (20, 76), 34 (61).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Sommerfelt, IV, 21 (116), 24 (141), 29 (126), VI, 5 (60, 70), 7 (62, 68), 18 (65, 73, 75), 27 (88).
Tveteràs, IV, 23 (62).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Sommerfelt, IV, 10 (90), 11 (45), VI, 2 (40, 61), 4 (33, 61), 5 (21), 16 (48), 27 (40).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Sommerfelt, VI, 11 (11, 27), 18 (139).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Sommerfelt, IV, 21 (25), 32 (14, 16); VI, 8 (115).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Sommerfelt, VI, 6 (15), 9 (75, 118, 145), 10 (14).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Sommerfelt, IV, 9 (25); VI, 2 (2), 21 (21, 37), 24 (1, 3).
Secretariat - general administration.
Sommerfelt, VI, 13 (63), 21 (3), 24 (174).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Tveteras, V, 21 (21), 22 (48, 50).
Working languages - Russian.
Sommerfelt, VI, 25 (83, 101, 115).

PAKISTAN

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Qureshi, II, 6 (2).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Sharif, V, 4 (3, 64), 5 (9), 7 (18).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Sharif, IV, 35 (78).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Sharif, V, 6 (21).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Sharif, IV, 30 (45).
Siddiqi, IV, 5 (98), 6 (39).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Sharif, IV, 21 (89), 24 (123).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Siddiqi, IV, 14 (193).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Sharif, IV, 33 (18).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Sharif, IV, 17 (119, 133).
Siddiqi, IV, 16 (142).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Siddiqi, IV, 20 (20), 22 (69).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Sharif, IV, 9 (19).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Sharif, V, 18 (3, 83, 85), 19 (13).
Technical assistance.
Sharif, IV, 7 (64).
Siddiqi, IV, 5 (98).
Tribute to Uruguay.
Sharif, II, 18 (89).

PANAMA

Executive Board - composition and functions.
Amado Burgos, II, 11 (33).

PHILIPPINES

China - vote.
Policarpio, V, 12 (2).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Los Santos, II, 8 (86).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Los Santos, V, 8 (50).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Los Santos, II, 15 (94).
Joint Staff Pensions Fund. Committee - election, 1954.
Los Santos, V, 17 (50, 52).
Non-governmental organizations.
Policarpio, V, 16 (84, 86).
Programme, - remodelling and decentralization.
Legarda, IV, 6 (24).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Legarda, IV, 21 (97, 145).
Los Santos, IV, 23 (63).
Reinoso de Rodriguez, IV, 24 (48).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Legarda, IV, 14 (151).
Reinoso de Rodriguez, IV, 12 (16).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Legarda, IV, 20 (91).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Los Santos, V, 19 (12), 21 (53), 22 (35).
Technical assistance.
Reinoso de Rodriguez, IV, 8 (7).
Tribute to Uruguay.
Los Santos, II, 18 (93).
Working languages - Spanish.
Enverga, V, 14 (91).

POLAND

Admission of new Members.
Michałowski, II, 3 (38, 72).
China - representation.
Michałowski, II, 2 (31, 32).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Michałowski, V, 13 (13).
Wiechecki, V, 10 (9), 20 (14, 16).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Michałowski, II, 5 (63).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Michałowski, II, 15 (18).
General Conference - rules.
Wiechecki, V, 19 (77, 88).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Michałowski, II, 5 (85).
Słonimski, IV, 25 (107).
Non-governmental organizations.
Wiechecki, V, 16 (64).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Lorentz, IV, 24 (37, 67), 25 (62, 94).

Słonimski, IV, 25 (107).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Halina Jaczewska, IV, 10 (6).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Michałowski, IV, 33 (13).
Winkler-Ketrzynski, IV, 26 (86).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Michałowski, IV, 17 (33).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Lorentz, IV, 18 (22).
Mencel, IV, 22 (62).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Mencel, IV, 4 (37).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Wiechecki, V, 21 (19).
Working languages - Russian.
Michałowski, II, 16 (171).
Wiechecki, V, 14 (108).

SAUDI-ARABIA

Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Khadra, IV, 13 (61).

SPAIN

Cultural agreements.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 30 (92).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 11 (57).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Ruiz-Giménez Cortés, II, 7 (60).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 4 (5, 20, 59), 5 (49, 71), 7 (71).
Financial Regulations - amendments
Fraga Iribarne, VIII, 7 (10).
General Conference - rules.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 19 (83, 85, 87).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Ruiz-Giménez Cortés, II, 15 (80).
Headquarters.
Fernandez Quintanilla, XI, 3 (3).
Member States - withdrawal.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 3 (53).
Non-governmental organizations.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 16 (79, 81).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 23 (103), 24 (49, 62, 126), 29 (48).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 10 (73), 11 (14, 66, 77), 13 (106).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 28 (19).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 26 (54), 27 (79).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 15 (16), 16 (41, 108), 17 (124).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 22 (6).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 4 (68).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind
Fernandez Quintanilla, IV, 29 (101).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 23 (19, 51, 59, 94, 101, 108, 110, 118, 123).
Secretariat - general administration.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 6 (63).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 18 (25), 19 (12, 29).
Technical assistance.
Estelrich Artigues, IV, 8 (95, 106).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 2 (90).
Working languages - Spanish.
Fraga Iribarne, V, 14 (81).

SWEDEN

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Düring, II, 4 (57).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Ståhl, V, 5 (42).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Düring, IV, 34 (97).
International understanding and co-operation.
Düring, VI, 27 (3).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Düring, IV, 33 (52).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Düring, IV, 11 (73), VI, 27 (17, 32, 34).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Düring, IV, 26 (62, 107), 27 (27, 65, 89), 33 (16).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Düring, IV, 32 (97); VI, 27 (61, 68).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Düring, IV, 31 (9, 20, 27).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Ståhl, V, 21 (27).
Technical assistance.
During, IV, 8 (28).
Working languages - Russian.
Düring, VI, 19 (66).

SWITZERLAND

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Bourgeois, II, 6 (64).
Esperanto.
Bourgeois, II, 18 (42).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Barbey, V, 5 (2).
Bourgeois, II (187), 14 (29).
Merminod, V, 11 (29), 14 (49); VIII, 3 (27), 6 (37, 41).
Salis, II, 11 (60).
Executive Board - election, 1954.
Bourgeois, II, 15 (13).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Salis, IV, 34 (50, 88).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Barbey, V, 6 (18).

International civil servants.
Merminod, VIII, 7 (45).
Programme, remodelling and decentralization.
Barbey, IV, 5 (55).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Bourgeois, IV, 23 (50), 24 (99).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Weilenmann, IV, 14 (34, 88).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Barbey, IV, 26 (89, 131).
Salis, IV, 33 (4).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Barbey, IV, 16 (126).
Bourgeois, IV, 32 (33, 52).
Weilenmann, IV, 17 (89).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Weilenmann, IV, 18 (139).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Barbey, IV, 9 (37).
Salis, IV, 4 (11).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Barbey, IV, 29 (175).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Merminod, V, 23 (78, 81, 86).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Merminod, V, 22 (18).
Secretariat. Department of Mass Communication.
Barbey, IV, 29 (10).

THAILAND

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Attagara, V, 10 (17).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Pin Malakul, (Mrs.), II, 5 (98).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Pin Malakul (Mr.), IV, 35 (61).
International administrative tribunals.
Attagara, V, 23 (129).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Charyavibhaj, IV, 25 (8).
Pin Malakul (Mrs.), IV, 29 (22, 60).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Charyavibhaj, IV, 28 (77).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Attagara, V, 18 (2).
Technical assistance.
Charyavibhaj, IV, 8 (11, 133).
Working languages - Spanish.
Attagara, V, 14 (94).

TURKEY

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Tuncel, II, 12 (39).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Tuncel, II, 9 (99).
Member States - reports.
Tuncel, X, 3 (5), 7 (2), 8 (12, 18, 20, 23, 25, 28, 31, 38, 41, 47, 49, 61).
Non-governmental organizations.
Tuncel, V, 15 (26).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Tuncel, IV, 21 (77)
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Tuncel, IV, 17 (93), 32 (62, 65, 70, 81, 87).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Tuncel, V, 18 (82).

UKRAINE (S.S.R. OF)

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Dudnik, V, 9 (16).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Koval, II, 8 (117).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Koval, IV, 11 (62).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Tulchinskaia, IV, 16 (112, 113).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Koval, IV, 5 (1).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Dudnik, V, 21 (54).
Working languages - Russian.
Dudnik, V, 14 (106).

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Committee on Contributions - reports.
Pohl, V, 9 (27, 44), 10 (12, 57, 64, 84, 96, 98), 11 (55), 13 (35), 14 (5).
Director-General - reports.
Pohl, V, 3 (28), 19 (43).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Pohl, II, 8 (137).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Pohl, V, 7 (53).
International administrative tribunals.
Pohl, V, 23 (136, 147).
Member States - reports.
Widdowson, X, 7 (41), 9 (11).
Member States - withdrawal.
Pohl, V, 3 (39).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Widdowson, IV, 25 (114).
Non-governmental organizations.
Pohl, V, 15 (25), 16 (6, 62, 139).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Widdowson, IV, 6 (21).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Widdowson, IV, 24 (50), 25 (41, 84, 114).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Widdowson, IV, 11 (52, 54, 56), 13 (90).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Widdowson, IV, 27 (36).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Widdowson, IV, 16 (143).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Widdowson, IV, 20 (82), 22 (34).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Widdowson, IV, 3 (37), 9 (15).
Secretariat - general administration.
Pohl, V, 6 (52, 64).
Secretariat - staff compensation plan for service-incurred risks.
Pohl, V, 17 (33).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Pohl, V, 22 (23).

Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Pohl, V, 3 (15).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Pohl, V, 2 (32, 44)

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Admission of new Members.
Soldatov, II, 3 (23, 68).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table.
Torocheshnikov, IV, 34 (7, 13).
China - representation.
Soldatov, IX, 1 (6, 12, 19, 25, 30, 33, 37, 42).
Stoletov, II, 1 (45), 2 (17).
China - vote.
Soldatov, V, 10 (72), 12 (5).
Stoletov, II, 1 (45).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Soldatov, II, 12 (42); V, 9 (11, 30), 10 (14, 72), 11 (41, 71).
Credentials - presentation and verification.
Soldatov, IX, 1 (6, 12, 15, 19, 25, 30, 33, 37, 42).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Stoletov, II, 5 (117).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Soldatov, V, 7 (21, 47).
General Conference - rules.
Soldatov, V, 19 (74, 76).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Zimin, IV, 35 (40).
Member States - withdrawal.
Soldatov, V, 3 (69).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Solodovnikov, IV, 25 (117).
Non-governmental organizations.
Soldatov, II, 16 (123); V, 16 (29, 99).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Solodovnikov, IV, 21 (55, 131), 25 (117), 29 (149).
Zuev, IV, 24 (70), 25 (117).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Burchuladze, IV, 10 (98, 152).
Kadyrov, IV, 13 (93).
Solodovnikov, IV, 13 (83, 138).
Zimin, IV, 10 (37).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Torocheshnikov, IV, 28 (22).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Soldatov, IV, 31 (97).
Solodovnikov, IV, 27 (31).
Stoletov, IV, 32 (115).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Stoletov, IV, 15 (17), 32 (42).
Torocheshnikov, IV, 16 (59).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Stoletov, IV, 22 (92).
Torocheshnikov, IV, 25 (26).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Solodovnikov, IV, 27 (131).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Stoletov, IV, 4 (74).
Programme and Budget Commission - report.
Zimin, IV, 35 (40).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Solodovnikov, IV, 29 (89).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Solodovnikov, IV, 29 (88).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Soldatov, V, 17 (86), 18 (4, 55, 58), 21 (12).
Secretariat - training programme.
Soldatov, V, 20 (34).
Working languages - Russian.
Soldatov, II, 16 (147, 161, 163, 208, 221), 17 (31); V, 14 (100, 116).

UNITED KINGDOM

Admission of new Members.
Cowell, VI, 19 (100).
Thomas, II, 3 (29, 64).
Associate Members.
West, VIII, 5 (21, 23, 40, 47, 50, 57, 60, 64).
Auditors - report, 1952-53.
Cowell, VI, 16 (5).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table.
Cowell, IV, 34 (8); VI, 38 (7).
China - representation.
Cowell, IX, 1 (29).
Webster, II, 2 (29).
Clubs of Friends of Unesco.
Bowen Thomas, IV, 30 (77).
Cowell, VI, 19 (132).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Arthur, V, 9 (34, 77), 10 (6, 51, 65, 82, 108), 11 (53, 59), 14 (27).
Bowen Thomas, V, 20 (5, 19).
Credentials - presentation and verification.
Cowell, IX, 1 (10, 29).
Cultural agreements.
Cowell, IV, 30 (95, 103); VI, 12 (90).
Director-General - reports.
West, V, 3 (32); VIII, 4 (31).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Bowen Thomas, II, 8 (198).
Esperanto.
Bowen Thomas, II, 18 (44).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Bowen Thomas, V, 14 (66).
Grubb, II, 11 (198); V, 5 (11), 7 (40, 54, 79), 8 (4, 33).
West, VIII, 2 (22), 3 (20, 25, 31, 42), 6 (20, 34, 71).
Financial Regulations - amendments.
Arthur, V, 2 (64); VIII, 7 (13).
General Conference - rules.
West, V, 19 (64, 89), VIII, 5 (35, 37).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Cowell, IV, 34 (40), 35 (36, 67); VI, 38 (37).
General Conference. Nominations Committee.
West, VIII, 5 (80, 85).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Bowen Thomas, II, 15 (62).
Cowell, VI, 20 (9, 23, 30).
West, V, 6 (22).
Headquarters.
Arthur, V, 23 (2, 5).
Cowell, XI, 2 (10, 17, 32, 45, 57, 61, 70), 3 (2, 7, 10, 20, 30, 37).

International administrative tribunals.
Arthur, V, 23 (142), 24 (10).
International civil servants.
Arthur, V, 24 (36); VIII, 7 (33, 38, 43).
Bowen Thomas, V, 20 (27).
Cowell, VI, 26 (19, 24, 29, 33).
International Fund for Education, Science and Culture.
Arthur, IV, 31 (41, 49).
International understanding and co-operation.
Cowell, VI, 28 (8, 17, 24, 32, 37, 68, 87), 29 (16, 26, 32, 35, 42, 47, 49, 52), 30 (8, 11, 29, 37, 51, 53, 59).
Member States - reports.
Bishop, X, 5 (8), 8 (11, 19), 9 (4).
Grubb, X, 2 (9, 32, 40).
Member States - withdrawal.
Bowen Thomas, V, 19 (52).
Nevinson, V, 3 (75).
West, V, 3 (41); VIII, 5 (7, 10, 16).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Cowell, VI, 26 (29, 33), 37 (105).
Ward, IV, 25 (124).
National Commissions.
Cowell, VI, 15 (39, 72, 77).
Nominations Committee - reports.
Bowen Thomas, II, 18 (66).
Non-governmental organizations.
Cowell, VI, 16 (5).
Webster, V, 15 (66, 98), 16 (2, 14, 63, 97, 118, 133, 145).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Bowen Thomas, IV, 33 (49).
Cowell, VI, 14 (24), 22 (21), 23 (36, 45, 58, 71), 25 (3, 16, 27, 50, 58, 64, 70, 76), 26 (6, 9, 11), 31 (22, 63, 78, 82, 84), 32 (58), 33 (5, 50, 53, 67, 81, 95, 106, 110, 112, 117, 119), 34 (7, 28, 55, 63), 35 (20, 33, 53, 57).
Webster, IV, 6 (8, 43, 63).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Cowell, VI, 5 (55, 58, 63, 71, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 105, 114), 6 (49, 56), 7 (6, 51, 57, 74, 83, 89, 92, 108, 118, 120), 8 (7, 10), 18 (76, 84, 95, 107, 114, 117), 24 (140), 27 (84).
Nevinson, IV, 25 (82).
Ward, IV, 25 (15, 43, 78, 124).
Webster, IV, 21 (86, 126), 23 (39), 24 (98, 121, 148, 161).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Arthur, VI, 3 (9, 14, 25, 29, 48, 57, 65, 74, 80, 84).
Clegg, IV, 12 (61, 92), 14 (144, 168, 197).
Cowell, VI, 4 (12, 24, 30, 43, 47, 64, 67, 74, 76, 82, 99, 106), 5 (30, 36), 6 (9, 102, 106), 7 (12, 16), 16 (37, 51, 61), 21 (10), 24 (83, 93, 104, 109, 114), 27 (30, 42), 37 (2, 7).
Robertson, IV, 10 (101), 13 (24).
Ward, IV, 11 (10, 64, 80), 12 (108), 13 (10, 87, 119, 129, 132, 136, 153), 14 (11, 53, 109), 31 (71, 82).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Clegg, IV, 28 (21).
Cowell, VI, 10 (21, 37, 42, 51, 55, 75, 77, 84, 86), 19 (62).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Cowell, IV, 31 (92); VI, 6 (84), 11 (4, 14, 20, 24, 29, 35, 45, 60, 69, 75, 87, 98, 112, 124, 128, 138), 12 (9, 19, 24, 31, 33, 37, 55, 90, 96), 18 (122, 125, 132, 137), 19 (3, 29), 24 (151), 27 (97).
Grubb, IV, 27 (38, 40), 32 (117).
Ward, IV, 27 (116)
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Arthur, VI, 37 (66, 77, 87).
Bowen Thomas, IV, 32 (79, 89).
Cowell, VI, 8 (8, 32, 36, 40, 44, 50, 53, 61, 64, 72, 78, 98, 103, 109, 117), 9 (10, 13, 26, 57), 16 (78, 87, 106, 112, 115, 124), 17 (2, 21, 72, 83, 85, 99), 24 (125, 130), 27 (63, 69), 30 (15, 18), 37 (59).
Simonsen, IV, 15 (67, 89, 104, 118), 16 (58, 92, 137), 17 (74, 99), 19 (8, 41, 67, 97), 32 (41).
Webster, IV, 21 (21), 32 (75).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Cowell, VI, 6 (17), 9 (126, 140, 146, 153), 10 (6, 8, 11), 18 (7), 24 (136), 27 (76), 37 (105).
Ward, IV, 18 (160), 22 (37, 56).
Webster, IV, 18 (18, 104, 106, 125, 179, 184, 190, 194), 20 (4, 71, 92), 22 (64, 68), 24 (21, 32).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Bowen Thomas, IV, 3 (1), 9 (10).
Cowell, VI, 20 (70, 74), 21 (14, 22, 32), 24 (13, 26, 35, 50, 52, 55, 58), 36 (17).
Programme and Budget Commission - report.
Cowell, IV, 35 (36).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Cowell, VI, 12 (120), 24 (161).
Science co-operation offices.
Cowell, VI, 14 (24, 56, 61).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
Ward, IV, 29 (82).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Arthur, V, 23 (84, 92, 120).
Secretariat - general administration.
Cowell, VI, 13 (67, 77), 24 (180).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Arthur, V, 17 (77).
Bowen Thomas, V, 18 (5, 10, 44, 74), 19 (10, 17), 21 (6), 22 (49, 59).
Secretariat. Bureau of Personnel and Management.
Cowell, VI, 13 (27, 29, 33).
Secretariat. New York Office.
Cowell, VI, 15 (97, 99, 108).
Secretariat. Regional Centre in the Western Hemisphere, Havana.
Cowell, VI, 15 (28).
Technical assistance.
Cowell, VI, 26 (48, 58).
Ward, IV, 8 (40, 66, 132)
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Arthur, V, 2 (39), 24 (10).
Working languages - Russian.
Cowell, VI, 19 (81).
West, V, 14 (112).
Working languages - Spanish.
Cowell, VI, 19 (137).
West, V, 14 (93).

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Admission of new Members.
Kotschnig, II, 17 (143).

Lee, VI, 19 (102, 109, 112).
Nufer, II, 3 (15, 77).
Associate Members.
Simsarian, VIII, 5 (53, 61, 68).
Auditors - report, 1952-53.
Laise, V, 2 (7, 11); VI, 16 (4, 10).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table.
Lee, VI, 38 (6).
China - representation.
Kotschnig, IX, 1 (9, 14, 17, 35).
Nufer, II, 2 (26).
China - vote.
Kotschnig, V, 12 (6).
Laise, V, 10 (73).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Kotschnig, V, 10 (90), 13 (14, 56).
Laise, V, 10 (73, 78), 11 (51, 72).
Scott, V, 9 (45), 10 (3).
Credentials - presentation and verification.
Kotschnig, IX, 1 (9, 14, 17, 35).
Cultural agreements.
Lee, VI, 12 (92).
Director-General - reports.
Simsarian, VIII, 4 (23, 33, 39, 56, 62).
Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Nufer, II, 7 (112).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Kotschnig, II, 11 (107, 182); V, 1 (24), 4 (9, 57), 5 (46, 59), 7 (11, 29, 39, 66), 8 (2, 19, 63, 88), 11 (20), 14 (34, 36, 45, 47, 64, 74); VIII, 2 (28, 34, 39, 44, 48), 3 (3, 18, 22, 44, 51, 72, 74, 78), 6 (16, 27, 33, 63, 65).
Financial Regulations - amendments.
Kotschnig, VIII, 7 (7).
Laise, V, 2 (75).
General Conference - rules.
Brownell, V, 19 (75).
Kotschnig, V, 5 (48).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Brownell, IV, 34 (31, 104), 35 (108).
Lee, VI, 38 (34, 60, 69).
General Conference. Nominations Committee.
Simsarian, VIII, 5 (88).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Heffelfinger, II, 15 (42); V, 6 (20).
Laise, VI, 20 (7, 17, 19, 28, 33).
Ibarbourou, Juana de - tribute.
Hope, II, 18 (32).
International administrative tribunals.
Laise, V, 23 (146, 151), 24 (5, 8)
International civil servants.
Brownell, V, 20 (25).
Kotschnig, VIII, 7 (49).
Lee, VI, 26 (20, 28, 32).
International Fund for Education, Science and Culture.
McCullough, IV, 31 (40).
International understanding and co-operation.
Angell, VI, 28 (114).
Lee, VI, 28 (10, 22, 80, 104, 122), 29 (39, 46), 30 (45, 57).
Joint Staff Pensions Fund. Committee - election, 1954.
Laise, V, 17 (51), 24 (41).
Member States - reports.
Connors, X, 7 (21).
McCullough, X, 2 (6, 12, 25, 37), 8 (2, 21, 22, 35, 40, 45, 48, 53, 63), 9 (7, 19, 21, 23).
Member States - withdrawal.
Kotschnig, V, 3 (42, 57, 61, 67).
Simsarian, VIII, 5 (12, 15).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Lee, VI, 20 (45), 26 (32), 37 (94).
National Commissions.
Laise, VI, 15 (45, 62).
Non-governmental organizations.
Heffelfinger, V, 16 (87, 121).
Kotschnig, V, 15 (53), 16 (10, 42, 61, 77, 105).
Laise, VI, 16 (4, 10).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Heffelfinger, IV, 33 (39); VI, 32 (56).
Laise, VI, 14 (29).
Lee, IV, 6 (4, 57); VI, 22 (44), 23 (37, 55, 63, 75), 25 (4, 9, 18, 25, 33, 36, 57, 59, 72), 26 (7), 31 (9, 14, 37, 43, 72, 79), 32 (71, 83), 33 (17, 41, 43, 48, 52, 65, 78, 89, 88, 96, 102, 109, 111, 118), 34 (2, 12, 19, 59, 67, 78), 35 (58).
McCullough, IV, 30 (46).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Angell, IV, 25 (47).
Hope, IV, 21 (53, 122), 23 (40), 24 (82).
Laise, VI, 5 (89), 7 (122, 142).
Lee, VI, 5 (108, 117, 123), 7 (37, 47, 73, 113), 8 (1, 3, 6, 8, 12), 18 (64, 83, 86, 92, 118), 24 (142).
McCullough, IV, 29 (30, 40, 147).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Angell, IV, 12 (80), 13 (1, 41), 14 (4, 26, 51).
Brownell, IV, 10 (91), 11 (70), 13 (23), 14 (164).
Laise, VI, 2 (48, 52, 54, 66, 68, 71, 77), 3 (33), 4 (37), 24 (79).
Lee, VI, 2 (17), 3 (19, 39, 43, 55), 4 (20, 27, 58, 70, 87), 5 (25, 27, 42), 6 (11, 19, 97, 108), 16 (32, 41, 60), 20 (41), 24 (85, 101, 106), 27 (24, 35), 37 (4, 6, 16, 24).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Lee, VI, 10 (22, 27, 43, 65, 69), 19 (50, 55).
McCullough, IV, 28 (87).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Hardy, IV, 26 (28, 32, 61, 110, 130), 27 (22, 99, 132).
Lee, VI, 6 (86), 11 (5, 26, 34, 89, 106, 116, 130), 12 (7, 47, 54, 56, 62, 92), 18 (140).
McCullough, IV, 31 (90).
Scott, IV, 32 (122).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Angell, IV, 15 (73, 79), 16 (3, 42, 63).
Brownell, IV, 32 (51).
Hope, IV, 21 (7, 11).
Lee, VI, 8 (23, 43, 54, 91, 110, 112, 120), 9 (12, 42, 49, 58), 16 (88, 103, 109, 120), 17 (6, 8, 15, 20, 27, 43, 46, 57, 62, 68, 101, 103, 119, 122, 147), 24 (120), 27 (62), 37 (47).
Scott, IV, 32 (13).
Spilhaus, IV, 16 (156), 17 (17, 55, 57, 63), 19 (55, 113).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Angell, IV, 18 (75, 86, 166, 182), 20 (44, 68), 22 (67, 73, 89), 24 (8, 20, 33).
Lee, VI, 9 (127, 142, 154), 10 (15), 18 (5, 16, 34, 41, 46), 37 (94, 100, 107).
Scott, IV, 20 (55).

Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Hardy, IV, 27 (132).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Laise, VI, 1 (33), 12 (133), 16 (16, 19, 21), 20 (55, 58), 21 (12, 36), 24 (39, 41, 45, 61, 69).
Lee, VI, 20 (64), 21 (20), 24 (24, 36, 16).
Spilhaus, IV, 4 (7), 9 (38).
Programme and Budget Commission - report.
Brownell, IV, 35 (55).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Laise, VI, 12 (111, 113, 122, 129), 24 (154, 163, 167, 172).
Science co-operation offices
Laise, VI, 14 (29, 63, 89).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind
McCullough, IV, 29 (113).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Laise, V, 23 (37, 73, 83).
Secretariat - general administration.
Laise, V, 6 (77); VI, 13 (44, 49, 51, 55, 61, 68, 73, 76, 80, 86), 21 (5), 24 (167, 172, 177, 190).
Secretariat - general policy.
Laise, VI, 13 (91), 14 (5).
Secretariat - Medical Benefit Scheme.
Laise, V, 17 (9).
Secretariat - salaries, allowances and leave.
Laise, VI, 13 (14, 17, 37).
Secretariat - staff compensation plan for service-incurred risks.
Laise, V, 17 (38).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Brownell, V, 18 (36, 37), 19 (7), 20 (74).
Kotschnig, II, 16 (106).
Laise, V, 17 (82, 86).
Secretariat. Bureau of Personnel and Management.
Laise, VI, 12 (138, 143), 13 (14, 17, 23, 37, 41).
Secretariat. New York Office.
Laise, VI, 15 (95, 100, 102, 104).
Secretariat. Regional Centre in the Western Hemisphere, Havana.
Laise, VI, 15 (16, 27).
Technical assistance.
Angell, IV, 8 (63, 88).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Kotschnig, V, 3 (11).
Laise, V, 2 (34, 91).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Laise, V, 2 (21, 23, 29, 41), 24 (5, 8).
Working languages - Russian.
Kotschnig, II, 16 (166, 205); V, 14 (123); VIII, 6 (77).
Laise, VI, 19 (95).
Lee, VI, 19 (93, 109), 25 (85, 94, 108).
Working languages - Spanish.
Kotschnig, V, 14 (92, 111).

URUGUAY

China - representation.
Carbajal Victorica, IX, 1 (11, 13).
Credentials - presentation and verification.
Carbajal Victorica, IX, 1 (11, 13).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Secco Ellauri, II, 6 (137).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Blanco Acevedo, VIII, 6 (9, 36).
Carbajal Victorica, II, 11 (125); V, 4 (31), 7 (35).
General Conference - documents.
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 35 (132).
General Conference - rules.
Nogueira, V, 19 (68).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Secco Ellauri, II, 15 (46).
Ibarbourou, Juana de - tribute.
Ibarbourou, II, 18 (34).
International civil servants.
Nogueira, V, 20 (24).
Member States - withdrawal.
Ferreiro, V, 3 (71).
Non-governmental organizations.
Nogueira, V, 15 (73).
Opening speech.
Malet [Mayor of Montevideo], II, 1 (35).
Martinez Trueba, [President of the National Council of Administration of Uruguay], II, 1 (19).
Zavala Muniz, II, 1 (30).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Ranieri, VI, 14 (27).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Bollo, IV, 21 (125), 23 (10, 64, 105, 118), 25 (31).
Estable, IV, 29 (130).
Otero Mendoza, IV, 25 (76).
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 21 (83).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Bollo, IV, 11 (41), 12 (96).
Carbajal Victorica, IV, 11 (102).
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 10 (44, 87), 12 (8, 57, 112), 13 (2), 14 (17, 55, 76, 150, 185).
Ranieri, VI, 16 (38, 47).
Secco Ellauri, VI, 2 (44, 82).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Bollo, IV, 28 (47).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Bollo, IV, 33 (5).
Estable, IV, 26 (56).
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 27 (50, 152).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Bollo, IV, 19 (63).
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 21 (12).
Ranieri, VI, 9 (51), 17 (108, 139, 150).
Villar, IV, 17 (28), 19 (46, 92, 94).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Benvenuto, IV, 22 (38).
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 20 (19, 46, 62).
Ranieri, VI, 9 (128, 131).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 3 (22), 9 (47).
Secco Ellauri, VI, 1 (39).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Nogueira, V, 23 (49).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Carbajal Victorica, V, 20 (79).
Nogueira, V, 17 (96).
Secretariat. Regional Centre in the Western Hemisphere, Havana.
Ranieri, VI, 15 (26).

Technical assistance.
Pinto de Vidal, IV, 8 (43, 118).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Blanco Acevedo, V, 3 (9).
Working languages - Russian.
Secco Ellauri, II, 16 (192).
Working languages Spanish.
Nogueira, V, 14 (84).

VIET-NAM

Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Vo Van Lua, II, 9 (157).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Vo Van Lua, II, 17 (75).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Vo Van Lua, IV, 33 (19).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Vo Van Lua, IV, 17 (97, 115).

YUGOSLAVIA

Admission of new Members.
Vlahović, II, 3 (45).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Petrović, V, 11 (40).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Vlahović, II, 7 (164).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Petrović, V, 7 (22, 58), 14 (53, 73).
Vlahović, II, 11 (161).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Matić, IV, 35 (107).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Matić, II, 15 (65).
Petrović, V, 6 (24).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Stanković, IV, 6 (10).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Matić, IV, 23 (35, 59).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Stanković, IV, 12 (63).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Matić, IV, 28 (68).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Stanković, IV, 15 (25), 16 (68, 139).
Vlahović, IV, 17 (70).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Matić, IV, 22 (25, 55).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Matić, V, 22 (12).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Petrović, V, 15 (6).

## ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

CARIBBEAN REGION, GROUP OF BRITISH TERRITORIES

Admission of Associate Members.
Joseph, II, 3 (88)
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Houghton, IV, 13 (46)

GOLD COAST

Admission of Associate Members.
Erzuah, II, 3 (93).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Erzuah, IV, 11 (81), 13 (100).

MALAYA, BRITISH BORNEO GROUP

Admission of Associate Members.
Haji Mahmood, II, 4 (2).

SIERRA LEONE

Admission of Associate Members.
Blyden, II, 3 (101).

## NON-MEMBER STATES

PARAGUAY

Admission of new Members.
Ramirez, II, 11 (13).

## UNITED NATIONS

Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Steinig, II, 9 (108).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Steinig, IV, 11 (16, 74), 14 (140).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Steinig, IV, 16 (65).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Steinig, IV, 20 (49).

## SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
World Health Organization (Budnik), II, 8 (188).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
International Labour Organization (Garbarini Islas), IV, 10 (60), 12 (84).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
World Health Organization (Higgins), IV, 16 (144), 32 (113).

## INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Director-General [L.H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Organization of American States (Nannetti), II, 6 (112), (Sanchez Reulet), II, 9 (177).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Organization of American States (Sanchez Reulet), IV, 21 (104).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Organization of American States (Sanchez Reulet), IV, 18 (189), 20 (3), 22 (14, 39).

## NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Non-governmental organizations.
"Académie internationale de la céramique" (Heller), V, 16 (71, 76).
Conference of International Non-Governmental Organizations (Riegner), V, 15 (83).

World Federation of Democratic Youth (Bloch), V, 16 (110).
World Federation of United Nations Associations (Arias Perez), V, 16 (128).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (Syme), IV, 21 (112).
International Federation of University Women (Pecson), IV, 23 (65).
International Union of Architects (Mardones Restat), IV, 21 (149).
Pax Romana (Montero Sapriza), IV, 24 (143).
Union of Latin American Universities (Coto Conde), IV, 29 (135, 137, 157).
Universal Esperanto Association (Lapenna), IV, 29 (125, 151).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (Horne), IV, 14 (66).
International Federation of Christian Trade Unions (Viera Fernandez), IV, 14 (72).
Union of Latin American Universities (Coto Conde), IV, 31 (55, 74).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
International Association of University Professors and Lecturers (Riesz), IV, 28 (10).
ORT World Union (Friedman), IV, 28 (24).
World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (Legarda), IV, 28 (16).
World's Young Women's Christian Association (Miller), IV, 28 (84).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
ORT World Union (Friedman), IV, 26 (73).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
International Sociological Association (Ganon), IV, 18 (80), 22 (77).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Catholic International Union for Social Service (Schroeber), IV, 5 (27).
Conference of International Non-Governmental Organizations (Riegner), IV, 4 (90).
World Jewish Congress (Steinberg), IV, 5 (32).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.
International Commission for a Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind, (Carneiro), IV, 29 (114).

# EXECUTIVE BOARD

Admission of new Members.
Adam, II, 3 (13, 62).
Pecson, VI, 19 (100).
Auditors - report, 1952-53.
Bender, V, 2 (3).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table.
Adam, VI, 38 (12).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54.
Adam, II, 4 (13).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Bender, V, 6 (29).
Laugier, V, 14 (42, 90).
General Conference - observers.
Adam, II, 4 (7).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Adam, IV, 34 (62), 35 (32, 115); VI, 38 (27).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Adam, II, 15 (36).
Bender, V. 6 (12).
Pecson, VI, 19 (141), 20 (2).
General Conference, 9th session. Committee on Contributions.
Adam, V, 20 (18).
Headquarters.
Adam, V, 23 (4); XI, 2 (3), 3 (28, 32).
Joint Staff Pensions Fund. Committee - election, 1954.
Bender, V, 17 (49).
Member States - withdrawal.
Bender, V, 3 (34, 38).
Non-governmental organizations.
Veronese, V, 15 (16, 45, 97), 16 (19, 33, 40, 58, 74, 92, 114, 122).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization.
Adam, IV, 5 (41), 6 (34, 47, 69), 33 (38); VI, 22 (2, 10), 23 (1, 33, 62, 70), 25 (17), 31 (7, 42, 81, 84), 32 (55), 34 (72), 35 (59).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Pecson, IV, 23 (37, 108), 25 (79, 105), VI, 18 (80, 94, 97).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Pecson, IV, 10 (2, 136), 11 (47), 12 (99, 115), 13 (155), 14 (188); VI, 16 (31, 35, 39, 44, 46, 50, 54).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Adam, VI, 6 (115).
Pecson, IV, 28 (17, 42, 92); VI, 19 (45).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Adam, IV, 27 (154); VI, 12 (2).
Pecson, IV, 26 (68), 27 (10, 52); VI, 18 (123, 127), 19 (12, 18, 24, 34, 40).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Adam, VI, 9 (2, 4, 8, 14).
Pecson, IV, 16 (21, 28, 36, 106, 132, 133), 17 (35), 19 (17); VI, 16 (77, 101), 17 (11, 59, 97, 130, 137, 140, 143, 152, 154).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Adam, VI, 9 (150), 10 (1).
Pecson, IV, 18 (103, 183), 20 (74), 22 (95); VI, 18 (1, 13, 29, 32, 36, 38, 42).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Adam, IV, 9 (2).
Programme and Budget Commission - report.
Adam, IV, 35 (32).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Pecson, VI, 19 (126).
Science co-operation offices.
Adam, VI, 14 (28).
Pecson, VI, 14 (73).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Adam, V, 23 (50).
Secretariat - general administration.
Bender, V, 6 (59).
Secretariat - general policy.
Adam, VI, 14 (3, 6).

Bender, V, 6 (12, 29).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Bender, V, 17 (69, 88), 20 (47).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Bender, V, 2 (83).
Universal Declaration of Human Rights - commemoration.
Laugier, II, 18 (49).
Working languages - Spanish.
Laugier, V, 14 (90).

## DIRECTOR-GENERAL [L. H. EVANS]

Closing speech. II, 18 (117).
Committee on Contributions - reports. V, 13 (9, 51, 79).
Credentials - presentation and verification. II, 2 (20).
Director-General - reports. V, 19 (44, 47).
Director-General [L. H. Evans] - report, 1953-54. II, 4 (27), 10 (62).
Executive Board - composition and functions. V, 14 (46); VI, 37 (125).
General Conference - documents. IV, 35 (122, 125, 129).
General Conference, 9th session - seat. II, 15 (88); VI, 13 (43).
Headquarters. II, 16 (143), XI, 2 (31, 40, 49, 78, 83).
International administrative tribunals. V, 23 (127, 131, 137, 139, 145), 24 (6, 9).
Member States - report. X, 9 (1).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary. VI, 37 (102).
Programme - remodelling and decentralization. IV, 6 (1), 30 (43, 52).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities. IV, 23 (69, 117), 29 (33).
Programme, 1955-56 - education. II, 17 (73); IV, 12 (29), 13 (45, 59, 70, 80, 117, 120, 123, 127, 160, 163), 31 (63); VI, 4 (55), 37 (21, 26, 36).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons. IV, 28 (60).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences. IV, 17 (7), 32 (11), VI, 37 (54, 63, 89).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences. IV, 24 (16, 83).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance. IV, 27 (142, 148).
Programme and budget, 1955-56. IV, 2 (15), 3 (40), 9 (3, 16), 12 (1, 77); VI, 4 (2, 25, 28, 31, 39, 56), 21 (38), 36 (4, 13, 20).
Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind. IV, 29 (110).
Secretariat - Appeals Board. V, 23 (60, 67, 69, 80, 82, 87, 93, 98, 102).
Secretariat - general administration. V, 6 (45, 53, 57, 68, 80); VI, 13 (43, 45, 52, 58, 60, 64, 66, 72, 79, 84).
Secretariat - general policy. VI, 13 (87, 89).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations. II, 16 (70, 94); V, 17 (60, 73, 75, 78, 105), 18 (15, 21, 35, 43, 63, 67, 69, 72, 75, 78, 88, 91, 95, 98, 102, 104), 19 (2, 9, 15, 20, 27, 31, 33), 20 (40), 21 (11), 22 (26, 31, 34, 39, 44, 54, 56, 64, 67, 69).
Secretariat. Bureau of Personnel and Management. VI, 13 (16, 19, 25, 39).
Technical assistance. IV, 7 (3).
Tribute to Uruguay. II, 18 (117).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56. V, 24 (6, 9).
Working languages - Russian. II, 16 (186)

## ASSISTANT DIRECTOR-GENERAL [M. ADISESHIAH]

Technical Assistance. IV, 7 (5), 8 (71, 89, 103, 126, 130, 136, 142), VI, 26 (44).

## ASSISTANT DIRECTOR-GENERAL [R. MAHEU]

Auditors - report, 1952-53. VI, 16 (8).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table. IV, 34 (10).
Club of Friends of Unesco. IV, 30 (79, 81); VI, 19 (131, 133).
Committee on Contributions - reports. IV, 32 (112); V, 10 (109).
Cultural agreements. IV, 30 (83); 12 (81, 89, 95).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget. IV, 34 (81, 105), 35 (33); VI, 38 (47, 62, 68).
General Conference, 9th session - seat. VI, 20 (4, 20, 34).
International civil servants. VI, 26 (14, 18).
International understanding and co-operation. VI, 28 (7).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary. VI, 20 (44, 47, 49), 26 (26).
National Commissions. VI, 15 (53, 56, 58, 68, 74, 84).
Non-governmental organizations. V, 15 (21, 88), 16 (9, 12, 32, 98, 109, 136, 142); VI, 16 (8, 14).
Programme- remodelling and decentralization. IV, 6 (26, 52), 30 (1, 16, 33, 55, 60, 70), 33 (62, 67); VI, 14 (12, 30, 38, 41), 22 (8), 23

(7, 38, 47, 66, 74), 25 (7, 11, 79, 82), 31 (3, 38, 46, 56, 60, 64, 73), 33 (9, 21, 26, 31, 35, 49, 60, 64, 73, 87, 91, 101, 108, 114, 120), 34 (3, 14, 18, 23, 27, 31, 34, 39, 43, 45, 49, 54, 56, 58, 64, 71), 35 (15, 25, 31, 36, 41, 46, 49, 54, 61).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities. VI, 5 (62, 67, 69, 98, 100, 111, 119, 121), 7 (53, 102, 123, 131, 136).
Programme, 1955-56 - education. IV, 31 (85); VI, 2 (8, 19, 25, 35, 42, 49, 60, 63, 67, 83), 3 (2, 24, 27, 30, 32, 34, 52, 54, 56, 59, 61, 63), 4 (76, 91, 95, 102, 105, 108, 112), 5 (28), 6 (2, 70, 79, 95), 16 (56, 59), 20 (38), 21 (7), 24 (87, 103).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons. VI, 10 (46, 48, 61, 79).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication. IV, 26 (25, 48, 112, 114, 137, 140), 27 (3, 19, 41, 49, 155), VI, 6 (82), 7 (18), 11 (15, 21, 31, 40, 44, 47, 52, 68, 71, 84, 86, 92, 105, 139), 12 (4, 8, 25, 32, 38, 40, 42, 46, 68, 76, 79, 81, 89, 95), 19 (10, 42).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences. IV, 15 (108), 19 (22, 36, 59, 75, 86, 98, 109, 124), 21 (2, 8), 32 (18, 83, 88, 114); VI, 8 (25, 75, 94), 9 (9, 16, 39), 16 (81, 84, 96, 107, 116, 121, 125), 17 (23, 31, 34, 47, 56, 64, 81, 88, 90, 93, 116, 125, 128, 132, 141), 24 (122).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences. IV, 31 (18); VI, 9 (73, 80, 84, 93, 100, 103, 106, 108, 122), 10 (12), 18 (20, 25), 24 (134), 26 (36).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance. VI, 12 (68).
Programme and budget, 1955-56. VI, 1 (15), 2 (8, 19, 25, 35, 42, 49, 60, 63, 67, 83), 16 (22), 20 (53, 56, 65, 67, 71), 21 (30), 24 (5, 20, 28, 34, 42, 63, 66, 71, 77, 193).
Programme and Budget Commission - report. IV, 35 (33).
Publications and documents of Unesco. VI, 12 (104, 108, 116, 123, 128), 19 (126), 24 (155, 157, 162).
Science co-operation offices. VI, 14 (12, 30, 38, 41, 57, 69, 81).
Secretariat. New York Office. VI, 15 (89, 91, 103, 107).
Secretariat. Regional Centre in the Western Hemisphere, Havana. VI, 15 (17, 29).
United Nations/Unesco - relations. V, 15 (10).
Working languages - Russian. VI, 19 (64, 67, 69, 82, 86, 90, 96), 25 (79, 82, 95, 99, 119).

# SECRETARIAT

Associate Members
Saba, VIII, 5 (17, 19, 22, 25, 51, 55, 59, 62, 72).
Auditors - report, 1952-53.
Harper-Smith, V, 2 (5, 8, 10).
Budget, 1955-56 - appropriation table.
Rao, VI, 38 (2, 9, 11).
China - representation.
Saba, IX, 1 (1, 18, 28, 31).
Committee on Contributions - reports.
Farr, V, 6 (79); VI, 15 (8), 21 (1).
Harper-Smith, V, 9 (43, 64, 67, 84), 10 (13, 20, 28, 38, 41, 44, 52, 54, 60, 63, 66, 76, 86, 88, 97, 99), 13 (33, 45), 20 (15).
Montagnier, VI, 13 (70).
Rao, VI, 24 (166, 176), 37 (118).
Credentials - presentation and verification.
Saba, IX, 1 (4, 8, 18, 26, 28, 31, 36).
Director-General - reports.
Saba, V, 3 (30); VIII, 4 (2, 11, 14, 20, 37, 47, 57, 61).
Discrimination.
Chevalier, II, 17 (100).
Executive Board - composition and functions.
Saba, II, 14 (9, 16, 32, 39); V, 5 (51), 7 (7, 10, 26, 76, 78), 8 (37, 75); VIII, 2 (9, 17, 26, 37, 42), 3 (5, 17, 19, 29, 41, 63), 6 (3, 5, 12, 29, 32, 39, 40, 53, 55, 61, 66, 68).
Financial Regulations - amendments.
Harper-Smith, V, 2 (54, 57, 60, 62, 67, 69, 74); VIII, 7 (1, 4).
Saba, VIII, 7 (3, 26, 28).
General Conference - rules.
Saba, V, 3 (67), 19 (79, 86), VIII, 5 (19, 22, 25, 30, 33, 75, 77).
General Conference. Advisory Committee on Programme and Budget.
Saba, IV, 35 (88, 92, 113).
General Conference. Nominations Committee.
Saba, VIII, 5 (77).
General Conference, 9th session - seat.
Montagnier, V, 6 (13).
Rao, VI, 20 (18).
Headquarters.
Callison, XI, 2 (7, 9, 13, 16, 20, 74).
Saba, XI, 2 (22, 43, 52, 56, 58, 62).
Human rights - international covenants.
Saba, IV, 30 (105).
International civil servants.
Saba, VIII, 7 (32).
International understanding and co-operation.
Carter, VI, 28 (107, 119, 126).
Elvin, VI, 28 (6, 34, 48, 54, 59, 63, 86, 90, 102), 29 (10, 27).
Guiton, VI, 30 (31).
Kirpal, VI, 28 (71), 29 (14).
Joint Staff Pensions Fund. Committee - election, 1954.
Harper-Smith, V, 17 (43, 55).
Member States - reports.
Francovich, X, 2 (10, 22, 24, 29, 34, 39), 3 (4).
McPhee, X, 8 (58).
Member States - withdrawal.
Saba, VIII, 5 (1, 17).
Mickiewicz, Adam - anniversary.
Kirpal, VI, 26 (27, 31).

National Commissions.
Chevalier, VI, 15 (31, 50).
Rao, VI, 15 (49).
Non-governmental organizations.
Hercik, V, 16 (66, 80).
Programme, 1955-56 - cultural activities.
Elvin, VI, 6 (44).
Kirpal, VI, 24 (139).
Rao, VI, 5 (54, 56), 7 (82, 100, 104, 121).
Thomas, IV, 21 (28, 105, 109, 128, 141), 23 (20, 45, 47, 77, 81, 86, 97), 24 (55, 77, 80, 95, 100, 106, 115, 149, 162), 25 (22, 29, 36, 49, 73, 85, 108, 118, 121), 29 (15, 26, 29, 39, 44, 64, 136, 143); VI, 5 (47, 52, 59, 64, 75, 79, 81, 84, 86, 88, 92, 94, 96, 102, 104, 113, 115), 6 (31, 34, 36, 38, 40, 43, 48, 50, 60), 7 (4, 7, 26, 29, 33, 39, 43, 46, 48, 50, 61, 70, 77, 80, 87, 90, 94, 106, 109, 116, 119, 124, 126, 128, 133, 138), 8 (2, 10), 18 (48, 50, 53, 55, 57, 59, 62, 67, 69, 72, 77, 85, 87, 90, 98, 101, 103, 106, 111, 116), 27 (80, 89).
Programme, 1955-56 - education.
Desjardins, VI, 6 (65, 68, 72, 74, 76, 78, 89).
Elvin, IV, 10 (63, 122, 141), 11 (19, 25, 82, 95, 103), 12 (18, 33, 65, 83, 93, 106, 127), 13 (18, 33, 47, 71, 91, 108, 137, 154), 14 (1, 27, 61, 87, 93, 99, 102, 106, 108, 130, 147, 178, 203, 209), 31 (60, 83), 32 (27); VI, 3 (12, 18, 41, 46, 58, 64, 76, 79, 81, 83, 85), 4 (10, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 40, 42, 44, 48, 53, 61, 65, 69, 83, 86, 97, 103), 5 (2, 8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 22, 26, 39, 41). 6 (24, 28, 44, 92, 101, 104, 107, 109, 111, 113), 7 (2, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20), 16 (36, 40, 52, 55), 20 (42), 24 (80, 84, 98, 100, 110), 27 (16, 33, 38, 41, 45, 53), 37 (3, 34).
Guiton, VI, 2 (14, 30, 55, 57, 62, 73).
Ortiz, (Regional Fundamental Education Centre for Latin America), IV, 13 (142).
Rao, VI, 2 (58), 3 (8, 10, 15), 4 (96, 99).
Programme, 1955-56 - exchange of persons.
Carter, IV, 28 (1, 7, 48, 66, 74, 78, 81, 86); VI, 6 (114), 10 (18, 23, 32, 36, 38, 40, 50, 53, 72, 73, 76, 78, 81, 85), 19 (46, 49, 52, 61).
Elvin, VI, 19 (59).
Programme, 1955-56 - mass communication.
Desjardins, IV, 26 (1, 71, 76, 84, 95), 27 (38, 67, 71, 84, 94, 103, 105, 109, 119, 124, 153), 29 (2, 6); VI, 6 (63, 68, 72, 74, 76, 78, 89), 11 (1, 10, 12, 18, 32, 43, 48, 50, 55, 65, 73, 76, 78, 82, 88, 96, 100, 111, 114, 117, 121, 125, 127, 129, 133, 137), 12 (10, 12, 17, 22, 27, 39, 43, 50, 53, 58, 63), 18 (121, 124, 128, 131, 133, 135, 138, 140), 19 (2, 13, 25, 30, 35, 37, 41), 24 (147), 27 (101).
Elvin, VI, 6 (67).
Rao, VI, 11 (57, 61, 74, 80), 12 (18, 20, 23), 24 (150).
Zuckerman, IV, 27 (136); VI, 19 (19, 21), 27 (104).
Programme, 1955-56 - natural sciences.
Auger, IV, 15 (8, 50, 64, 77, 90, 106, 117, 120), 16 (7, 8, 11, 25, 43, 51, 56, 69, 71, 74, 89, 109, 161), 17 (45, 67, 71, 75, 78, 82, 86, 98, 103, 105, 108, 113, 126, 132, 137), 19 (5, 12, 25, 44, 56, 71, 110, 116), 21 (13), 32 (48, 63, 68, 86, 94); VI, 8 (14, 29, 33, 37, 39, 41, 46, 49, 55, 60, 63, 66, 70, 87, 96, 100, 106, 108, 111, 116, 119), 9 (7, 11, 17, 21, 25, 27, 30, 34, 36, 58, 60), 16 (82, 97, 108), 17 (1, 3, 5, 17, 26, 40, 50, 54, 61, 65, 67, 69, 73, 75, 80, 94, 100, 104, 107, 111, 117, 124, 129, 131, 144, 149, 155), 24 (117, 124, 127, 131), 27 (58, 65, 67, 70), 37 (41, 44, 50, 73, 80).
Rao, VI, 8 (35), 24 (123), 37 (76, 78).
Programme, 1955-56 - social sciences.
Myrdal, IV, 18 (2, 50, 74, 93, 98, 105, 113, 145, 150, 152, 167, 172, 180, 191), 20 (12, 23, 30, 38, 84, 101), 22 (16, 40, 53, 58, 63, 65, 70, 84), 24 (13, 23), 31 (1); VI, 5 (32), 6 (12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23), 7 (21), 9 (62, 70, 76, 82, 89, 115, 119, 123, 129, 135, 141, 143, 151), 10 (2, 5, 7), 16 (63, 72), 18 (2, 9, 14, 23, 30, 33, 39, 43), 24 (134), 26 (41), 37 (91).
Rao, IV, 18 (129, 136), 20 (45, 93); VI, 9 (78, 83, 86, 91, 95), 18 (26, 45).
Programme, 1955-56 - voluntary international assistance.
Zuckerman, IV, 27 (136).
Programme and budget, 1955-56.
Desjardins, VI, 20 (73).
Harper-Smith, VI, 12 (132, 134).
Rao, VI, 1 (26), 16 (17), 20 (59), 36 (10).
Publications and documents of Unesco.
Delavenay, IV, 29 (164), 30 (126, 130); VI, 12 (101, 110, 117, 121, 126).
Rao, VI, 12 (103, 112, 114).
Science co-operation offices.
Auger, VI, 14 (45, 52, 79, 82).
Seal and emblem of Unesco.
Delavenay, IV, 30 (113).
Saba, IV, 30 (116, 120, 122, 124).
Secretariat - Appeals Board.
Farr, V, 23 (13, 44, 74).
Henquet (Staff Association), V, 23 (91).
Secretariat - general administration.
Auger, VI, 13 (53).
Farr, V, 6 (39, 43, 75, 79); VI, 13 (50, 78).
Montagnier, VI, 13 (69, 82).
Secretariat - general policy.
Montagnier, VI, 13 (69).
Rao, V, 6 (36).
Secretariat - Medical Benefit Scheme.
Harper-Smith, V, 17 (1, 8, 13).
Secretariat - staff compensation plan for service-incurred risks.
Harper-Smith, V, 17 (16, 29, 36, 39).
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations.
Farr, V, 24 (15, 18).
Henquet (Staff Association), V, 17 (99), 20 (51, 58).
Saba, V, 18 (70, 81, 84), 22 (4, 25).
Secretariat - training programme.
Farr, V, 20 (35, 37).
Secretariat. Bureau of Personnel and Management.
Farr, VI, 12 (135, 137, 142, 144), 13 (2, 21, 28, 30).
Harper-Smith, VI, 13 (34).
Rao, VI, 12 (139), 13 (15, 32, 36).
Secretariat. Department of Mass Communication.
Desjardins, IV, 29 (2, 6).

Secretariat. New York Office.
Farr, VI, 15 (93, 98).
Rao, VI, 15 (90, 101).
Secretariat. Regional Centre in the Western Hemisphere, Havana.
Francovich, VI, 15 (3, 18).
Technical assistance.
Garrido, IV, 7 (18).
Harper-Smith, V, 2 (14).
Sabas Olaizola, IV, 7 (27).
Turner, IV, 7 (36).
Unesco Coupon Scheme - losses on exchange.
Harper-Smith, V, 2 (79).
Zuckerman, V, 3 (12, 18).
Working Capital Fund - administration, 1955-56.
Harper-Smith, V, 2 (17, 28, 34, 36, 45, 47).
Working languages - Russian.
Delavenay, VI, 19 (68, 70, 97), 25 (84, 109).
Leguen, VI, 19 (71, 76, 78), 25 (86, 92, 97).
Montagnier, VIII, 6 (76).
Saba, II, 16 (182); VIII, 6 (75).

# Special subscription services

*The subscription services listed below are intended particularly for librarians and for organizations concerned with the study of international affairs. Subscriptions should be sent to Unesco National Distributors or, in case of difficulty, direct to Unesco.*

## UNESCO DOCUMENTS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE

This service offers direct from Paris one copy of each Unesco main series document in the language selected by the subscriber. Unesco documents (usually roneoed) are of particular interest to those wanting more complete documentation on the organization and activities of Unesco than is provided by its official publications. Main series documents – as distinguished from working series – are available for distribution outside Unesco House in English and French, some in Spanish. Subscribers to the Spanish service should state alternative language where no Spanish version is available. Unesco documents are not sold separately.

Annual rate (including postage): $30 £10 10,000 fr.

## COMPREHENSIVE PERIODICALS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE

A combined subscription to all 10 Unesco periodicals (French or English version, Spanish when available) offering a considerable reduction over the total cost of separate subscriptions.

Annual rate (including postage): $25 £6.6.0 6,000 fr.

## BOOK SUBSCRIPTION SCHEME

One copy of each new book or pamphlet in any one language sent on publication direct from Paris. Available only to subscribers to the two services described above. Cost: value of the books despatched, plus postage. Payment is made in one sum every six months.

# UNESCO PUBLICATIONS : NATIONAL DISTRIBUTORS

ALGERIA
Éditions de l'Empire,
28 rue Michelet,
ALGIERS.

ARGENTINA
Editorial Sudamericana S.A.,
Alsina 500,
BUENOS AIRES.

ASSOCIATED STATES OF CAMBODIA, LAOS AND VIET-NAM
Librairie Nouvelle
Albert Portail,
Boîte Postale 283,
SAIGON.
*Sub-depot:*
Librairie Albert Portail,
14 avenue Boulloche,
PHNOM-PENH.

AUSTRALIA
Oxford University Press,
346 Little Collins St.,
MELBOURNE.

AUSTRIA
Wilhelm Frick Verlag,
27 Graben,
VIENNA I.

BELGIUM
Librairie Encyclopédique,
7, rue du Luxembourg,
BRUSSELS IV.
N.V. Standaard-Boekhandel,
Belgiëlei 151,
ANVERS.

BOLIVIA
Librería Selecciones,
avenida Camacho 369,
casilla 972,
LA PAZ.

BRAZIL
Livraria Agir Editora,
rua México 98-B,
Caixa postal 3291,
RIO DE JANEIRO.

CANADA
University of Toronto Press,
TORONTO.
Periodica Inc.,
5112 avenue Papineau,
MONTREAL 34.

CEYLON
Lake House Bookshop,
The Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.,
P.O. Box 244,
COLOMBO I.

CHILE
Librería Universitaria,
Alameda B. O'Higgins 1059,
SANTIAGO.

COLOMBIA
Hans Otto Ungar,
Librería Central,
Carrera 6d. A. No. 14-32,
BOGOTA.

COSTA RICA
*Trejos Hermanos,*
apartado 1313,
SAN JOSE.

CUBA
Unesco Centro Regional en el Hemisfero Occidental,
Calle 3 No. 306 Vedado,
apartado 1358,
HAVANA.

CYPRUS
M.E. Constantinides,
P.O. Box 473,
NICOSIA.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
Artia Ltd.,
30 Ve smeckach,
PRAGUE 2

DENMARK
Ejnar Munksgaard Ltd.,
6 Nørregade,
COPENHAGEN K

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Librería Dominicana,
Calle Mercedes 49,
apartado 656,
CIUDAD TRUJILLO, R.D.

ECUADOR
Librería Científica,
Luque 233,
Casilla 362,
GUYAQUIL.

EGYPT
La Renaissance d'Égypte,
9 Adly Pasha Street,
CAIRO.

ETHIOPIA
International Press Agency,
P.O. Box 120,
ADDIS ABABA.

FINLAND
Akateeminen Kirjakauppa,
2 Keskuskatu,
HELSINKI.

FORMOSA
The World Book Co. Ltd.,
99 Chung King Rd.,
Section I,
TAIPEH.

FRANCE
Unesco Bookshop,
19 avenue Kleber,
PARIS-16e

FRENCH WEST INDIES
Librairie J. Bocage,
rue Lavoïs,
FORT DE FRANCE
(Martinique).

GERMANY
Unesco Vertrieb für Deutschland,
R. Oldenbourg,
MUNICH.

GREECE
Librairie H. Kauffmann,
28 rue du Stade,
ATHENS.

HAITI
Librairie «A la Caravelle»,
36 rue Roux,
Boîte postale III-B,
PORT-AU-PRINCE

HONG KONG
Swindon Book Co.,
25 Nathan Road,
KOWLOON.

HUNGARY
Kultura, P.O.B. 149,
BUDAPEST 62.

INDIA
Orient Longmans Ltd.,
Indian Mercantile Chamber,
Nicol Road,
BOMBAY
17 Chittaranjan Ave.,
CALCUTTA.
36-A Mount Road,
MADRAS.
*Sub-depots:*
Oxford Book and Stationery Co.,
Scindia House,
NEW DELHI.
Rajkamal Publications Ltd.,
Himalaya House,
Hornby Road,
BOMBAY I.

INDONESIA
G.C.T. van Dorp and Co.,
Djalan Nusantara 22,
JAKARTA.

IRAN
Iranian National Commission for Unesco,
Avenue du Musée,
TEHERAN.

IRAQ
McKenzie's Bookshop,
BAGHDAD.

ISRAEL
Blumstein's Bookstores, Ltd.,
35 Allenby Road,
P.O.B. 5154,
TEL AVIV.

ITALY
Librería Commissionaria
G.C. Sansoni,
via Gino Capponi 26,
Casella postale 552,
FLORENCE.

JAMAICA
Sangster's Book Room,
99 Harbour Street,
KINGSTON.
Knox Educational Services,
SPALDINGS.

JAPAN
Maruzen Co. Inc.,
6 Tori-Nichome,
Nihonbashi,
TOKYO.

JORDAN
Joseph I. Bahous and Co.,
Dar-ul-Kutub,
Salt Road,
AMMAN.

KOREA
Korean National Commission for Unesco,
Ministry of Education,
SEOUL.

LEBANON
Librairie Universelle,
Avenue des Français,
BEIRUT.

LIBERIA
J. Momolu Kamara,
69 Front and Gurley Streets,
MONROVIA.

LUXEMBOURG
Librairie Paul Peuck,
33, Grand-Rue,
LUXEMBOURG.

MALAYAN FEDERATION AND SINGAPORE
Peter Chong and Co.,
P.O. Box 135,
SINGAPORE.

MALTA
Sapienza's Library,
26 Kingsway,
VALLETTA.

MEXICO
Librería y Ediciones Emilio Obregón,
Avenida Juarez nº 30,
MEXICO, D.F.

NETHERLANDS
N.V. Martinus Nijhoff,
Lange Voorhout 9,
THE HAGUE.

NEW ZEALAND
Unesco Publications Centre,
100 Hackthorne Road,
CHRISTCHURCH.

NIGERIA
C.M.S. Bookshop,
P.O. Box 174,
LAGOS.

NORWAY
A/S Bokhjornet,
Stortingsplass 7,
OSLO

PAKISTAN
Ferozsons,
60 The Mall,
LAHORE.
Bunder Road,
KARACHI.
35 The Mall
PESHAWAR.

PANAMA
Agencia Internacional de Publicaciones,
apartado 2052,
Plaza de Arango No. 3,
PANAMA, R.P.

PARAGUAY
Agencia de Librerías de Salvador Nizza,
calle Pte. Franco No. 39/43,
ASUNCION.

PERU
Librería Mejia Baca,
Azangaro 722,
LIMA.

PHILIPPINES
Philippine Education Co.,
1104 Castillejos,
Quiapo,
MANILA.

PORTUGAL
Publicações Europa-América, Ltda.,
Rua das Flores 45, 1º.,
LISBON.

PUERTO RICO
Pan-American Book Co.,
SAN JUAN 12.

SPAIN
Librería Científica Medinaceli,
Duque de Medinaceli, 4,
MADRID.

SURINAM
Radhakishun and Co. Ltd. (Book Dept.),
Watermolenstraat 36,
PARAMARIBO.

SWEDEN
A/B C.E. Fritzes Kungl., Hovbokhandel,
Fredsgatan 2,
STOCKHOLM 16.

SWITZERLAND
Librairie Antoine Dousse, ancienne librairie de l'Université,
Case postale 72,
FRIBOURG.
Europa Verlag,
5 Rämistrasse,
ZURICH.
*Sub-depot:*
Librairie Payot,
place Molard,
GENEVA.
Librairie Barblan et Saladin,
10, rue Romont,
FRIBOURG.

SYRIA
Librairie Universelle,
DAMASCUS.

THAILAND
Suksapan Panit,
Arkarn 9,
Rajdamnern Ave.,
BANGKOK.

TUNISIA
Victor Boukhors,
4 rue Nocard,
TUNIS.

TURKEY
Librairie Hachette,
469 Istiklal Caddesi,
Beyoglu,
ISTANBUL.

UNION OF BURMA
Burma Educational Bookshop,
551-3 Merchant Street,
P.O. Box 222,
RANGOON.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
Van Schaik's Bookstore (Pty) Ltd.,
P.O. Box 724,
PRETORIA.

UNITED KINGDOM AND N. IRELAND
H.M. Stationery Office,
P.O. Box 569,
LONDON, S.E. 1.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Columbia University Press,
2960 Broadway,
NEW-YORK 27, N.Y.

URUGUAY
Oficina de Representación de Editoriales,
18 de Julio, 1333,
MONTEVIDEO.

VENEZUELA
Librería Villegas Venezolana,
Madrices a Marron N.35,
Pasaje Urdaneta,
Local B.
CARACAS.

YUGOSLAVIA
Jugoslovenska Knjiga,
Terazije 27/II,
BELGRADE.